

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: February, 2020

Final evaluation of "Improving children's access to water and sanitation in Somalia (2015-2018)"

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		82%	Satisfactory
● ● ● ● ●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 100%)	4	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
● ● ● ● -	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
● ● - - -	Fair (34.76% - 62.49%)	2	
● - - - -	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.75%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	Final evaluation of "Improving children's access to water and sanitation in Somalia (2015-2018)"
Report sequence number	Somalia/63/2019/8933
Region	ESAR
Year of report	2019
Office	Somalia
Coverage (countries)	Somalia
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	February 1, 2020
Name of review firm	AIMS

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)	Jointly managed with organizations outside the UN system
Unicef goal areas	
Every child survives and thrives	No
Every child learns	No
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	No
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes
Every child has an equitable chance in life	No
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object	Country Programme
Evaluation type	Summative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome
Geographic scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	SDG 6

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.*

This report generally meets the requirements for UNICEF evaluations. The evaluation team faced challenges including security issues and the move of the UNICEF office which may have had some effect on evaluation quality. At seven pages, the Executive Summary could be more concise, though it could also have provided broader context to improve understanding of the challenges of working in post-conflict Somalia. The Introduction provides a background on the project, stating that poor sanitation and unsafe water affects almost every citizen every day of the year. It clarifies there was a strong gender component to address adverse development impacts on women and girls. The evaluation process and its limitations are described, although mitigation strategies could have been more explicit. Although a mixed methods approach was requested in ToRs, the methodology was heavily reliant on qualitative data. It could have been strengthened by the inclusion of more quantitative information, most notably gender-disaggregated and community health data, but also additional qualitative information on the opinions and experiences of children under 16 years (and families) who are core UNICEF beneficiaries and key informants. Otherwise, the findings were mostly well supported by qualitative evidence gathered from programme staff, key stakeholders and beneficiaries over 16 years of age. The conclusions are derived from the findings, though could have gone further in assessing if project activities had any influence on limiting the spread of disease in the affected project area. Although the recommendations appear to be useful for the UNICEF country programme and SIDA, as well as for UNICEF to consider in the context of its global practice, stakeholder involvement in their development is not clear. The annexes are complete. In respect to the UN-SWAP indicators, the evaluators considered gender within broader questions, but could potentially have reflected further on some of the gender-related findings and carried them through to the conclusions and recommendations.

Recommendations for Improvement: *The rater will identify topline recommendations that would improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. Cite resources that may assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations as relevant.*

The suggested improvements are directed to presentation, design, methodological and findings issues. In terms of presentation, it is recommended that the Executive Summary be limited to approximately 5 pages as succinct summaries are more likely to be read in full (the maximum length should be specified in the ToRs). The purpose, scope and objectives could have been incorporated into a more focused and dedicated section to enhance readability. The Findings could also be more insightful for users of the report had they been framed within a broader socio-cultural-economic context, which would help decision makers in understanding a complex intervention in a post-conflict economy hampered by the many epidemics going around. The methodology could be made more robust by greater inclusion of more quantitative gender and community health data related to outputs and outcomes. As a preliminary theory of change was created, the evaluators could have been requested to construct an updated one based on learning to accompany the recommendations on future WASH interventions. It is also not clear if UNICEF and Sida were able to provide the support to the team to the extent indicated in the ToR, which may have helped address some of the limitations faced. To help ensure evaluation standards outlined by UNICEF/GEROS are fully met, it is good practice for managers to explicitly mention in the evaluation ToRs, the GEROS requirements and UNICEF Adapted Reporting Standards (2017) and the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations (2014), particularly Chapter 7 Conduct/Implementation of an HR & GE Responsive Evaluation.

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		83%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	83%	
	i An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users (Maximum of approximately 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	The Executive Summary could be more concise as it was 7 pages long.
	ii Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	The elements are present.
	iii Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report.	Yes	It includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation. Provision of more information on the context would benefit the international donor community (secondary intended users of the evaluation) that need to better understand the challenges of working in post-conflict economies.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		92%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 2.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	100%	
	i Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The description of the programmed intervention is clear and relevant.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The intended beneficiaries are described by type (PIN, IDP, IPC, PIN WASH), by geographic location, and in terms of numbers (section 4.2).
Question 3.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	75%	
	i Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (relevant policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Partially	The description of the context is clear and relevant. While governmental institutions are introduced on page 21, users of the report could benefit from more information and data on political structures, socio-cultural-economic factors (e.g. ethnicity, diaspora remittances, number of female headed households), as well as country progress on universal achievement of UNICEF's mandates (noting the Theory of Change on Page 30 clarifies the contribution of water, sanitation and hygiene in protecting child rights, meeting their basic needs, and expanding their opportunities to meet full potential).
	ii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention.	Yes	The description of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention is clear and relevant.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	100%	
	i Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders.	Yes	The implementing agencies and development partners are identified.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The report identifies roles of key stakeholders and UNICEF on page 23-25.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		83%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	75%	
	i Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve.	Yes	The intended users and uses of the evaluation are specified in section 2.3.
	ii Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation.	Partially	It is noted that the Interagency Standing Committee principals and the Working Group and Emergency Directors Group are expected to use Interagency Humanitarian Evaluation results and lessons learned to contribute to global policy and practice.
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	75%	

	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).	Partially	There is a limited description of the purpose of the evaluation, though the evaluation objectives (and whether there was any change to the ToR) is not discussed. To be complete, the evaluation purpose in section 2.1 should have clarified the need to also evaluate how the encountered challenges were addressed to meet modified "end-of-project targets and achievable outputs and outcomes". The evaluation objectives stated in the ToR were to assess 'progress towards improved health and quality of life of 150,500 people' and evaluate the 'efficiency of project strategies'.
	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 geographic, thematic and chronological scope are described on page 16.
Question 7.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	100%	
	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to the evaluation.	Yes	The description of intended results is clear, i.e. the reduced risk and burden of wash-related disease.
	ii The causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (theory of change, logic model, results chain, evaluation matrix, etc.).	Yes	The causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and graphic form. The evaluators could have provided an annex with the logical framework to improve the report.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	79%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 8.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	100%	
	i Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation.	Yes	The evaluation framework and key questions are clear and relevant. In addition to focusing on 4 OECD/DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability), the report notes a focus on 'gender and inclusion'.
Question 9.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	75%	
	i Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope.	Yes	The design and set of methods are clearly described.
	ii Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated.	Partially	The description of data sources, rationale and sampling strategy is clear, though the rationale for excluding children under 16 years from interviews was not provided. There is no mention in the Methodology of how many people participated in the study, and this information should be made clear in the body of the report, preferably for each type of data source.
	iii Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant).	Yes	The methods of analysis and approach to triangulation used is clear and complete.
	iv 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 description of limitations, though more information could have been provided, including on how risk was mitigated. While mitigation of security risk was mentioned, there is no indication of how the risk of limited evidence was mitigated other than reliance on 'UNICEF's reflections'. The statement "we are confident that the data we collected is more than adequate for an approach based on triangulation of findings" does not explain the <i>what</i> and the <i>how</i> . For example, whereas the report states triangulation was used to address disaggregated gender data deficiencies, it does not clarify if any additional evidence was collected to ensure gender, inclusion, and human rights were appropriately addressed.

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:	75%	
	i Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).	Yes	UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines were referenced, however an explicit statement on the obligations of evaluators was not provided. There was a clear statement that no member of the evaluation team had any conflict of interest, though this was limited to personal involvement with programme development and management.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (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.	Partially	A description of ethical safeguards for participants is provided. An ethical review of the evaluation by UNICEF was not sought as the evaluation did not to interview children younger than 16 years of age. Noting several communities refused to engage with the evaluation team, with some eventually relenting, more information on how this issue was taken up could have been useful for learning and a possible recommendation for future projects. In such a diverse and post-conflict setting, the evaluators could also have gone further by clarifying in an annex: 1) how respect for culture, local custom, and religious beliefs and practices were appropriately managed, and, 2) how beneficiaries were provided with information on how to seek redress for any perceived disadvantage suffered as a result of the evaluation.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	79%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 11.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	75%	
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria.	Partially	A significant level of evidence was marshalled on the outputs and targets, though more information could have been collected to respond to the question of whether the "risk of burden of water-related diseases was reduced (particularly for women and children)". Noting the lack of gender-disaggregated data, the evaluation could have strengthened the evidence by seeking the views children under 16 years of age, a subset of the primary beneficiary group. For example, the new MHM regime did not fully meet the hygiene and sanitary needs of a subset of beneficiaries in Bari, Puntland (noting the annex states 90% of girls over 16 years of age were not willing to stay in school during their periods). As one evaluation objective was 'to evaluate the efficiency of the strategies employed in contributing to the achievement of the results', how the intervention could have addressed this issue could have been more fully explored.
	ii Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Box 2 provides a summary of the project outcomes, whereas Annexes 5 and 6 lists the signs of outcome achievement and contribution analysis.
Question 12.	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.	67%	
	i The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Partially	The evaluation presents multiple lines and levels of credible evidence. The analysis could have been improved by incorporating local community health data as an objective indicator, to better assess if there was any change in the burden of disease for key beneficiary groups (boys, girls, women).
	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.	Partially	The findings respond to the evidence presented generally, though may have warranted additional analysis to close out potential issues. For example, the report provides information that could link placement of the new wells in Kismayo/Lower Juba, lack of water quality testing and quality of latrine construction to the cholera outbreak.

	iii The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The evaluators reviewed the logic of the approach and established program activities had the potential to contribute to the specific objectives (Page 28).
Question 13.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	100%	
	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).	Yes	The evaluators assessed the monitoring system. It was also found it could have benefitted from indicators focused on the achievement of programme objectives, as well as collection of gender-disaggregated data.
	ii Assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making.	Yes	The report notes the monitoring data created clarity that UNICEF was on track to achieve its targets, allowing discussion on "delays in project implementation" and "performance" to inform decision making.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	88%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 14.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	83%	
	i Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The strengths and weaknesses are presented clearly, with the effectiveness analysis determined through contributions analysis.
	ii Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	The foreseeable implications are described, with original assumptions assessed and reformulated to support future interventions in the WASH space.
	iii The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings.	Partially	At least one key finding was not reflected. The report found there had been a cholera outbreak in one of the project areas, though it did not conclude if project activities had any influence on limiting the spread of disease.
Question 15.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified?	100%	
	i Identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	Yes	The identified lessons stem logically from the findings.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	90%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 16.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	83%	
	i Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations derive from the findings and conclusions.
	ii Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation).	Yes	The recommendations can be used for future project design and implementation.
	iii Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation.	Partially	It is noted that the evaluation team discussed the recommendations amongst themselves in a dedicated meeting but it does not appear stakeholders were involved. Although it was earlier mentioned that initial plans to have a sense-making session with UNICEF were not possible because the office moved during the course of the evaluation, it should have been feasible to have some discussions remotely. If such discussions were not feasible, this should have been included as a study limitation. It is not clear if the level of stakeholder participation was proportionate to the level of participation during the intervention and during conduct of the evaluation.
Question 17.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	100%	
	i Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations).	Yes	All recommendations are directed to UNICEF generally.
	ii Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	The recommendations are grouped as strategic and tactical, with additional recommendations for project management.
SECTION H:	EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	90%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 18.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	75%	

	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.	Partially	The name of the organization commissioning the evaluation was not provided on the cover page. There was a reference to the 5 month evaluation process kicking off in December 2018 (Page 13).
	ii Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, 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, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s).	Yes	All required information was included. It would be good practice to include a copy of a logical framework as an annex.
Question 19.	Is the report logically structured?	100%	
	i The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles).	Yes	The structure is clear and can be navigated using both numbered sections and titles/sub-titles.
	ii Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The ordering of sections is logically structured.
Question 20.	Is the report well presented?	100%	
	i Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report can be easily understood, though there are some grammatical errors.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	67%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 21.	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?	33%	
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	No	Whereas the ToR required evaluation design and conduct to "respect and protect the rights and welfare of the people and communities involved", page 37 notes "During inception, the UNICEF evaluation manager suggested against incorporating the core-commitment to children (CCC) or other right-based approaches in the evaluation." This comment and the choice to comply with it and the implications for the evaluation should have been further explained in the report.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	There is a clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders who were involved as informants and in data gathering. There does not appear to be any discussion of the Joint UNICEF and SIDA team that was established to guide and assist the evaluation team.
	iii Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations which can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.	Partially	There is stylistic evidence of the inclusion of gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing, though disaggregated data by gender, age, disability and minority group was not available.
Question 22.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	100%	
	i Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention (such as the involvement in the intervention of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children).	Yes	The evaluation identified and assessed the presence and absence of equity considerations in design and implementation.
	ii Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the ToRs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.).	Yes	There is proportionality between level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation.
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards)	78%	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	GEEW was integrated in the scope of analysis, though questions 2-8 could have been designed to ensure more GEEW-related data was collected and reported. As the ToR identified gender as a cross cutting issue that should be mainstreamed in the evaluation, the 'gender and inclusion' questions the evaluation answered should have been reported in the Evaluation Matrix. For example, was the risk of physical/sexual violence for women and girls minimised?

ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The methodology, methods and tool, and data analysis techniques are responsive to gender, though while the evaluators ensured they had female and male FGD facilitators to ensure the views of all in the group were included, the choice to use regional data for comparative purposes (page 41) may mask gender equality and empowerment issues.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The data analysis has explicitly and transparently triangulated the voices of different social role groups including girls over 16 years and women, though UNICEF Somalia did not collect and analyse disaggregated quantitative data on gender. There are specific sections on gender throughout the findings, however while an intervention focus was enhancing the protective environment and minimizing risk of physical/sexual violence, the one recommendation addressing gender does not go further than identifying the need to collect gender disaggregated data. There were other gender-related findings and conclusions that could have warranted recommendations.

SWAP Rating Guidance

i	<p>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>
ii	<p>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>
iii	<p>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>