

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Mid-Term Impact Evaluation of the Emergency Social Cash Transfer (ESCT) Programme

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	95%	Highly Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and 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			
Title of the evaluation report	Mid-Term Impact Evaluation of the Emergency Social Cash Transfer (ESCT) Programme		
Report sequence number	Zimbabwe/63/2023/19565		
Region	ESAR		
Year of report	2023		
Office	Zimbabwe CO		
Coverage (countries)	Zimbabwe		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 30, 2024		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	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	Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Impact		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	SDG 2		
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>This mid term evaluation of the Mid-Term Impact Evaluation of the Emergency Social Cash Transfer (ESCT) Programme in Zimbabwe is of very high quality, and closely aligned with the UNICEF standards for an evaluation in almost every aspect. As such this evaluation can be used as an example of best practice. The programme which was being evaluated was to support vulnerable households in selected urban districts, with a particular focus on households with pregnant women, children under two years old, elderly people (over 65), and persons with disabilities (PWD). A such, this evaluation is an excellent example of a rights based evaluation, which places importance on gathering data about the status and needs of rights holders, including excellent attention to the needs of marginalised groups of people. A key point of excellence in this evaluation was that it included an assessment of UNICEF's commitments to gender equality (including UNSWAP and CEDAW), equity, and HRBA, and assessed the extent to which these principles were integrated into the design, implementation, and results of the ESCT Programme.</p> <p>Specific areas of excellence included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Clear and logical structure, and excellent writing style. •Identification of stakeholders, and definition and use of the terms rights holders and duty bearers throughout. •Placing rights holders at the heart of this evaluation, and undertaking additional research to fully understand their needs •Thorough and strong evaluation matrix, sensible amendment of evaluation scope/ questions •Focus on gender at all stages of the evaluation, from design to analysis and recommendations, allowing evidence to be presented and analysed from situated perspectives of women's experiences. <p>Minor suggestions for improvement would include greater detail on why the midterm evaluation was taking place so late in the programme, and how the sequencing of this evaluation fits into wider decision making on programming. Additionally while the evaluation reference group was discussed, its members could have been listed in an annex along with the points in the evaluation they were consulted, and why.</p>			
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>This evaluation is very high quality, as such there are no significant areas for improvement, minor points would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Clarity on the timing of the evaluation, and why the midterm evaluation was taking place so late in the programme, and any implications of this from a utility perspective. •If explicit reference, and links, were made to SDGs. •If bias were more explicitly discussed in the risks and limitations section. 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%	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).	Yes	The executive summary serves as a stand alone document for decision making purposes and at 5 pages is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users.
	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 includes all necessary elements and is clear and well written with a systematic summary of the evaluation.
	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	All significant information is present, and no new evidence is introduced.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			86%	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.	Partially	There is a clear and relevant description of the intervention which aims to improve food security, dietary diversity, and maternal and child health outcomes. The programme is located in 8 districts in Zimbabwe. With regard to timeline, the programme started in 2020 and appears to have concluded in May 2023 (with the evaluations looking at evidence from start of the programme to September 2022). The programme budget is clearly outlined in section 1.2.5. (pp 7). This section could be improved if there was greater clarity on the implementation status and phase the evaluation is currently in. The background to the evaluation implies the programme is in its second phase, but in the recommendations section it states that the programme concluded in 2023.
	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	There is a clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders and duty bearers. Section 1.3 describes and summarises rights holders for the programme, stating that it is primarily focused in supporting those based in urban areas, and also pay specific attention to vulnerable groups such as women, children, older people and people with disabilities. Specific detail on the number of rightsholders accessing specific services (vouchers/ cash) is provided in Appendix 4. Data is disaggregated where possible (particularly in relation to people with disabilities), but it is well noted that disaggregated data was not provided to the evaluation team across the whole programme. Duty bearers are well described and defined in Table 2 (pp 7), along with their responsibilities.
Question 3.		Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The context is well described relating to policy, power, political and social issues, in the main body of the report as well in Appendices 2. The Zimbabwean policy framework to address food security is clearly outlined. The context directly relates to the need for the programme to support vulnerable people. The context of Covid 19, and the additional pressures this placed on individuals is also discussed.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	SDG 2 is referenced in the report, primarily in relation to international obligations, not the evaluation itself. This area could be improved if the report outlined which SDGs the programme contributed to, including targets and indicators.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the rightsholders in section 1.3. Primary rights holders are pregnant women, children under two years old, elderly people (over 65), and persons with disabilities (PWD). The evaluation also conducted additional research to more clearly identify and understand the needs of right holders at a provincial level due to the lack of district-specific data (appendix 2).
Question 4.		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	All stakeholders are clearly defined, and described, in Table 2 (pp7), including implementing partners, development partners, rightsholders and duty bearers.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	There is one main donor who is identified along with the budget (pp 7), while the responsibilities of key stakeholders is outlined in Table 2.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			92%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.		Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		

	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Partially	The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is defined as being to assess the impact of the ESCT Programme from its inception in August 2020 to July 2022, and to demonstrate accountability to stakeholders by assessing the extent to which the Programme achieved its intended impact. Its intended use, and key intended users are clearly described, with Table 3 outlining uses, and users of the evaluation. The report could be clearer on why it is need at this point in time, and how this mid term evaluation will inform ongoing programme implementation, or the development of future programmes.
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	There is a clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve, with one change made from the ToR, this was with regard to sustainability - initially, the evaluation was designed to assess the potential challenges in the planned transition in two additional regions however, due to the speed of implementation this was later revised to assess the challenges that arose during and after the transition that had already taken place in these districts. This is a sensible adaption and is clearly described.
	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 is clearly defined in the following ways: • Thematic Scope: looking at the programmes impact and challenges to programme transition to government social safety programmes (sustainability). It is well noted that other criteria such as relevance, effectiveness and efficiency will be explored in the endline evaluation. • Chronological Scope: This evaluation assessed the ESCT activities implemented from August 2020 to July 2022. • Geographical Scope: The evaluation covered all eight districts where the ESCT was implemented.
Question 7.	Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	There is a description of the interventions intended results, and which aspects of the results framework which are explored in this mid-term evaluation, and which will be evaluated in the endline 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	The programme ToC is provided, which provides clear links between outputs, outcomes and impact (Figure 7).
	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 theory of change is provided, and thoroughly assessed as part of this mid-term evaluation, and includes suggestions on where the ToC could be improved. Table 4 also usefully outlines (and analyses) underlying assumptions and external factors.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	86%	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.	Yes	Evaluation questions and sub questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of this evaluation. The relevant criteria are aligned with the questions. It is well noted that the sustainability questions were amended from the ToR to account for changes in implementation of the project. Additional questions were also added to capture a more nuanced, and gendered perspective.
	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 very thorough and well presented (appendix 5). It includes information on baseline data and indicators, aligned against each question and sub question. It is a sound basis on which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.
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.	Yes	The design is theory based and participatory - which is relevant and appropriate for the evaluation. Mixed methods are applied, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative data methods such as KIIs, FGDs, case studies, and a validation workshop. • Quantitative data through desk review, analysis of baseline programme data, and comparison with endline surveys. Overall the design and methods are robust and well described, to meet the evaluations purpose, objectives and scope. Figure 8 is a useful visual aid to the methods applied in the conduct of the evaluation, along with clear narrative descriptions.
	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 outlined and appropriate, including qualitative and quantitative sources.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	Sampling strategies are thorough and clearly described: For KIIs - A purposive sampling approach was applied and specific reference made to capturing diverse voices, and of women in particular. •For geographic sampling of regions, a purposive sampling was applied, and within that communities randomly selected. A clear description of this was provided. •For FGDs within the communities purposive sampling was applied to ensure diverse voices were captured, including people with disabilities, women, older people etc. In addition to this convenience sampling was applied allowing those who may not be identified through the programme itself, to be identified during field visits. •FGD participants who were willing to share more information were purposively selected for case studies.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Methods of analysis are clearly described, both for qualitative and quantitative data. Details of coding and analysis of Quantitative data are provided, as well as details of before and after analysis. Appendix 12 provides further useful data on the data cleaning and methods and data analysis.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology is excellent and allows for drawing of causal connections not just between outputs and outcomes, but impact.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Partially	There is a clear description of limitations and mitigation measures in table 9. This section could have been improved if it included mitigation of bias as a limitation, particularly given most of the sampling was purposeful, it may have been expected that bias in the sample would be discussed here, and mitigation strategies outlined.
Question 10.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	There is explicit and contextualised reference to UNEG obligations on evaluators.
	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	There is a description of ethical safeguards appropriate to the methodology, including ethical clearance from the Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe (Appendix 14), and more detailed ethical considerations outlined in the main body of the report, and in Appendix 13. There is explicit reference to "do no harm" and the evaluation outlines how it managed questions relating to gender based violence using existing data that was already being collected, and not risking traumatic and personal questions being asked if there were different ways to answer those questions. The evaluation did not involve data collection with children.
Question 11.	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	No	Innovative practices are not used in the report, although the approach and methodology used are appropriate and innovation is not requested in the ToR.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	Comments on Rating

Question 12.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence from multiple sources and systematically address all of the evaluation questions, sub questions and criteria.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The theory of change is referred back to in addressing evaluation questions, and achievement of outcomes, including testing and validating the assumptions made by the evaluation team to improve the ToC.
Question 13.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative evidence and deploys them to good effect. For example, the findings from comparison of baseline and midline data were tested and triangulated with findings from FGDs to identify outcomes, and impacts on peoples lives as a result of this programme. Case studies were deployed to good use to illustrate the impact on individuals, along with a wide variety of quotes throughout, again to illustrate the findings with real life examples, and validate evidence.
	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 respond to the evidence presented, even if that does not always tell a simple story (for example differences in gender based violence in different geographic areas). The findings also present positive and negative findings, often presenting negative findings as challenges, and then further breaking this down by groups of people. For example Table 9 presents challenges faced people transitioning from the ESCT (managed by UNICEF and partners) to the HSCT (managed by the government), but subdivides the data by challenges to duty bearers, and rights holders to understand the individual, organisational and government level challenges based on the evidence.
	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 are explored, particularly the organisational and managerial aspects of administering a programme such as the ESCT, and the transition to the state run programme. Figures 11 and 13 provide comparative process maps for the different systems, and analyse of findings from rights holders and duty bearers relating to achievements and challenges. There is explicit reference to the theory of change throughout the findings.
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.	Not Rated	As noted in the ToRs this midterm evaluation was not expected to assess the adequacy of the interventions monitoring system, as this would be covered by the endline evaluation under the relevance criteria.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	100%	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).	Yes	Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Evidence is presented succinctly and clearly, and includes a strong gendered perspective.
	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	Conclusions are appropriately derived from findings, and present both strengths and limitations, as well as contradictions in the data, for example in some cases indicating a small increase in gender based violence if women are given funds, in other geographic areas a decrease in GBV was recorded. Across all areas improved food security was identified, and the integration of gender quality principles in the programme, and in this evaluation, allow important information about (and between) different groups of people, to emerge. This section adds additional insight and analysis beyond the findings section.
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	Lessons stem logically from findings and have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of this evaluation to inform other cash based programming to reduce food insecurity, as well as important lessons about integrating equity and gender from the outset.

	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are concisely presented, with three key lessons identified, which have sufficient detail to be useful for wider intended audiences.
SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		100%	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	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose and are clearly formatted and well laid out. They are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, with useful reference for each recommendations back to the findings to which they directly relate.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users, and guidance is given as to implementation of these recommendations, particularly for the transition from the ESCT to the government programme, and with regard to cash based approaches, and focus on women and vulnerable groups.
	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	The process for developing the recommendations is clearly outlined as starting with the data collection, particularly engagement with rightsholders, concluding with a validation work with the ERG, which includes duty bearers.
Question 18.	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	There is a clear identification of duty bearers responsible for each recommendation, with primary and secondary duty bearers listed. Each recommendation has also been clustered around three key areas, and prioritised.
SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		100%	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 contain all relevant information.
	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	Annexes contain all expected and necessary data, and other detailed annexes, for example on methodology, needs of rightsholders and ethics.
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 structure is exceptionally clear, with good use of signposting throughout.
	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 accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports.
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	At 54 pages the report is a good length, and reads very well.
	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 very well written, it presents complex information in easy to understand formats and is very accessible.
	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	There is excellent use of visual aids, as well as narrative text, all visual aids are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text. There is also good use of referencing back to annexes, where relevant.
SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)		93%	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.	Yes	The evaluation references and uses rights based frameworks. A separate evaluation question was included to assess the degree to which the programme integrated gender equality (including UN System-wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) and the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), equity, and human rights-based approach (HRBA) principles.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	An evaluation reference group was established, and stakeholders were involved, although it is noted they were primarily duty bearers. This section would be improved if a list of all members of the ERG were provided.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	Language is empowering and inclusive, and clearly defines and uses the terminology of rights holders and duty bearers. Data is disaggregated by marginalised groups, where possible, and evidence assessed from different situated perspectives.
	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 evaluation is focused on gender and reaching the most vulnerable in society (as part of the ESCT programme), as such the evaluation is strongly focused on assessing the extent to which excluded and marginalised groups were reached by this intervention, and in what ways.
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)	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	The evaluation scope, criteria and questions all take good account of gender. Gender considerations were mainstreamed throughout this evaluation, and an additional gender related Evaluation Question was also added.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The methodology, tools and data analysis are gender responsive.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The findings, conclusions and recommendations take a gendered approach, with evidence presented from perspectives of women, not just women as a homogenous group, but from different women's situated perspectives, e.g. the nutritional needs of women who are lactating. A key point of excellence in this evaluation was that it included an assessment of UNICEF's commitments to gender equality (including UNSWAP and CEDAW), equity, and HRBA. The evaluation assessed the extent to which these principles were integrated into the design, implementation, and results of the ESCT Programme. Conclusions and recommendations also take excellent account of gender, with significant lessons and recommendations that have wider applicability beyond this programme.

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.

- 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?
- Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- 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.

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