

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Mid-Term Evaluation of the Maternal Child Nutrition Programme II (MCNP II) in Kenya

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		93%	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 Evaluation of the Maternal Child Nutrition Programme II (MCNP II) in Kenya	
Report sequence number		Kenya/63/2021/8924	
Region		ESAR	
Year of report		2021	
Office		UNICEF Kenya	
Coverage (countries)		Kenya	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)		January 19, 2022	
Name of review firm		DefEdge	
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		No	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)		Yes	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		Yes	
Evaluation object		Programme	
Evaluation type		Summative and formative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Non-experimental	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		2	
EQA Summary:			
<p>This is a thorough Mid-Term Evaluation of the Maternal Child Nutrition Programme II (MCNP II) in Kenya. The evaluation findings are intended to contribute towards generating evidence to improve nutrition programming in Kenya, inform the design of UNICEF's 2022-2026 nutrition programme and operationalize the UNICEF Nutrition Strategy 2020 - 2030. It is clear the evaluation team followed the UNICEF quality assurance guidelines very closely. Evaluators have provided a comprehensive description of the intervention context including the nutrition situation in Kenya and an overview of the socio-economic and political context. Evaluation questions are appropriate and follow the OECD-DAC criteria. The evaluation design and methods are appropriate and relevant for the evaluation objective. The evaluators adopted a non-experimental, mixed-methods design using documentary review, key informant interviews from relevant stakeholder groups involved in programme implementation, in-depth interviews with key informants from the community and focus group discussions with programme beneficiaries. Sampling methods as well as methods of analysis for different data sources are well described. There is a clear description of the ethical considerations including their application in most cases. The findings are well formulated and supported by different sources of data. Similarly, conclusions and lessons are useful and provide important insights, though could reflect a more comprehensive analysis of the budgetary and human resource implications. The evaluation team made clear efforts to integrate gender and human rights throughout the evaluation process.</p>			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<p>This is a high quality report. The main suggested improvements would be to the report structure and clarity by making sure that the graphics have sufficient resolution, sentences are checked for spelling mistakes and grammatical clarity, and the paragraph spacing facilitates ease of reading. It is also important to use rights-based terminology, such as reference to rightsholders and duty-bearers. In addition, the recommendations are quite broad and expansive and should make clearer their consideration of the human and financial constraints to implementation.</p>			
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	At 5 pages, the executive summary is reasonable in length.
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	All required elements are included.
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 evaluation summary includes all information necessary to understand the intervention and does not introduce any new material.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The location, budget, timelines and implementation status of the various pilot interventions and service delivery models under evaluation are all clearly described, especially within Table 2.

	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	Rightsholders as well as duty bearers are described clearly in Table 1. Though there is no clear disaggregation of rightsholders reached by gender or disability status, it is likely that this information is not available. The rightsholders targeted per intervention by age are provided, if available, in Table 2.
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	Evaluators have provided a comprehensive description of the intervention context including nutrition situation in Kenya and overview of the socio-economic and political context.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Linkages are drawn between the intervention and Vision 2030 and SDG 2 – Zero Hunger.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The targeted rightsholders' description is clearly provided, including their status and requirements.
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 key stakeholders including duty bearers and rightsholders are clearly identified by the evaluators in Table 1, including a brief description of their role.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	Key stakeholders' contributions to the MNCP II (Table 1) as well as their role in the evaluation (Table 3) are clearly described.
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.	Yes	The purpose and use of the evaluation, as well as the reason why it was needed at that point in time, are all clearly described.
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 specific objectives of the evaluation are clearly provided under section 2.2.
	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 programmatic, geographical, and chronological scope of the evaluation is clearly described as well as reference to changes made from expectations in the ToR under section 2.3. Mostly, the evaluation expanded its scope to include engagement of community members in the evaluation.
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	The intervention's outcomes are described in a Theory of Change narrative under Section 1.2, and visually presented in the MCNP II Results Framework in Figure 2. All programmatic components under the four result areas (demand, supply, enabling environment, risk-informed/emergency) were assessed within 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	The causal relationships are described in narrative form and presented in graphic form in the annexed ToC (Annex 4).
	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.	Partially	A Theory of Change is provided, though it is not clear whether the evaluators assessed the ToC and improved it, or constructed it from scratch based on the MCNP II Results Framework.
SECTION D:		EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	91%	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 are appropriate and refer to the OECD-DAC criteria. It is noted that the evaluation did not cover the 'coherence' or 'impact' criteria, as it did not fit the evaluation goals for MCNP II.
	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	A comprehensive evaluation matrix is provided in Annex 3 which includes evaluation criterion, evaluation questions, probes, indicators, secondary data sources, primary data collection methods, and reference tools.
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 evaluation design and methods are appropriate and relevant for the evaluation purpose and objectives. The evaluators adopted a non-experimental mixed-methods design, collecting qualitative and quantitative data.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation used qualitative as well as quantitative data sources. Data sources include documentary review, KIIs with key informants from relevant stakeholder groups involved in programme implementation, in-depth interviews with key informants from the community and FGDs with programme beneficiaries.
	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 methods for different sources of data are clearly described. Purposive sampling was used to identify the stakeholder groups and key informants. Whereas, multi-stage cluster sampling was adopted to identify counties, sub-counties and recruitment of participants for the beneficiary field study.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Methods of analysis for qualitative as well as quantitative data are well described. Quantitative data obtained from the secondary datasets was analyzed using MS Excel to generate insights for comparative and trend analysis of results and programme indicators. Whereas qualitative data was coded using NVivo software for thematic analysis.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The evaluation used an appropriate methodology for drawing causal connections between outputs and outcomes.
	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	Evaluators have clearly described 5 limitations including their mitigation strategies.
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	The UNEG obligations of the evaluators are clearly referenced, however there is no clear and complete description on means taken to adhere to them.
	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 considerations including their application are described clearly under Section 3.7
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.	Partially	The evaluators used a standard approach in conducting the assessment, however, the evaluation was innovative in providing a clear and comprehensive description of the training protocols for the data collection team, including role-plays for remote interviews. Additionally, the team closely followed up with the participants over mail and phone calls to increase response rates.
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	All questions and sub-questions are methodically addressed using adequate qualitative and quantitative data.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The ToC and evaluation matrix are clearly used in the formulation of findings.
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 findings are backed by credible qualitative as well as quantitative data. There is extensive use of quotes from different stakeholder groups including rightsholders, key informants, and health care workers.
	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	Findings present strengths as well as weaknesses of the intervention and are based on probes and indicators from the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 3).
	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 (enabling as well as bottlenecks) facilitating and affecting achievement of results are clearly described under Tables 8 and 9.
Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		

	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	The interventions' monitoring systems are adequately analyzed under the relevance and efficiency criteria in findings.
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, methodically presented by criteria, and are adequately 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	Conclusions are based on findings and present both strengths and weaknesses of the intervention.
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 are clearly derived from findings and provide useful insights for similar interventions.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	There are 6 concisely formulated lessons that provide useful information for the intended audience. The lessons detail the issue, activities undertaken, key achievements, and the potential forward-looking application.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	88%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Recommendations are based on findings and align with the purpose of the evaluation.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	Recommendations are somewhat broad and while guidance is provided, ensuring they are largely actionable, the budget and human resource implications are not thoroughly considered.
	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 recommendations is clearly described. Recommendations were drafted in consultation with the Ministry of Health (MoH) Division of Nutrition and Dietetics (DND), implementing partners, donors, other departments and line ministries. Additionally, they were validated during a multi-stakeholder meeting that included representation from UNICEF, the Government of Kenya, donors and implementing partners.
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	Recommendations are classified as strategic or operational. They are prioritized and directed towards intended users (mostly UNICEF Nutrition).
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	All required elements are 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.	Yes	Annexes include all required elements.
Question 20.	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Partially	Report is easy to navigate, however its readability is somewhat disrupted by the line spacing, which is compact and jams quite a bit of content into a small space.
	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 adheres 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 59 pages, the report is reasonable in length.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	Report is mostly easy to understand and free of errors. Sentences are sometimes poorly structured or long, which affects readability.
	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.	Partially	Many well chosen visual aids including graphs and tables are provided, however, most of the graphics are blurry and hard to read.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	86%	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	It is noted that the intervention is aligned to CRC, CEDAW, and human rights of persons with disabilities.

	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).	Yes	Rights holders as well as duty bearers participated in the evaluation as key respondents. Additionally, an ERG was established to provide technical oversight to the evaluation by review of the key evaluation deliverables and provided technical inputs to refine the overall evaluation design, matrix and report.
	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	Differential results are provided for male and female rights holders' to demonstrate how the outcomes differ between the two groups. However, there is no usage of rights-based terminology.
	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 assesses the extent to which the intervention has covered disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. Additionally, under the relevance criterion it is noted that the intervention is aligned to human rights of persons with disabilities, however the data here is somewhat mixed, as it previously notes that the programme is not fully aligned to the National Policy on Gender and Development, which includes the disability inclusive objectives.
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	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 is fully integrated in the evaluation purpose and objectives. Additionally, gender is covered under the relevance and effectiveness criteria.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	It is clearly noted that the evaluation tools and rubrics were developed in a gender sensitive way to assess the extent to which the programme is aligned to gender equality, human rights and equity dimensions. Similarly, ethical considerations are clearly described. Finally, a gender-disaggregated list of FGD participants is also provided.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	This is well done. The evaluation background discusses women's micronutrient status and the role of women in educating their offspring and contributing towards household economies and food security. Gender is adequately reflected in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The findings section also discusses key political, practical, and bureaucratic barriers in addressing gender and human rights issues.
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.			
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?			
b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?			
c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?			
d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?			
ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.			
a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?			
b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?			
c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?			
d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?			
e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?			
iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.			
a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?			
b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?			
c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?			
d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?			