

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2016.4

Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow

		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	Reducing Stunting in Children Under Five Years of Age: a comprehensive evaluation of UNICEF's strategies and programme performance – India Country Case Study	
Report sequence number	2017/001	
Region	ROSA	
Year of Report	2017	
Office	India	
Coverage (countries)	India	
ToRs present	Yes	
Date of Review	17/08/2017	
Name of reviewer	ImpactReady	
Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)		UNICEF managed
SPOA Correspondence <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	Health	Yes
	HIV/AIDS	No
	WASH	No
	Nutrition	Yes
	Education	No
	Child protection	No
	Social inclusion	No
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
Evaluation object		Strategy
Evaluation type		Summative and formative
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods
Evaluation design		Case study
Evaluation level		Outcome
Geographic Scope		National
SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		Rating
Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	Yes

	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/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	Yes
	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)	Yes
Question 2.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	100%
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Yes
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Yes
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Yes
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	33%
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Mostly
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	No
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	33%
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	Partly
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	Partly
••••	Executive Feedback on Section A	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory
<p>The UNICEF India Country Programme is well outlined, including those elements that are related to nutrition and to stunting. However, civil society or non-government stakeholders working with UNICEF at the country level are not clearly identified. The country context is very well explained and includes information on government strategies to reduce stunting. The report presents programme outcomes related to stunting and states that the programme had no theory of change in regards to stunting. Information on rights holders is broken down according to tribes and casts, which demonstrates a sensitivity to equity.</p>		 3
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
<p>All stakeholders (including non governmental actors) should be clearly identified and their contributions discussed. A practical way of doing this can be by creating a stakeholder table or chart that presents each stakeholder and its contribution towards reducing stunting. When identifying programme outcomes and desired programme results, it is most useful to include specific results targets so serve as a frame of reference for the evaluation assessment. This can be done by presenting a shortened version of the country programme's results framework. Additionally, even though the CO does not have a specific ToC for stunting, the evaluators could have worked with the CO to retroactively create one (even if it is in general terms) to inform the evaluation.</p>		0.05
SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		Rating
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	Yes
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	Yes
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%
	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	Yes
	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 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
••••	Executive Feedback on Section B	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory

<p>The report clearly explains why the evaluation is taking place at this point in time, what it is expected to achieve, and how the information will be used and by whom. Specific evaluation objectives are also clearly presented. The evaluation scope in terms of thematic coverage, geographic coverage, and timespan are clearly articulated.</p>			3
<p>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</p>		Weighting	
<p>This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.</p>		0.05	
<p>SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</p>			Rating
Question 7.	<p>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 consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</p>	33%	
	<p>Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation</p>	Mostly	
	<p>If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described</p>	No	
Question 8.	<p>Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</p>	83%	
	<p>Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope</p>	Yes	
	<p>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</p>	Partly	
	<p>Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?</p>	Yes	
	<p>Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?</p>	Yes	
Question 9.	<p>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:</p>	0%	
	<p>Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)</p>	No	
	<p>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)</p>	No	
	<p>ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children</p>	Not Rated	
• • •	<p>Executive Feedback on Section C</p>	Overall rating for Section	
<p>The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements</p>		Fair	
<p>The evaluation uses a good mixed methods methodology and is very strong at describing the methods of analysis used to code and analyse both quantitative and qualitative data. While data sources are presented within the annexes, the report does not discuss the sampling strategy used to select the data sources. The evaluation criteria are presented but the report does not explain why the additional non-standard criteria of "leadership and leveraging partnerships; equity; and knowledge/data generation, management, and use" are also included. The report makes no reference to the UNEG Ethical Standards or to the ethical obligations of the evaluators or ethical safeguards used to protect participants.</p>			2
<p>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</p>		Weighting	

0.15

If the evaluation uses any non-standard evaluation criteria, the reasons for doing so should be justified within the report. Simply referencing the ToRs is insufficient as it is expected that the evaluators validate the selected criteria. It is also essential that the report explain the sampling methods used to select data sources. This explanation is crucial for transparency purposes and to ensure that no biased selection of data sources took place. Along these same lines, it is necessary for all evaluation reports to discuss how the evaluation team upheld the UNEG Ethical Standards including the ethical obligations of the evaluators and how ethical safeguards were put in place to protect evaluation participants. The UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation can be found here: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		Rating
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	100%
	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	Yes
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	Yes
Question 11.	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.	83%
	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Yes
	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.	Yes
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	Partly
	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
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	17%
	Clear and comprehensive assessment 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)	Partly
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	No
••• -	Executive Feedback on Section D	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory
	Evaluation findings are structured around the evaluation criteria and answer specific evaluation questions identified at the beginning of each section. They are clearly written and are based on multiple lines of evidence. The analysis of effectiveness focuses on four main SP output areas that are relevant for India. While unexpected effects are somewhat included throughout the findings, they are not clearly identified or discussed. While the CO's ability to gather and share knowledge around stunting is assessed in detail, the analysis of the CO's M&E function is quite limited. It would be useful to include greater analysis on the M&E system's strengths and areas for improvement, including how the M&E system informs decision-making.	 3
	Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	It is important to clearly identify unexpected outcomes as they can be useful to inform adjustments to UNICEF programming. A useful way of ensuring that unexpected outcomes are included in the evaluation assessment is to create a specific evaluation question that looks into unexpected results. Finally, it can be very useful to decision-makers when evaluation reports provide an in-depth assessment around the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme's M&E system, including how information is used for decision-making. Again, a specific evaluation question looking into the programme's M&E system can be useful.	0.2
SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)		Rating
Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	89%

	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	Yes
	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)	Mostly
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	Yes
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	0%
	Correctly 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.	No
••••	Executive Feedback on Section E	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair
	Conclusions are presented at the end of each findings section (per evaluation criterion) and are accompanied by an analytical summary of the programme's strengths and areas for improvement according to each criterion. The report could be strengthened by including a separate conclusions section that highlights the most important elements overall emerging from the findings and that discusses the programme's primary strengths, areas for improvement, major causal factors for the achievement and non-achievement of results, and the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention. The evaluation does not include any lessons learned that can be clearly identified.	 2
	Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	Conclusions can be very useful when presented within their own stand-alone section so that decision-makers can quickly read them and get a sense of the most urgent issues emerging from the findings. The ToRs call for lessons learned to be discussed within each criterion. They should be clearly highlighted as lessons learned or they should be discussed within their own stand-alone section.	0.15

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		Rating
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	56%
	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	Yes
	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)	Mostly
	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	No
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	67%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Mostly
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Mostly
••••	Executive Feedback on Section F	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory
	The recommendations are logically derived from the findings and will likely be useful to decision-makers. However, they could be strengthened by providing more detailed information around how to implement them within the country context. They are numbered but the report does not explicitly state that they are presented in priority order. The report also does not specify how they were developed and if stakeholders were consulted during the process. It could be assumed that all of the recommendations are aimed at the UNICEF CO but this is not explicitly stated.	 3
	Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting

The recommendations could be strengthened by providing more detailed information around how to implement them within the country context. Additionally, it is important to clearly state which actors are expected to implement each recommendation and to explicitly specify the order of priority in terms of which recommendations to implement first. This additional information helps the audience understand how to best go about implementing the recommendations. Finally, additional credibility is provided to the recommendations if the report specifies how they were developed, especially how stakeholders were involved in developing or approving them.

0.15

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		Rating
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information? 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	50%
	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)	Mostly
		Partly
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	100%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	Yes
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	Yes
•••	Executive Feedback on Section G	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory
	The evaluation is well structured and easy to read. It is an accessible length (45 pages excluding annexes) and presents the report sections in the standard format. The opening pages contain all of the necessary elements but do not specify the timeframe of the evaluation. The annexes include some useful information including details on the evaluation methodology, a list of data sources, and people interviewed. However, some key documents that are usually included in the annexes and that add significant credibility to the report are missing. They include an evaluation matrix, copies of the data collection tools, and information on the evaluators.	 3
Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
	It helps to situate the reader early on in the report if the evaluation timeframe is included on the cover page. Additionally, annexes are important to provide the report with additional credibility. Even though this case study is part of a larger global evaluation, it is still desirable to include an evaluation matrix, copies of the data collection tools, and information on the evaluators within the annexes of the case study report.	0.05

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)		Rating
Question 19.	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%
	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	Partly
	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)	Partly
	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations 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.	Partly
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	58%

	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	Mostly
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	Partly
	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children	Mostly
	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.)	Mostly
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Approaches requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	4
	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected	Partially integrated 1 point
	Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Partially integrated 1 point
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.	Partially integrated 1 point
	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis	Partially integrated 1 point
••••	Executive Feedback on Section H	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair
	The report references human rights frameworks and human rights outcomes but does not explicitly place the evaluation within a human rights framework and does not explain how access to basic nutrition is a human right. A specific evaluation question is included to assess the extent to which equity was considered by the programme and this assessment cascades throughout the report. However, the report does not provide a detailed assessment regarding gender equality nor does it consistently disaggregate data by sex. It is unclear how gender equality, equity, and human rights principles were taken into consideration within the evaluation process itself. The ToRs specify that a national reference group will be developed to guide the evaluation and yet there is no discussion around how the reference group participated in the evaluation process or the extent to which stakeholders were involved in managing the evaluation and providing feedback.	 2
	Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	The report could better place the evaluation within a human rights framework by explaining how nutrition is a human right and by using human rights language such as "rights holders" and "duty bearers". It is often helpful to include a specific evaluation question relating to gender equality to ensure that sex disaggregated data is collected and that the programme's responsiveness to gender equality principles is assessed. Additionally, special measures need to be taken for the evaluation process itself to be sensitive to gender equality, human rights, and equity principles, such as ensuring that women and men are equally engaged in the evaluation and that data collection takes place in a location where stakeholders feel comfortable to express themselves, etc. Finally, it is very important to explain the extent to which stakeholders were involved in the management of the evaluation (i.e. through an evaluation reference group) and not only as sources of data, as this provides the evaluation with additional credibility.	0.15
SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		Rating
Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	67%
	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	Yes
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	Partly
	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	Mostly
••••	Executive Feedback on Section I	Overall rating for Section

The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair
The Executive Summary is well written and is a length that is accessible and useful to decision makers (4 pages). It presents valuable information regarding stunting in a global context; the purpose and objectives of the evaluation; as well as evaluation conclusions and recommendations. However, it is also necessary to provide a summary of the methodology used in carrying out the evaluation. The Executive Summary could also be strengthened by including a summary of the evaluation's key findings.	 2

Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
The purpose of an Executive Summary is to provide an overview of the most critical elements of the evaluation report, including a description of the evaluation's methodology. It is also a good idea to include a summary of the key findings. To find out more about how to create a high quality Executive Summary, please see the following resource: http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guides/executive_summaries/unicef	0.05

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)

•••-

Satisfactory

 **2.5**

Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

Lessons for improving the management and performance of future evaluations

The report is well written and presents interesting findings and recommendations based on a good mixed methods methodology. However, the report could be further improved. To begin, it is a good idea for the report to present the programme's results targets (not just outcome areas) to provide a framework against which to assess the programme's effectiveness at achieving results. Additionally, it is important to present a theory of change model in order to help the reader to understand how UNICEF interventions are intended to lead to results. If a ToC model does not already exist, it is a good idea for the evaluators to retroactively create one (even if only in general terms). Regarding the evaluation methodology, it is important for the report to explain why non-standard evaluation criteria were used; present the sampling rationale at the country level; and describe how ethical principles were respected by the evaluation team. It is a good idea to reference the UNEG Ethical Standards. The evaluation findings could be strengthened by clearly identifying unexpected results and by providing a detailed assessment of the programme's M&E system. The report should include clearly identified lessons learned, as requested in the ToRs. The report's recommendations could be strengthened by clearly identifying the target group for action for each recommendation and by explicitly presenting them in priority order. Additional credibility is provided to the recommendations when the report explains how stakeholders were involved in developing them. The annexes could be strengthened by including an evaluation matrix, copies of the data collection tools, and information on the evaluators. The Executive Summary needs to be lengthened in order to include a summary of the evaluation methodology and key findings. The report's gender equality component could be strengthened by including a specific evaluation question around the extent to which the programme followed gender equality principles and by presenting sex disaggregated data whenever possible.