

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Independent Final Evaluation of the UN Joint Programme Toward a Somali Led Transition to National Social Protection Systems (2020-2021)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	49%	Fair	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	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.
●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report	Independent Final Evaluation of the UN Joint Programme Toward a Somali Led Transition to National Social Protection Systems (2020-2021)		
Report sequence number	Somalia-63-2022-18964		
Region	ESAR		
Year of report	2022		
Office	Somalia		
Coverage (countries)	Somalia		
ToRs present	No		
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)	Jointly managed with one or more UN agencies		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	No		
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		
Evaluation object	Joint Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative		
Evaluation strategy	Qualitative		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	1, 3, 8 and 10		
EQA Summary: <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>			
<p>Strengths of the evaluation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the evaluation criteria, questions and sub questions are relevant and aligned to the evaluation purpose and objectives - the lessons are very well articulated, and provide sufficient content yet are applicable to other contexts - a benchmarking exercise is included to compare against other similar Joint Programmes (regarding coherence) - the evaluation considers people living with disabilities within the evaluation matrix, findings and recommendations - the report is logical in structure and follows UNICEF guidance <p>Shortcomings of the evaluation comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the executive summary cannot be used as a standalone document to inform decision-makers because it excludes key information about the JP, the methodology and the conclusions. The recommendations are not set out clearly. - the theory of change is stated to have been reformulated but is not included within the report (as narrative or as a visual) therefore it is not possible to know which of the elements of the theory of change are being tested within the evaluation - gender is not included within the methodology explicitly (although included as an evaluation question) - there is limited reference to the results framework, which should be introduced, critiqued and utilised (as far as possible) within the analysis for the findings - the conclusions sections, whilst strategic and useful in part, is not a comprehensive summary of the findings 			
Recommendations for Improvement: <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>			
<p>Recommendations for improvement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure that the executive summary can be used as a standalone document. Include a paragraph regarding the JP itself and key components, add 1-2 paragraphs sharing the evaluation methodology and also include the conclusions and list the recommendations clearly. - the scope of the evaluation should be set out (as per the ToR) to provide clarity - the methodology should include the theory of change that has been reformulated (as it states has been done) with a diagram or description within the text. This would then help to frame the enquiry for the evaluation, and in particular show the causal connections that are being tested - more information should be provided about the rights holders (numbers, situation and needs) - the ethical safeguards should be specified and also it should be shown how these were applied within the context of this evaluation (and any protocols included as an annex as relevant) - gender should be included explicitly within the methodology, within the scope, approach and data collection methods - the results framework should be an integral part of the evaluation report, including analysis of its adequacy and explicit utilisation within the findings (particularly around effectiveness) - the conclusions should be revised so that they provide a summary of the findings, and the recommendations then flow logically from them 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	33%	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	The executive summary is 4 pages long. The findings are shared in a concise way. It cannot be used as a standalone document because it is missing the evaluation methodology and conclusions, and the recommendations are not set out clearly.
	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 executive summary includes an introduction and also the summary findings. It does not include sufficient information about the Joint Programme (JP), the methodology or the conclusions. The recommendations are only included in a paragraph with the lessons learnt.
	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 summary includes limited information about the intervention itself which is introduced in terms of key partners, budget and timeframe but does not share what the key elements are. It does not introduce new elements.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	43%	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 JP is described (section 2) and the timeline (January 2020 - May 2022) is set out. The budget, location and objectives are also included.
	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 direct beneficiary is stated to be the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MoLSA) at federal and FMS levels. The rights holders are very broadly described as 'vulnerable populations in Somalia with particular emphasis on children, adolescents and youth, women, displaced persons and small farm holders'. However no more information is provided about related population numbers in this section.
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.	Partially	The context is described (pp12) in relation to the rationale for social protection, government policies related to social protection. However, it does not provide information about the context per se (such as geography, poverty situation and broad statistics, education/ health statistics, socio-economic situation, refugee situation).
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	The SDGs are not referred to within the context section.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The situation of the beneficiaries is set out, in terms of the vulnerable groups identified and the % of the population (although the numbers are not explained). The needs are not discussed in any depth.
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).	Partially	The government stakeholders are named in the executive summary and introduction, and the need to clarify roles is set out within the context. There is no comprehensive stakeholder analysis which sets out the different stakeholders and their roles.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	No	The specific contributions and roles of different stakeholders are not shared. It would be expected that there would be information included about the roles of WFP, LO, UNICEF and the Government of Somalia.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	42%	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.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is broad encompassing accountability, learning, stocktaking of achievements, good practices and lessons learned. The key users and uses are explained. These are as per the ToR.
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).	Yes	The main aim that the evaluation is setting out to achieve is explained well. The objectives are listed (and although the number has changed, and some have been consolidated, they are consistent in meaning with the ToR).
	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).	No	The scope of the evaluation is not explained in the report.
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.	Partially	The intervention components are shared (pp 11-12) but there is no articulation of the outcome and outputs or inclusion of the results framework (in the main body of the report or annex).
	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).	No	The causal relationships between outputs and outcomes are not mentioned in the report, or included as a graphic.

	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.	No	The report states that the Theory of Change was reformulated, but it is not explained within the text or included in a visual. Therefore the reader is not informed about the theory of change, or the causal pathways, that the evaluation is testing against.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		68%	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. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Partially	The evaluation questions are well formulated. However they do not include all of the questions from the ToR .Whilst the reviewer considers that the (many) questions within the ToR were reduced down, it would be expected that the changes would be explained and justified.
	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 evaluation matrix is comprehensive and includes lines of enquiry , data sources and 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	The evaluation design is theory-based (as requested in the ToR) , although the reformulated ToC is not discussed or presented. Research methods were desk review, KIIs and FGD.
	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	Data sources do not adhere to that set out within the ToRs. Although KIIs, FGDs and desk review is used, the ToRs also request case studies and cost analysis.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategy is stated to be 'convenience sampling' due to the political and social context (which seems justifiable to the reviewer) and it is clear that attempts are made to engage with three main stakeholders (government, civil society and UN). The different stakeholders interviewed are specified.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Techniques for data analysis are shared (triangulation, thematic and inferential analysis).
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	A theory-based approach should provide opportunity for exploring causal connections. However, it is difficult to judge in this situation given the lack of visual/ description of the ToC. The evaluation matrix does include questions regarding the reasons for achievement , or non-achievement, of targets .In terms of data collection methods, the KIIs and FGDs allows for exploratory enquiry about causal connection.
	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	Section 4 shares the limitations which include the reliability of technology for remote interviews, health issues and availability of respondents. Mitigation strategies are shared. It would be expected that there would also be discussion of the social and political situation which justified the use of convenience sampling.
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).	Partially	There is reference to UNEG norms and standards as well as UNICEF evaluation and other relevant policies. However, the principles are not specified and there is no discussion of how the principles are contextualised.
	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.	No	No detail is provided about ethical safeguards for participants and to what extent they were necessary or applied.
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 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.	Yes	The evaluation report shares a 'mapping exercise' to explore how other African countries for similar joint programmes are co-ordinating with partners. Interviews were conducted with the co-ordinators of the JPs in three different countries .This is a useful benchmarking exercise to compare the Somali JP to other similar JPs (and a point of learning for all).
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	33%	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.	Partially	The findings systematically go through each of the evaluation questions and sub-questions, however the narrative does not respond to each element of the question e.g. EQ 2 does not respond to the sub questions regarding the results frameworks, and ToC.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	No	There is limited reference to the results framework, even within the effectiveness and impact sub-sections. There is no comprehensive reporting on JP targets/ baselines. Some data that is likely to have been derived from the monitoring framework (e.g. number of trainings) but it is not explicit.
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.	Partially	The evaluation relies to a large extent upon data from interviews and FGDs, and although these are analysed and used well, the lack of explicit reference of the monitoring framework is a gap. Outputs and outcome data is not specifically presented. An example of a lack of statistical data, is the EQ5.2 regarding efficiency which does not include the financial data, or human resources data, or analyse it (e.g. changes as a result of the programme, finances/ capita, contributions by different partners).
	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.	Partially	The findings include positive and negative achievements, and causal factors. The evaluation matrix (Annex 2) does not include the indicators that the evaluation tested against (but the data that was found) and so it is not possible to know whether the findings are based on indicators/ benchmarks. Also a comprehensive view is not always taken, for example, within the discussion about whether the JP has facilitated systemic and catalytic change the report identifies the contribution but does not take an overall view of what hasn't been done/ what else could have been done.
	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).	Partially	The causal factors are explored utilising the qualitative data derived from interviews, FGD. Although the methodology states that a theory based approach has been used and a Toc reformulated, this is not included within the report, and so it is not clear whether a logical chain has been tested.
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.	No	The JP's monitoring framework is not assessed, despite there being a specific sub-question which asks this point.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	75%	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	The conclusions are not a comprehensive and concise summary, but they do make strategic and valid points e.g. regarding the contribution to an appetite for SP, timeliness of the programme, contribution to individual capacity development and the support to a comprehensive approach to SP system. As they are not as comprehensive in scope as the findings or recommendations, they do not provide a 'bridge' of the two elements.
	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	The conclusions do not summarise the findings (by criteria) as is standard practice (for UNICEF evaluations). They do however present a picture of the overall strengths and limitations, from a SP system perspective. They are not as comprehensive as the recommendations and thus there are themes that emerge within the recommendations that are not included within the conclusions (e.g. gender, safety nets).
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 are well thought through, derived well from the findings , and have strong applicability and relevance beyond the programme.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are clearly articulated, and have enough context/ depth but also are sufficiently generic to be widely relevant.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	38%	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 recommendations are aligned with the purpose and objectives. They focus on coherence and sustainability of the JP in the future (as the forward-looking element of the objectives) but also go significantly beyond this to broader SP system recommendations. They are clearly derived from the findings.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	There are 13 recommendations (which is on the upper end of feasibility). They appear useful for intended users, but they are relatively high level and could benefit from some action points/ operational suggestions.
	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	No	The process for developing the recommendations is not mentioned.
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.	No	There is no prioritisation of the recommendations, or consistent identification of responsible agency for each recommendation (although this is mentioned within the text for some of them) .
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	79%	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.	Yes	The opening pages include: the name of the JP, the locations, table of contents with relevant tables, annexes, list of acronyms and the name of the evaluation form. The date of the report is not included .
	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.	No	There are only two annexes - list of interviewees and evaluation matrix. Various annexes are missing, despite them being clearly requested within the ToR.
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).	Yes	The report is straightforward to navigate, and follows a logical structure. The headings are clear. The synthesising of the key points from each of the finding areas is a useful element of the report. The report could benefit from including finding statements for each key finding area.
	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 of the report is logical and follows UNICEF guidelines, and the guidance set out in the ToR.
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 a reasonable length of 44 pages (excluding executive summary and annexes). There was no specified number of pages within 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 easy to understand generally but there are some paragraphs which do not flow logically, and some which require expanding to provide sufficient detail to be clearer (e.g. pp 33 re political instability). The report would benefit from being reviewed to check for grammatical errors in places
	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 text is broken up sufficiently with tables, graphs and text boxes.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	45%	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 some mention of the rights of those living with disability, and gender equality rights, however there is no comprehensive approach to rights .
	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	There is description of the level of participation of duty bearers within the evaluation, however the numbers of those interviewed is not specified within the methodology (or disaggregated). Stakeholders are involved as interviewees.
	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).	Partially	The language does not show any bias. The terminology of rights holders and duty bearers is not included. There is some disaggregation of data by gender but this is not consistently the case.
	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	The focus of the evaluation is social protection support including child rights and other vulnerable groups, and there is discussion of the needs of persons living with disabilities .

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)	2	
	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 an EQ regarding gender and effectiveness (focused upon reducing/exacerbating gender inequalities and gender-based discrimination). It is lacking on regarding relevance (as per the ToRs).The evaluation does not set out the scope at all.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Not at all integrated	The methodology does not mention gender within the approach, data collection methods or data analysis techniques, despite it being a specific requirement of the ToR.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	There is a dedicated finding on gender inequality which discusses both inclusivity and a more transformative approach. Gender is not included within a conclusion (despite it being a request of the ToRs). There is a dedicated recommendation which is appropriate and brings in a more transformative approach.

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>