

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Final Evaluation of the Project Activate! Integrated Social Protection and Employment to Accelerate Progress for Young People in Montenegro

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		86%	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. Decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Final Evaluation of the Project Activate! Integrated Social Protection and Employment to		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Republic of Montenegro/66/2022/18883		
<b>Region</b>	ECAR		
<b>Year of report</b>	2022		
<b>Office</b>	Republic of Montenegro		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Montenegro		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	13th and 14th January 2023		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD Parc		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	Jointly managed with one or more UN agencies		
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	No		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Joint Programme		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative and formative		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	1, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10		
<b>EQA Summary:</b> <i>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.</i>			
Key strengths: - The team were able to answer the evaluation questions with confidence. This was possible due to the way that they collected, as well as analysed the primarily qualitative data. The results of this project will be of benefit to members of the joint programme. - Though a good report, there is a caveat - the findings section though interesting and informative are very descriptive in nature, ideally the report could include the voices of those who were interviewed. More specifically, the report would benefit from using some quotes and drawing more on the secondary data.			
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> <i>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.</i>			
-The report needs an executive summary, at present there isn't one - If would help to know how long the interviews were and how the sites that were chosen were chosen, this could be added in the annex section. - Though evident triangulation has been used, the report could be more specific about sources, be this primary or secondary. Ideally the evaluation questions should be included in the methodology section, this will help guide the reader.			
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>		0%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 1.</b>	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		The report doesn't contain an executive summary therefore anyone who has access to this report will be expected to read the whole report. The report is 56 pages long, excluding the annexes section. Many people simply won't have the time to read the whole report, hence why the team who wrote this report will need to add an executive summary.
	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).	No	The report doesn't contain an executive summary.
	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.	No	The report doesn't contain an executive summary.
	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.	No	The report doesn't contain an executive summary.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 2.</b>	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 timeline, budget and implementation status are noted within the report, it is also clear why there was a need for this joint programme intervention.
	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).	Yes	This a national project and one which aims to work with vulnerable people, the report notes the following: <b>Target groups of the JP was adolescents and youth (including NEETS), Roma, people with disabilities, children, ex-Yugoslav refugees, stateless/persons at risk of statelessness, returnees, people living in a risk of poverty (beneficiaries of financial social assistance), and victims of human trafficking. The JP intended to pay attention to cross-cutting needs of women and children within the above categories of right-holders.</b> (page11). Some data is provided that looks at gender and age, there is a gap in terms of disability data. This noted it is clear who the intended beneficiaries are and who the duty bearers are.
<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</b>		
	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 report contains an interesting section that discusses- key policies, the current economic situation, the political climate, cultural power/privileges and the impacts that the Covid 19 pandemic had on the country. Though given a rating of Yes, the report would benefit from describing/explaining what social protection means in the context of Montenegro.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	The project aimed to address SDGs- 1, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 10.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	This has been done, it is clear that certain groups of people, especially young people are vulnerable to poverty as well as limited access to education.
<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?</b>		
	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	The implementing agencies are noted within the report. It is clear who was involved in this project. Given the number of stakeholder it would help if the report include a stakeholder map that way one could see how each partner worked with each other as well as the various government departments that were involved in this initiative and the CSOs amongst others. This is just a suggestion.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	Two graphs are included in the report that provide financial information. It is clear what the contributions were of each stakeholder.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>		
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, it is clear who the intended users of the report are.
<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>		
	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).	Yes	The report provides a complete description of what the evaluation sought to achieve. The report doesn't say if there have been any changes from the ToR, if there have been these could be noted in the report, a simply foot note would be enough.
	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	The scope of the evaluation is noted, this is aligned to the ToR. Justification has been give for the scope of the evaluation.
<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?</b>		
	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 clear description of the intervention's intended results.
	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	The ToC is presented in both a narrative as well as graphic format.
	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 ToC is assessed within the evaluation as noted in the methodology section of the report.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>

<b>Question 8.</b>	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. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria (this being the OECD DAC criteria) are specified and are aligned with the questions. In the methodology section the evaluation questions aren't included, for ease these should be included here as well as in the evaluation matrix.
	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	The report contains a very good matrix and one that contains the following information- judgement indicators, sources of information and data collection and analysis methods. Though a very good matrix it would help to know if there were any overarching evaluation questions for each OECD DAC criteria.
<b>Question 9.</b>	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.	Yes	The design and set of methods that were used for this evaluation were adequately robust enough for this evaluation. They are described as well as justified. Though the methods were appropriate it would help to know why the team didn't do any primary quantitative data collection.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation used secondary qualitative data and primary qualitative data, both of which are appropriate, though as noted above it would help to know why the team didn't undertake quantitative primary data collection. The interview guides for the KII are included as an annex, as there are many questions for each participant it would help to know how long the interviews were. If the team could include this detail this would enhance the report.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	Though not explicit, it's clear that the sampling strategy for the KII was purposeful as too was the sampling strategy for the interviews that were undertaken with participants of PUNOs activities. For this section to score higher the team could note how participants of PUNOs activities were selected. What's missing from this section is how the project and geographical locations were chosen, this will need to be included, there the team could expand what's written in annex 10.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The report includes a complete description of the methods of analysis that were undertaken during the analysis phase of the evaluation.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	This is possible.
	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).	Yes	The reports includes reference to three limitations and how the team tried to mitigate these.
<b>Question 10.</b>	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	Reference has been made to UNEG Ethical guidelines.
	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	Reference has been made to ethical safeguards, as well as how they were applied. Vulnerable people didn't take part in this evaluation, nor were children involved.
<b>Question 11.</b>	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 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.	No	The evaluation did not include innovative practices.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>

<b>Question 12.</b>	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 findings marshal sufficient evidence to systematically answer the evaluation questions.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The findings section is connected to the ToC, the ToC forms of the backbone of this evaluation and it's findings.
<b>Question 13.</b>	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.	Partially	The report presents both output and outcome level data, as evidenced by the ToC. The report findings are rather descriptive in nature and therefore not very credible. Ideally, given the rich data that was generated the findings section could include more quotes and the views of various stakeholders. It is evident that the team employed triangulation, this noted the report could have engaged more with the secondary data and where they made assertions supported this with literature.
	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	The findings are supported by evidence, though as noted, it's rather descriptive. The findings include both positive and negative findings, thus demonstrating the independence of the team.
	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	This is a theory based evaluation, the findings analyses the outcomes and outputs of the ToC.
<b>Question 14.</b>	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.	Not Rated	The evaluation undertook a desk review of numerous documents, assessing the adequacy of the interventions monitoring systems wasn't part of the evaluation.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 15.</b>	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).	Yes	The conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.
	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.	Yes	The conclusions are derived from the findings, they present both the strengths and limitations of the joint programme intervention.
<b>Question 16.</b>	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 stem logically from the findings, they have the potential to have wider applicability and relevance beyond this evaluation.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons contain sufficient detail, they are useful for the intended audiences of this report.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 17.</b>	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 recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, they are aligned to the purpose of the evaluation.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are clearly presented, they are actionable to the intended users. Guidance has been included.
	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).	Yes	It would appear that the recommendations were developed by the evaluation team, however the following is included in the report- <b>Evaluation recommendations will be presented and validated through interactive discussions with EMG members during interviews and during the evaluation de-briefing meeting to be held in July 2022. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this evaluation will further be disseminated by PUNOs.</b> Due to this inclusion it is possible that the recommendations may have changed. As this is an independent evaluation, the recommendations are normally devised by the evaluation team and then presented to the client.
<b>Question 18.</b>	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	A table has been included that notes who should/could be responsible for each proposed recommendation.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	93%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 19.</b>	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.	Yes	The opening pages of the report contain all of the relevant information/sections that are noted in this criteria. The only thing that is missing is the timeframe of the evaluation.
	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 section includes the ToR, evaluation matrix, results framework, list of those interviewed, reference list, site visits and interview guides. It is comprehensive. The annex section of the report in the table of context section needs to be looked at again, there is a number formatting error.
<b>Question 20.</b>	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).	Yes	The report is easy to navigate, there are clear titles and it is well formatted.
	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.	Yes	The structure is in accordance to UNICEF guidelines.
<b>Question 21.</b>	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 a reasonable length, however it doesn't contain an executive summary.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	Overall the report is easy to understand. It is however evident that the report has been written by a non native English speaker, it could benefit from sense checking again/copyediting. Some punctuation errors - foot notes go after punctuation.
	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.	Yes	The visual aids that are used within the report are appropriate, they convey key information. The figure on page 39 is excellent and very informative.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	69%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 22.</b>	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.	Yes	Reference has been made to rights based approaches.
	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	A reference group was established, it isn't however clear who was involved in the reference group, nor what their roles were, this is something that the team may wish to clarify.
	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	The report is inclusive, it meets the aims and objectives of the evaluation. Appropriate terminology has been used.
	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	Child rights are noted, marginalized groups are given attention as too is gender (though minimal attention was given to empowerment). The intervention isn't however very disability inclusive, this is noted in the report.
<b>Question 23.</b>	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.	Satisfactorily integrated	Mainstreamed, where possible.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Some elements of this criteria have been met, stakeholders were treated with respect and the majority of those who were involved in the project were women.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	Certain social groups are discussed in the report, this criteria is mainly non applicable owing to the scope of the project. The evaluation didn't engage with vulnerable people and a gender focus wasn't needed.

#### SWAP Rating Guidance

**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.**

- 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?
- Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
- Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
- Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

**ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.**

- 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?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

**iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.**

- 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?
- 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?
- c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- 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?