

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Evaluation of the UNICEF L3 Response to COVID-19

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	93%	Highly Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Evaluation of the UNICEF L3 Response to COVID-19		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Evaluation Office-65-2022-19055		
<b>Region</b>	HQ		
<b>Year of report</b>	2022		
<b>Office</b>	Evaluation Office		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Global		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	January 16, 2023		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed		
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>			
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)	No		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	System		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Meta evaluation		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Outcome		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	Multi-region/Global		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	N/A		
<b>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.</b>			
<p>The evaluation provides UNICEF with a comprehensive synthesis of its response to COVID-19. The main strengths are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The report is well-written and logically structured.</li> <li>-The executive summary can act as a stand-alone document to inform decision-making for senior management.</li> <li>-The context of UNICEF's intervention is well described showing how UNICEF played a critical role in the global response to the pandemic.</li> <li>-The evaluation report is supported by a sound methodology presented in the annexes and only briefly summarised in the main body of the report.</li> <li>-There are aspects of the methodology which could be considered innovative in terms of ensuring a robust analytical process for what is a high-level evaluation combining a synthesis of existing evaluations with interviews with key stakeholders. The use of evidence streams and how they work together is particularly interesting.</li> <li>-Gender equality issues are integrated satisfactorily in the findings which reflects how they were considered in the design.</li> <li>-Over two thirds of the report is devoted to a strong set of findings which are supported by evidence-based analysis using both qualitative and quantitative data.</li> <li>-The conclusions and recommendations are informed by these findings, and give confidence they are evidence-based. The recommendations are tightly defined and are actionable.</li> </ul> <p>The weaknesses are very limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The evaluation matrix could have been referenced more clearly. This has presented a problem in that it is not clear how or why the evaluation questions are interpreted in the report as different questions and headings are used in the evaluation report.</li> </ul>			
<b>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.</b>			
<p>The evaluation report could be improved in several specific areas. Firstly, the background (section 1.2/1.3) could have been strengthened if it had included a summary of UNICEF's overall programmatic response which it could have taken from section 2.3 of the inception report (which summarises all UNICEF multisectoral programme response areas). Secondly, the report (section 1.3) could have provided a more detailed narrative to support the logic model used in particular explaining the causal relationships or pathways between the different elements. Thirdly, the report (section 1.6) could have explained clearly how the evaluation questions have been interpreted in the report as the findings are structured around a different - but relatively similar - set of questions and issues. Fourthly, the report could have referred to the evaluation matrix more clearly in section 1.6 of the report and how it has been used to frame the analysis. Fifthly, the report could have also explained how the recommendations were developed, and what role UNICEF staff played, and discussed the role of the evaluation reference group. Finally, the report could have been more explicit in how UNICEF's response addressed child rights in a specific findings section (section 2.4).</p>			
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating	
<b>Question 1.</b>	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).	Yes	The executive summary is well-presented. It provides a comprehensive summary of the evaluation with a description of the evaluation context which is very useful. It can act as a stand-alone document with a strong set of findings, key conclusions and a clear set of 8 recommendations to inform decision-making and wider audiences. It is longer than most executive summaries at 12.5 pages (of a particular type of format). This is considered acceptable by the reviewer as it is clearly an important meta-evaluation of a corporate global response to COVID-19.
	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 contains all the key elements required by the ToR. It is clearly structured and flows well. [It should be noted that the ToR do not specify what is required for the report although a simple indicative structure is included in the inception report.
	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.	Yes	The executive summary clearly explains the corporate-wide intervention and why the evaluation of a global emergency (L3) response is important. The ToR state that it is a "requirement of the UNICEF Evaluation Policy (2018) whereby all L3 emergencies must be evaluated". It is a strong summary of the key elements of the main body of the report.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>			100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 2. Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</b>				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The object of the evaluation is clearly described as UNICEF's L3 emergency response to COVID-19. It is clearly looking at UNICEF's corporate and global response to the COVID-19 pandemic from Jan 2020 to Mar 2022. The background includes a useful timeline of UNICEF's strategic frameworks used in its response (section 1.3), and a detailed description of the funding of UNICEF's response (section 1.5).
	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	The object of the evaluation is UNICEF's emergency response to the COVID-19 pandemic impacting on all global, regional and country programmes. As such the evaluation background describes rightsholders and duty bearers in general terms while also documenting the global impact on children. There are detailed descriptions of the target groups (identifying specific groups of children assisted by UNICEF) and analyses of UNICEF's response to these target groups are contained in section 2.2 of the Findings section. (Note that section 2.3 of the inception report summarises all UNICEF multisectoral programme response areas).
<b>Question 3. 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 intervention context presents an overview of the COVID-19 pandemic and clearly highlights the impacts of COVID-19 on children around the world (section 1.2). The background talks more about UNICEF's organisational response (section 1.3) rightly leaving the more specific country programmatic responses to the Findings.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Not Rated	Not rated. SDGs are not specified in the ToR. It is assumed this is due to the object of the evaluation being a corporate response to a global emergency. SDGs are referenced in figure 5 of the report which documents UNICEF's wider contributions including "Mobilize and leverage financing to avoid regression on SDGs and help governments manage fiscal gaps".
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	As stated the rightsholders are described as all children affected by COVID-19. Specific detail on their status and needs are well-documented in the findings section (see for example, sections 2.2 and 2.4). This is considered appropriate.
<b>Question 4. 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	In terms of UNICEF's global response to the pandemic, section 1.4 identifies the relevant global frameworks and key development partners with whom UNICEF has engaged. UNICEF's role within the global response is depicted in figure 5 and its role in the global vaccination roll out in covered in figure 6. The report also highlights clearly the donors to UNICEF's response in section 1.5 as well as how UNICEF transferred funds to its implementing partners (figure 10).
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	As above (question 4.i) the specific funding contributions of donors are covered. More detailed descriptions and analysis of the roles of key stakeholders involved in UNICEF's response at the country level and UNICEF's global role with stakeholders are covered in the Findings (e.g. table 10 to 13 and section 2.3).
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>			100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5. 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 clear - to assess UNICEF's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is well-timed in that it looked at UNICEF's response to COVID-19 just after the main phase of the pandemic while recognising the pandemic was not yet over. It has a dual purpose for accountability and learning. It is designed to be useful as an assessment of a corporate response, identifying intended users at the HQ and country level. It contains a clear opening preface by the Director of UNICEF's Evaluation Office.

<b>Question 6.</b>	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 primary objective is clearly stated: "to assess, from a global perspective, how well UNICEF responded to COVID-19 and the extent to which it realized its intended role in the global pandemic response." This objective is supported by two specific objectives focused on (i) the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of UNICEF's response and (ii) the coherence and effectiveness of UNICEF's work with other partners and agencies. This is in line 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).	Yes	The scope of the evaluation is clearly defined as UNICEF's global response to COVID-19 so it covers everything related to UNICEF's institutional response, both at a global and a country level. The timeframe is clearly defined as from Jan 2020 to Mar 2022.
<b>Question 7.</b>	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	UNICEF's intended results for its emergency response to COVID-19 are captured in the ToR as 'Draft Pathways to Outcomes' (figure 1). This has in turn been replicated and revised slightly in the evaluation report (see figure 11) to show UNICEF's intentions for its response. This presents what activities, outcomes and impacts are being examined by the evaluation.
	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	While figure 11 (a logic model) includes the activities and UNICEF's contribution to outcomes and impact, the causal relationships or pathways between these elements is not explained in the full report. The logic model is however explained in annex 2 which states: "The evaluation team reviewed this model against the Level 3 CEAP and programmatic guidance...and found it to be mostly an accurate theoretical representation of the intended pathways of change".
	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	As noted in 7.i and 7.ii above, the evaluation applied a theoretical framework (see Figure 11) which was based on UNICEF's intentions for its L3 emergency response to COVID-19. It has been adjusted slightly and fine-tuned by the evaluators as suggested in the ToR.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>91%</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? 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 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 11 evaluation questions (EQs) in the ToR and repeated in the inception report and annex 2 and 3 to this evaluation report differ from the questions and headings used in the findings section. This is not clearly explained. While there are similarities between them, some original questions may have not been addressed sufficiently or in full and therefore its not clear whether the objectives of the evaluation have been fully met. For example, the following questions are not explicitly addressed: <i>question 7: How efficiently were funds mobilized, (re)allocated and used? question 9: What were UNICEF's key areas of strength and weakness in coordinating with these partners? and question 11: How well has UNICEF ensured linkages with, ownership and strengthening of local partnerships across the response?</i> The evaluation report contains 4 overarching questions and 11 sub-questions including issues related to UNICEF advocacy, remote ways of working and supply chains which are not explicit in the original EQs. The evaluation could have explained how the questions used in the findings aligned to the evaluation questions.
	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.	Partially	Annex 3 presents an evaluation matrix which is considered to be the 'spine' of the evaluation by the evaluators. For each EQ it includes a comprehensive list of indicators, methods, data sources and analysis / triangulation points. This is useful, although the matrix has not been referenced in the evaluation report itself. Annex 3 states: "It provided the main analytical framework against which data were gathered and analysed. It was shaped around the evaluation questions..." But the analysis in section 3 of the evaluation report (The Findings) is structured around a slightly different set of questions as noted in 8.i.
<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	Annex 2 (methodology) and annex 3 (evaluation matrix) present a well-considered evaluation design and set of connected methods. The methods are sound and clearly meet the evaluation's objectives and scope. Of particular note are the consideration of evidence streams and specific methods employed for each EQ.
	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	Data sources are clearly described in annex 3 and annex 2. The evaluation report also summarises the data sources succinctly in section 1.6 emphasising the use of existing data and evidence including a review of 89 evaluations and 111 key stakeholder interviews.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	Annex 2 presents a sampling strategy which is also covered in the inception report. Given the scope of the evaluation, the sampling for both desk reviews and remote case studies is appropriate in capturing the diversity of UNICEF's response. The sampling is briefly referenced in the evaluation report.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Annex 2 explains clearly the approach to analysis. It places an emphasis on validity and reliability of the analysis which is clearly articulated. The analytical processes make use of individual data streams and meta-analysis giving the impression of a richness in the analysis approach which comes through in the findings.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The conceptual approach and in particular the use of the logic model underpins the methodology which considers the linkages and connections between the different elements of the programme including the activities and contributions to outcomes and impact. Annex 2 and 3 provide confidence that the methodology has drawn connections between the different levels of the theoretical framework used.
	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 evaluation report identifies three broad limitations which focus on the broad scope of the evaluation, the risk of evaluation fatigue and not 'burdening' UNICEF staff in the field, and travel restrictions due to COVID-19. Risks are also presented in annex 2. The methodology presented and used provide confidence that these constraints - all of which were indicated at the outset - have been covered and addressed as feasible for an evaluation of this type.
<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	Annex 2 makes explicit reference and use of the UNEG norms and standards for evaluation (see tables 4 and 12). They are applied to the five evaluation criteria used in this evaluation.
	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	Ethical safeguards are considered in the evaluation where appropriate. Table 12 in annex 2 identifies seven ethical standards which are more than adequate for this type of evaluation including respect for dignity and diversity, rights of participants and avoidance of harm. No children were interviewed due to the corporate and high-level nature of the evaluation (also recognised in the ToR).
<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 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.	Yes	There are aspects of the methodology employed which could be considered innovative in terms of ensuring a robust analytical process for what is a high-level evaluation combining a synthesis of existing evaluations with interviews with key stakeholders. The use of evidence streams and how they work together is particularly interesting.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>92%</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.	Partially	The evaluation findings are comprehensive. There is a strong evidence base supporting the analysis and findings. They clearly address the two main objectives of the evaluation - (i) to examine the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of UNICEF's work in response and (ii) the coherence and effectiveness of UNICEF's collaboration and coordination with partners. As noted in response to question 7 above however they have not explicitly and systematically addressed the evaluation questions as stated in the ToR and annexes 2 and 3 of the report.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The findings have clearly used the intervention's draft pathways to outcomes as it is used in the evaluation's analytical framework. It is used explicitly in sections 2.2 (e.g. targeting against intentions, programmatic adjustments by results sectors), 2.3 (e.g. UNICEF contributions to global coordination) and 2.4 (e.g. key programme indicator results). Capturing data and evidence against key programme indicator results, by sector and by region, is particularly important and useful.

<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.	Yes	The evaluation findings are well-evidenced using, analysing and synthesising a significant body of evidence drawn from 89 evaluation reports, UNICEF corporate reports and interviews with 111 key stakeholders from UNICEF and partners. There is a focus on outcome-level data which is appropriate for this high level evaluation. Triangulation is well considered throughout the findings using the multiple data sources highlighted.
	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 clearly supported by a wide range of evidence. This is expected given the consideration of different evidence streams described in the methodology (annex 2). The findings present a balanced and objective analysis, and are both positive and negative. They relate well to existing UNICEF indicators and standards, for example they refer to approaches to Accountability to Affected Populations and UNICEF corporate indicators.
	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	Causal factors affecting the achievement of results and outcomes are documented throughout the findings, for example factors compounding UNICEF's response (page 47-48) and the gaps between analysis and programming (pages 68-71). As a theory-based evaluation, the findings have analysed the logic chain.
<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.	Yes	The evaluation takes account of the overall monitoring and learning (section 2.2.vi). While it assesses UNICEF has relatively mature monitoring and evaluation systems, it highlights a number of weaknesses including ongoing data capture and standard monitoring systems under strain.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<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 present a clear overall analysis of UNICEF's response to Covid-19. The conclusions flow well coming across as presenting an overall story of UNICEF's response and link well to the recommendations which are forward looking.
	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 follow on well from the findings coming across as providing overall insights and analysis which go beyond the present set of findings. The conclusions come across as a higher-level view of the overall UNICEF response.
<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	By nature this evaluation brings together lessons learned from the evaluations it has assessed and the corporate learning processes it has considered. The ToR did not request a specific section on lessons learned but indicates that this evaluation will generate learning through the findings, conclusions and make actionable recommendations which "aim to support UNICEF going forward in its continued journey of organizational improvement".
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	As above, the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented in a clear way to capture learning.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<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 eight recommendations are well-grounded, and are clearly informed by the findings and conclusions. They are clearly aligned with the evaluation purpose in recommending improvements for future UNICEF responses to global health emergencies.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	Each recommendation is tightly worded. They are specific and actionable. They are supported by a clear rationale for the recommendation and identify specific actions to be undertaken.

	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	It is not clear how the recommendations were developed. There were consultation and validation meetings with UNICEF staff during the evaluation process. It is assumed that duty-bearers (i.e. UNICEF staff) were consulted. The rationale for each recommendation implies consideration of UNICEF staff views and does align with the recommendations made by the Humanitarian Review of 2020.
<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	Each recommendation identifies clearly who is responsible for the recommendation and the actions to be undertaken.
<b>SECTION H:</b>		<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	100%	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 evaluation report includes all relevant information including the object (i.e. UNICEF's L3 emergency response to COVID-19), timeframe and date of report, names of evaluators and role of UNICEF's Evaluation Office, a clear table of contents etc.
	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 evaluation report is supported by a comprehensive set of annexes in particular the ToR and annexes 2 and 3 on methodology and the evaluation matrix respectively. Also included are the list of interviewees, guidance and bibliography. The results chain is presented in the full report.
<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 well-structured. It has clearly numbered sections and a good use of sub-titles. It is formatted in a UNICEF style which is appropriate due to the corporate nature 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.	Yes	The report is produced in a UNICEF style. There is a focus on delivering a comprehensive executive summary, a description of UNICEF's organisational response and its global role, and over two thirds of the report are devoted to findings followed by a set of conclusions and recommendations.
<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 executive summary is lengthy but feels appropriate given that the critical nature of the object of the evaluation, and it can act as a stand-alone summary. The overall report is 133 pages long but this is equally considered appropriate.
	ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is well written. It is accessible and jargon free. It doesn't contain any obvious errors.
	iii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report includes a wide range of visual aids (infographics, figures, tables, photos) which add value and are well referenced in the text.
<b>SECTION I:</b>		<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	86%	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	The evaluation is explicit about specific UN strategic frameworks which relate to - and help to frame - the UNICEF response. Three key frameworks are discussed in section 1.4.
	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	The ToR refer to an evaluation reference group but its role in the evaluation is not clearly described in the evaluation report. The evaluation discusses that it was conducted under UNICEF's L3 emergency processes and consultations and validation meetings were held with UNICEF staff and management.
	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 evaluation is written in a positive and inclusive way. Data is disaggregated as far as possible and results are presented covering different groups especially different groups of children.

	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.	Partially	The evaluation partly covers child rights (see table 14 in relation to how UNICEF achieved HAC results), and child rights are implied in relation to targeting the most vulnerable groups of children. It could however have been more explicit in how UNICEF addressed child rights overall. Disability issues are more clearly discussed in the report, for example in relation to key programme indicators and disabled children being a key target group (see table 4).
<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)	9	
	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.	Fully integrated	Gender equality is integrated into the evaluation criteria and questions in relation to looking at the appropriateness and effectiveness of UNICEF's global response to COVID-19. Gender is integrated into the evaluation matrix in relation to the questions (EQ 3 is focused on gender and equity) and specific indicators
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The sampling criteria gave attention to gender. The evaluation indicated it followed UNEG's Guidance on Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation. Gender equality issues were seen in the evaluation's principles and ethical standards. Gender advisors were interviewed in at least two of the countries, and gender-focused documents were included in the document review.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The findings reflect an adequate analysis of gender, for example in discussing how gender equality concerns were a main focus of early programmatic responses, the inclusion of gender guidance and gender indicators, how there was uneven attention to gender equality in programme implementation, and gender-based violence was covered. Recommendation 7 is focused specifically on gender and equity in UNICEF humanitarian responses.

#### 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>