

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of UNICEF's Response to the Venezuelan Outflow: Brazil Case Study

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	78%	Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may use the evaluation with caution. Substantive improvements in some areas are needed
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	Evaluation of UNICEF's Response to the Venezuelan Outflow: Brazil Case Study
Report sequence number	Brazil/62/2022/18807
Region	LACR
Year of report	2022
Office	Brazil Country Office
Coverage (countries)	Brazil (with reference and linkages to the other countries involved in the multisectoral intervention: including Colombia, Ecuador and Peru)
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	February 2, 2023
Name of review firm	IOD PARC

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)	
Every child survives and thrives	Yes
Every child learns	Yes
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object	Joint Programme
Evaluation type	Summative and formative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Non-experimental
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome
Geographic scope	Regional
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,16,17

EQA Summary: The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.

The report is satisfactory in meeting UNICEF evaluation standards. Taking into account the challenges of the intervention and the evaluation, being at the humanitarian-development nexus in a multi-country, multi stakeholder emergency response, **the main strengths of the report include:**

- The report meets the main objective of identifying key lessons of the ongoing Brazil CO response to the Venezuela Outflow crisis to inform and provide useful learning for the design and implementation of future country programming especially with regards to Humanitarian Programming.
- There is good use of ethnographic data to triangulate findings.
- The recommendations are clear and concise with sufficient detail to aid in implementation.

The main weaknesses of the report are:

- There should be greater use of tables, figures or maps which would aid in understanding and help to break up long tracts of narrative, for example: a table of stakeholders and their roles, disaggregated data by gender, race or other marginalized groups and the use of summary tables of findings against EQs.
- There is a lack of clarity and context regarding the overarching 5 country case study methodology, in particular the challenges of data collection due to the lack of a results framework or specific Brazil CO monitoring data, and mitigation against this, for example more clarity on outcome harvesting and quantitative methods of data collection.
- The evaluation stated it would be participatory in nature, but little evidence was provided to demonstrate this, or how it managed the inclusion of marginalised groups in practice.
- The findings were unclear in places, and lacked analysis across different groups of people, or genders. The evidence on effectiveness was lacking and there was insufficient data to answer many questions.
- Lessons and conclusions were not clearly articulated, or differentiated from the findings.

Recommendations for Improvement: The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.

Key recommendations for improvement are noted below, broken down by which section of the evaluation they relate to:

Background and Context

- A stakeholder map, or other visual representations of stakeholders and coordination mechanisms would aid in understanding.

Methodology

- Greater clarity should be provided on the methodology and details about the specifics of the Brazil methodology set out, taking into account the data collection challenges, and situating this study within the wider 5 country case study approach.
- A table should be included in the Annex to show how the evaluation questions changed following the IR.
- If a participatory approach is taken, it should be applied throughout the evaluation.

Findings

- Findings should be more succinctly summarised, with data in tables or grouped together as relevant.

Conclusions

- Conclusions would have benefited from being re-formulated to ensure that they are clear and precise

Lessons

- Lessons should not be summary of the conclusion, but specific and relevant to the objective of the evaluation and should be numbered or subtitled.

SECTION RATINGS		
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	67%	Comments on Rating
Question 1. Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		

	i Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	For the most part the document is standalone and can be used to inform decision making, for the Brazil CO in particular. However, it would have been helpful to include a context on the fact this report is one of 5 country case studies, and exactly how it will go on to support regional decisions making as part of the regional synthesis report. The Executive Summary stretches onto 7 pages, brevity of language and more succinct summaries of the findings would have helped to shorten it.
	ii Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	The Executive Summary, for the most part, contains all necessary elements.
	iii Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Partially	The Executive Summary is overlong, some information should be more succinct (the findings section), while it could be improved if it included: •Details of how the participatory approach would be applied, and clarification that the participatory work held in February 2022 to validate findings was composed only of UNICEF staff, as was the Reference Group. •More detail on the gaps in evidence and data, and any mitigation measures taken. •Lessons learned could be clearer. For example, one bullet point simply states "school passports" with no context on what the learning about them is. •Include regional recommendation as well as country, along with timelines.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		93%	Comments on Rating
Question 2. Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?			
	i Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The location of the intervention and description of activities are included, for example UNICEF aims to: •Ensure provision of assistance in hotspots at the border and in the transit paths - in Roraima, Amazonas and Para UNICEF's multi-sectoral services focused on 61 locations, including 14 official shelters and 29 informal settlements. •Strengthen child protection systems •Scale up efforts to address emerging needs of migrants and host communities in urban settings. • Provide children and families –both migrant and from host communities– with protection support, lifesaving relief, and development assistance. The object and timeline of the case study is clearly defined as UNICEF's Response to the Venezuela Outflow in Brazil between 2019 and 2021. Cost and budget details are described, with two tables (which are unnamed) on page 15 detailing what funding has been received, compared to what is needed, and where gaps lie. However, there could be a narrative description of what the implications of the funding gaps mean in terms of the intervention, or its evaluation. The intervention is assumed to be ongoing as this is a formative evaluation.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	The rights holders are described as Venezuelan refugees in Brazil (300,000) , with the focus of this evaluation on the approximately 50,000 migrants in Roraima state. A continual movement of people across the border is anticipated (taking into account the impact of COVID 19 on the free movement of people during the time of this intervention). The responsibility of duty bearers is described and the Government of Brazil (GoB) has good laws and protections for refugees, however, it is noted that " <i>While documented refugees and migrants have, in theory, unlimited access to public services, in practice challenges have been identified in their access to education and healthcare.</i> "pp13).UN agencies work jointly and provide specific support as per their remits and expertise. This section could be improved if numbers of people reached was given (not estimates), and it data was disaggregated by gender, race, disability etc. to better describe the rightsholders. Tables and figures to display this information would be more helpful than long narrative descriptions.
Question 3. Is the context of the intervention clearly described?			
	i Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The country context of Brazil is clearly and succinctly explained, with details on the progress the country has made towards reducing poverty and other associated factors increased access to education. The inequalities are also clearly outlined to include issues which will impact on the implementation of this intervention, including: •High levels of rural poverty and inequality •Poverty and inequality highest among specific racial groups, e.g. those of Afro-descent, and particularly indigenous people. •Gendered inequalities • Other marginalised groups, such as children with disabilities being excluded from education, and LGBT people experiencing prejudice and discrimination. The culture, and power imbalances between different groups of people is clearly described and this section does a good job of explaining the intersection of multiple inequities for different groups of people (especially indigenous people), resulting in, for example, higher levels of childhood malnutrition and child and maternal mortality, as well as low levels of education and high levels of gendered violence.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	There is no specific reference to SDGs, however there is an implicit aim to analyse SDGs by means of the evaluation.

	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is a discussion of the status and needs of the rightsholders, which includes a good outline of the key issues and challenges which rightsholders/ migrants face along with a description of differing needs according to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Urban/ rural populations •Formal accommodation/ informal settlements • Access to food and basic sanitation • Higher risks of gender based violence, teen pregnancies and lack of access to education are issues which can affect all refugees, but are amplified for indigenous people.
Question 4.		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	There is identification of implementation agencies, development partners, rights holders, duty bearers and stakeholders. However, this data is not presented succinctly in one place, and is instead noted at different points in the country context, the description of the intervention, or the needs of rights holders. There is a table (not numbered) in section 2.3 (on scope) which outlines internal UNICEF partners, and external partners, and which level they operate at (from community to federal). However, it would make more logical sense to include a section on key partners in Section 1, as part of the background and context, and to provide a stakeholder map.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	•There are narrative descriptions of the different stakeholders, and linkages between them for example a description of the government and UN stakeholders roles and national coordination processes and structures - which appears thorough. Implementing partners, are listed, but would benefit from a description of their roles and contributions. While all information is included it could be improved if there was greater clarity about UNICEF's role in the multi sectoral response to the Venezuelan migration crisis, and in the Brazil context specifically. The use of visual representations of the contribution and roles of the key stakeholders would aid in understanding. •There is also a section (pp15) entitled "Funds and partners mobilization" which sets out the financial contributions through the regional appeal (HAC). This could be improved if there was more context to understand how financial resources were allocated, although it is acknowledged that the evaluation team may not have had access to this data.
SECTION C:		EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	83%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.		Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Partially	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly described, including why it is needed at this time, and its intended use and key intended users (UNICEF CO and Regional office, and partners). However, how the evaluation fits within the wider scope of the 5 country case studies, and how it will be used to inform a final synthesis is not included. It might be helpful to include an overview of the other country case studies, an outline of how they will collectively be used to produce a synthesis, and how this report will contribute to that end goal.
Question 6.		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Partially	There is a clear description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve. It is noted that changes were made to the evaluation questions at IR stage, and it would have been helpful to include a summary of those changes as an annex.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	Geographically the scope is described narratively as primarily being focused in the Northern states of Roraima and Amazonas, with reference to specific cities and areas within these states. It is also noted that UNICEF's contribution at federal level, mainly in relation to coordination mechanism will be assessed. A map would greatly aid in understanding of the geographical scope. Chronologically scope is well defined, and it is noted that there was a request from UNICEF regional office to extend the scope of the evaluation to December 2021 (the ToRs state June 2021) which was challenging, as fieldwork was completed in November 2021, and reporting and monitoring data is only available up until June 2021 which means that evaluation could not meet this request due to a lack of data and evidence. The thematic scope is not well described, and would benefit from more detail on what precisely will be evaluated. There is a clear section on what will not be covered by the evaluation, in terms of time, and other key factors, and reasons for this, for example : <i>"The evaluation cannot cover the linkages between the emergency response and the upcoming CPD, as it has been reviewed in parallel during the data collection phase, and the conclusion and recommendations of that exercise have not been shared yet. We articulate however, analysis and recommendations from the emergency response perspective to link with the long-term programming of UNICEF in Brazil."</i>
Question 7.		Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	There is a description of the intended results at a high level, and a ToC that was developed by the evaluation team for the Brazil case study. There is a lack of clarity on which elements and which specific results are to be tested/ evaluated.
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	There is a thorough Theory of Action which has been developed, and which logically presents information about the assumptions, and context of the evaluation, through to strategies, outputs, outcomes and change at impact level. The graphic is complex but contains appropriate and relevant information.

	iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	The evaluation is not explicit in the main body of the report that it is a theory based evaluation, and how this will be tested. However it has constructed a theory of change which will be tested, and it does state in the executive summary it is theory based.
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)			75%	Comments on Rating
Question 8.		Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. <u>The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.</u>	Yes	The evaluation questions and sub questions are appropriate to meet the purpose of the evaluation, and aligned with the relevant criteria set out in the ToR.
	ii	In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	Yes	There are suggested indicators for each question, and data collection tools listed against each evaluation question. Some of the indicators also outline assumptions, and there is reference to internal frameworks, such the APP and Children on the move framework. The evaluation matrix would be strengthened if it included an indication of the robustness of data sources, and the relevance of indicators.
Question 9.		Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Partially	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex 10 outlines the methodology of the overarching evaluation for all 5 case studies (although it is not referenced in the main body of the report). It is sometimes difficult to match up the methodology of the IR with the methodology in the main body of this report, and as such more detail is required on the final, methodology for the Brazil country case study, and how it may have differed from the overarching methodology. The data collection methods identified are primarily qualitative, with the use of quantitative data via secondary sources, such as project monitoring and financial information. The methods could have been strengthened, and potentially been more robust in achieving the evaluation objectives of ensuring inclusion of marginalised groups if surveys of beneficiaries/ migrants had also been carried out to enable more people to be reached (perhaps greater diversity of people) and larger datasets gathered. A participatory approach is noted as being part of the design, but with little detail on how it will be applied. The utilization focused and forward looking approaches are relevant and appropriate.
	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Partially	<p>Data sources are qualitative and quantitative and clearly described, and appropriate. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document and literature review Context analysis and Timeline Semi-structured KII On-line surveys (Internal and Partners) Hybrid Country-Remote Visits Beneficiary and focus group discussions (FGDs) <p>They could be improved if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was more detail provided on how ethnographic observation, and shadowing of UNICEF field staff would be utilised, greater clarity on how robust this is as a data source, and why it has been included would be helpful. Robustness of all sources had been assessed. Alternative sources had been considered to meet gaps, such as surveys. There was greater clarity on how outcome harvesting would be applied to generate data.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	<p>The sampling strategy for KIIs included UNICEF staff at CO, and at field offices, and included a high number of UNICEF staff, complimented by key partners at national and local levels.</p> <p>The site selection for field work visits is well described and explained, and illustrated with a map of the field areas visited, the logic of visiting different sites was a purposeful sampling stagey, but "The final decisions regarding the number and compositions of group discussions with beneficiaries and host communities depended on the sites visited, time available, nature of programming, as well as practical and public health concerns." (Annex 10). which limits the type of data available and doesn't allow appropriate time to ensure that diverse perspectives could be captured.</p> <p>The FGDs did not involve children under 18, but did two include 2 FGDs with indigenous people, along with a mix of men and women.</p>
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	The methods of analysis are mostly clearly described. This included context analysis and thematic analysis. The ER describes validation processes.

	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	The Theory of Action/Change developed is thorough and includes outputs and outcomes, and causal connections between them, the evaluation explicitly states it intends to draw out causal links, and if applied as intended the methodology should enable this. However, the gaps in the data, and the lack of detail on how this will be addressed, as well as more in depth information on how the analysis will be conducted is likely to limit the ability to draw causal connections.
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Partially	There is a good description of the limitations and constraints, including mitigation strategies where appropriate. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Although one mitigation strategy is to undertake outcome harvesting, which was not mentioned in the methodology section, so it is unclear how this will be applied. •There is no reference back to the evaluability assessment and the data gaps identified there, which might have been expected. •Mitigation of bias was not addressed.
Question 10.		Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	The UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008) are referenced and the specific elements that the case study has adhered to have been outlined
	ii	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	The report states that the case study was designed with consideration of the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008) and UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards and Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis (2015). It was noted that no people under 18 took part in KIs or FGDs.
Question 11.		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Not Rated	There are no specific innovative practices utilised.
SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)			92%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.		Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	The evaluation does answer and address each of the evaluations questions, sub questions and criteria. However, some sections, relating to achievement of results(effectiveness) can only answered in part due to a lack of results framework, and ToC at the outset of the intervention - issues that are out side of the scope of the evaluation. To address this some indicators are selected from general Humanitarian Monitoring Data, and analysed over time.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	There is use of the ToC in the formulation of the findings, as well as explicit reference to the fact that having a regional or country ToC at an earlier stage of the intervention would have been a much welcomed tool to help guide UNICEF's response to the emergency response, particular at early stages. The lack of a results framework also hampers analysis of results, however as noted in earlier section, some of this can be retrospectively reconstructed, and there is also some data from the Humanitarian Performance Monitoring, which is compiled every three months, but this data is not necessarily aligned with UNICEF interventions. There is also some more detailed analysis of the ToC/ToA in later sections which would be better placed in the findings section, and means that evidence is not presented logically or grouped as might be expected.
Question 13.		Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.		

	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	<p>There is mixed use of the data and triangulation, with strengths being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The section on UNICEFs added value to the response to the Venezuelan outflow crisis (pp 45) is clear and concise. •While the ethnographic observations may not have been well explained as a part of the methodology section, they are deployed to good use in the findings section, given the gaps in evidence of e.g. results relating to WASH, they can provide direct reports (and images) to show a lack of adequate sanitation, and access to clean water. "It is even sad to note that the Safe Space (SuperPana) for children established by UNICEF does not have any hand washing facilities or access to sanitation" (pp32) <p>Secondary data from document analyses is weaker, mainly due to the lack of a results or monitoring framework for the UNICEF intervention, meaning much of the evidence on results and effectiveness has had to be retrospectively reconstructed, using limited sources. This is likely to be why the evaluation does not present output and outcome level data. The evaluation could have been strengthened if there had been more effective ways to mitigate against this (such as finding more ways to include the voice of beneficiaries/ rightsholders).</p> <p>There is evidence of triangulation of data, and the voices of people from KIIS and FGDs are shared, although there is no use of direct quotes, which would help to gain a more in depth and situated perspective.</p>
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	<p>Findings are largely supported by the evidence, or the evaluation states where the evidence is not strong enough to make a judgement.</p> <p>Both positive and negative evidence is presented but with a large number of questions not being able to be answered (due to gaps in data), this could have been better presented, for example a table / summary of all the EQs, and whether they were answered in full, or in part, with a reason why. There is very limited use of performance indicators, as there was no performance framework.</p> <p>The evaluation noted that the needs of marginalised and vulnerable were not being met appropriately for a number of reasons, mainly because needs assessments were not conducted, and because in some cases UNICEF is simply not present to identify at risk children or vulnerable people. This was supported by interviews with KIIs and FGDs.</p>
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	<p>There are some specific causal factors noted some in relation to the internal UNICEF factors, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Weak coordination between Brazil CO other regional LACRO country offices and the regional office •Lack of appropriate staff to respond to the emergency, with field staff often deployed on short term contracts, and posts for experienced staff/ team leaders vacant for some time •Lack of guidance for staff on how to respond to the emergency •The challenge of balancing an emergency response with an already complex Brazil CO development programme <p>Other contextual factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The impact of COVID 19 •Challenges of coordination with multisectoral partners, in particular the government of Brazil, and the army which runs the centres for refugees, and where UNICEF has limited influence' •Lack of experienced partners •limited and short term funding and funding mechanisms that "sideline" the UNICEF CO. <p>The evaluation is theory based and does refer back to the ToC/ ToA constructed at the start of the evaluation, but analysis of the logical chain from implementation to results is challenging due to the lack of data gathered at the start, and during the intervention.</p>
Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	<p>The evaluation notes the lack of a performance framework and associated monitoring as a gap in the evidence, but does outline that data has been gathered through HAC and HPM monitoring process, but without clearly defining those processes. The difficulties of managing information between different partners has been noted as particularly challenging, for UNICEF, and presumably for the evaluation team.</p> <p>There is a judgement that UNICEF could improve its monitoring, as it is not complete, and has impacted on UNICEFs ability to make decisions and report both vertically and horizontally. There is, however, a forward looking element that indicates that there have been more recent improvements for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Of relevance is the evolution of the M&E capacities at BV field office level. From a hand-based data collection in 2019 they have been able to evolve to an online and real time system that offers a complete overview of the progress of activities of the different sectors. The preliminary results of the dashboard and the functionalities it offers represent an example of good practice and will be a source of lesson to be learned by other CO of the region." pp56
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	50%	Comments on Rating
Question 15.	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		

	i	Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Partially	<p>The conclusions are not clearly formulated, they are buried in large tracts of text, and in one case, a case study (pp53) which presents new evidence (and would be better placed in the findings section). That said the case study evidence was useful, and is one of the few places where Accountability to Affected populations and indigenous people in particular is addressed in terms of what UNICEF has done so far, and how this could be improved for short term immediate actions, and long term good practice.</p> <p>The conclusions do, for the most part, reflect the objectives and purpose of the evaluation which should help UNICEF understand what has achieved (or not), what constraints there are, what can be learned in terms of short and long term planning and be forward looking in terms of local, national, regional and global learning.</p> <p>A core part of this learning, as well as a challenge, will relate to UNICEF's power and role in participatory working (given a key partner is the Army), and in setting guidance, strategies, results frameworks and monitoring in place to know what is being achieved, by whom, and where, and crucially where gaps lie to enable continued momentum.</p>
	ii	Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	<p>This section is mixed, with some confusion on some elements such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is new country context and stakeholder information brought into the conclusions section that may have been more appropriate in the background/ context section, e.g. that the fact that establishment of coordination and fundraising structures (the R4V and the RMR) was led by UNHCR and IOM, this would also have helped explain some of the findings which refer to UNICEF's role, and challenges in practical achievement. •This section explains in a little more detail what the HAC documents are and why they are not accurate tools to measure UNICEF's results - data better presented in the methodology. •There is also significant referral to the ToC/ToA, which is valid, but would be expected to be more present in the findings section, which would aid in linking this to the relevant evaluation questions. <p>Other conclusions are derived from the findings, and are also forward looking, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Given the lack of ability of UNICEF to operate in some thematic areas, or physical spaces (as outlined in the findings) sensible conclusions are reached as to the role that UNICEF can play going forward, such as supporting the embedding of human rights based responses and principled action. •The importance of regional and country emergency preparedness response strategies, which are able to be adequately resourced. •The ToC / ToA, does appear to have been useful in identifying which parts of the assumed/ reconstructed results chain are impacting on outcomes. •Ongoing coherence with government policies.
Question 16.		Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Yes	The lessons do stem logically from the findings, and have wider applicability.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	<p>The lessons are not clearly or concisely presented, they consist of a long narrative which is not titled or numbered, it is unclear how many lessons have been provided, but perhaps up to 12? To improve this section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The lessons should be shortened to the top three or four, such as the challenges of operating at the humanitarian development nexus, or reaching marginalised groups. •They should be numbered and sub headings used. •It should be clear what lessons are being presented and why.
SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)			88%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The evaluation recommendations are well formulated and do logically follow on from the findings and conclusions.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	Recommendations are specific to UNICEF, and presented in light of the overarching context of the 5 regional case studies, of which this one will contribute to an overarching synthesis report. The recommendations for the Brazil CO in particular are clear with guidance given for implementation, as appropriate.
	iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	Partially	<p>The process for developing the recommendations is described, and involved a validation meeting with the Brazil CO and UNICEF regional staff. There is no reference to other partners in terms of developing the recommendations, which may be acceptable given the recommendations all rest with UNICEF to implement.</p> <p>However, given the multi-sectoral and complex nature of the multi-agency and government response to the Venezuelan migration emergency, as well as the views of migrants themselves, it would have improved this section if there had been some mention of coordination/ discussion with other stakeholders (duty bearers or rights holders).</p>
Question 18.		Are recommendations clearly presented?		

	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	All recommendations are for UNICEF to implement, and the recommendations are clearly presented and clustered by Regional office and Brazil CO, with subdivisions for operational and strategic recommendations. There is prioritisation by time, some with specific timelines given. There is clear identification of the those responsible for actioning each recommendation: UNICEF COs and RO, with specific roles in the Brazil CO, e.g. Chief Field Officers and Emergency Manager.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	64%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Partially	Most of these elements are included, but not the timeframe of the evaluation or a list of figures/ tables graphs.
	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Yes	The annexes include the relevant data appropriate to a UNICEF evaluation report. However additional data could have been usefully provided such as, •Where this case study is situated in the wider context of the 5 regional case studies, the regional synthesis, and timelines for the other elements. •An outline of how the evaluation questions were amended after the IR. • More detail on the Brazil country methodology and how it differed from the overarching 5 country case study methodology. •More detail on how UNEG principles were taken into account or integrated. •Additionally the annexes do not have page numbers.
Question 20.	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Partially	The report is quite well formatted, although there is room for improvement such as naming tables and figures. Sub titles are not well used, and there are often long narrative sections of information which could be presented more clearly if it were broken down into sub sections. Some information is not presented in a logical/ sequential way, for example in relation to describing the stakeholders information is scattered across almost all sections of the report.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Partially	At a high level yes, the report follow the UNICEF guidelines on structure, but in practice the logic of where information is presented and why, is not always clear.
Question 21.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	The report is of a reasonable length and does not exceed any specifications in the ToR.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The report is not written in an accessible way, and it sometimes difficult to follow the narrative as it can weave about topic areas and lacks clarity and succinctness. As noted in some of the previous answers it has been difficult to understand the operating context, roles of stakeholders, what data is presented in tables, and why. There are also a number of errors for example: •In describing the multicultural and ethnic make up of Brazil numbers of the population who self define as white, brown, black or indigenous are listed, however, the number (in millions) is missing for most of these (pp 9), making it confusing the understand the percentages given without a closer reading. • Some acronyms are used without description as a footnote, or included in the acronym list, e.g. PISA (pp9) or Gini coefficient (pp 9). •Very few of the tables or figures are numbered. •The annexes do not have page numbers.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Partially	There is limited use of visual aids, even when they would be very helpful, for example, a stakeholder map, a list of key activities undertaken by UNICEF, and a map of the geographic site of the UNICEF intervention included as part of the context section. The tables and figures which are included are not labelled or well referenced.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	62%	Comments on Rating
Question 22.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Partially	There is reference to rights based frameworks, e.g. in relation to Children on The Move, and other rights based approaches, however, there is little evidence of how this was applied in practice to inform the design of the evaluation.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	An evaluation reference group was established, but there is not any information (for example in an Annex) detailing who was part of it, so it is assumed this was composed solely of UNICEF staff. This may have been appropriate (if the ToR determined its composition), but the evaluation should have noted this information. Although the evaluation stated it would take a participatory approach, there is little evidence of how rightsholders were involved in any part of the evaluation process, other than those who took part in focus group discussions. Duty bearers were included in the KIs, but do not appear to have participated in the evaluation, other than during data collection.

	iii	Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	Language used is inclusive, and there is appropriate and relevant discussion of different marginalized groups. Data collection is disaggregated across some different groups, for example by gender of people taking part in KIs and FGDs, as well as the fact that 2 FGDs consulted with indigenous people. However the results were not assessed differentially to any great depth, other than to note greater risks to marginalized people, nor were they assessed across different groups.
	iv	Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Yes	There is significant reference to the Children on the Move framework as well as other human rights and principles, and it is noted that insufficient data exists to assess the extent to which the intervention meets these objectives.
Question 23.		Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	4	
	i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Partially integrated	There is recognition of gender and the importance of design that allows for GEEW data to be collected, but little evidence it strongly guided the scope and design of the evaluation.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	There is some disaggregated qualitative data collected, but only through a KIs and FGDs. There is no evidence the data methods and analysis were designed with a gender responsive approach in mind, or one that would enable a gendered analysis.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	There is evidence presented that outlines gendered findings and evidence, but there is not an overarching or, specifically described gendered analysis.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>