

Independent Evaluation and Audit Services (IEAS)
UN WOMEN Global Evaluation Quality Assessment and Rating



Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Reviewer Guidance :
Rating explanation	The report can be used with high level of confidence and is considered a good example.	The report can be used with certain degree of confidence.	Partially meets requirements with some missing elements. The report can be used with caution.	Misses out the minimum quality standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all). - Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. - Executive feedback - provide summary of the extent to which the report meets or fails to meet the criteria provided under each parameter. Please also include suggestion on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating, and the executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.
Parameter Weight (%)	1: Object and context 2: Purpose and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings	5 5 15 20	5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Presentation	20 15 10 10	Are weightings equal to 100%? OK

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Evaluation of Women, Peace and Security in the Arab States			Geographical Coverage	Regional
Sequence number	12	Evaluators	3	Year	2019
Region	Arab States	Country(ies)	Jordan, Lebanon, Tunisia, Iraq	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	3,634,216.87	Evaluation Budget (USD)	80,000.00	Reviewer	María José De León Pellecer
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in			Review Date	09 February 2019

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	83%	Executive Feedback on Section 1

<p>1.1 The report clearly specify the object of the evaluation, and provides clear and complete description of the intervention's logic or theory of change, intended beneficiaries by type and by geographic location(s) as well as resources from all sources including humans and budgets, and modalities.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>1.1 The report described that the project is a three year intervention working regionally and at the country level with UN partners, national and regional partners, NGOs and civil society partners to address these challenges from the lens of women, peace and security and translate the concerns into concrete actions. The report described the outcomes, outputs and theory of change.</p>
<p>1.2 The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional. This also includes explanation of the contextual gender equality and human rights issues, roles, attitudes and relations.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>1.2 The report described the regional context where the Project was implemented. The background included analysis about the crisis and conflict context and the barriers that women faced in participating, and finding secure spaces for themselves and their children and addressed refugees' living conditions.</p>
<p>1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>1.3 Partially, in the project description the report makes reference to relevant stakeholders that work with women but does not specify who they are. 1.4 The report identified the implementation status of the project and mentioned that it was a three year project, starting from January 2016 and ending in January 2019.</p>
<p>1.4 The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	
<p>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</p>	<p>RATING</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 2</p>
<p>2.1 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation: The evaluation report provides clear explanation of the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation including the intended use and users of the evaluation and how the information will be used.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>2.1 The evaluation aimed to provide insights and lessons learned from the project in terms of process, best practices and areas for improvement in order to inform a second phase of the project. In doing so, it strived to contribute to enhancing UN Women's approach to promoting women's engagement in peace negotiations and ensuring women's rights are recognised and addressed as priorities in recovery and post-conflict contexts.</p>
<p>2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including justification of what the evaluation covers and did not cover (thematically, geographically etc) as well as the reasons for this scope (eg., 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).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>2.2 The scope of this final evaluation included a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the project. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through the time of evaluation fieldwork were considered to the extent possible. The evaluation assessed both the positive and negative changes produced by the project – intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the countries.</p>

SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	Very Good
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
3.1 Methodology: The report specifies and provides complete description of a relevant design and sets of methods including the chosen evaluation criteria, questions, and performance standards. The methods employed are appropriate for analyzing gender and rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.	Fully	3.1 The report provided a complete description of the methodological design. The evaluation approach is comprised of three interlinked elements: (i) belief in the primacy of qualitative data, (ii) commitment to participatory methods and (iii) flexible responsive methods. The evaluation adopted the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project. It also included a separate criterion on gender equality and human rights. In addition, the evaluation has strived to document the key changes that could be observed/documentated because of the project intervention, as well as highlighted the unintended results of the project. The report also assessed the logic of the ToC and suggested additional changes/adaptations to align it with the project's overall goal.
3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling: The report clearly describes the methods for the data sources, rationale for their selection, data collection and analysis methods. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limitations.	Fully	3.2 The evaluation report described the data collection methods used among them KIIs, focus group discussions, and desk reviews. Data was triangulated.
3.3 Stakeholders Consultation: The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	Fully	3.3 The report included a specific section describing the stakeholders involved in the consultations and in which country-- for example, government officials, women affected by conflict, UN Women staff, and CSOs.
3.4 Limitations: The report presents clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias.	Fully	3.4 The report mentioned four limitations during the evaluation, among them security concerns, difficulties locating and following up with some of the stakeholders, lack of financial information and difficulties finding women affected by the conflict.
3.5 Ethics: The evaluation report includes a discussion of the extent to which the evaluation design included ethical safeguards and mechanisms and measures that were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed with relevant ethical standards including but not limited to informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations.	Fully	3.5 There is a specific section focused on ethics. The evaluation has been conducted in accordance with the UN Women Evaluation Policy, United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system, and other key guidance documents. Ethical considerations include ensuring the consent of the participants for participating in meetings and key informant interviews and focus group discussions.
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good

<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 4</p>
<p>4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.1 The evaluation report provided sufficient levels of evidence in each of the criteria assessed. The findings were presented according to each evaluation criteria.</p>
<p>4.2 Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgements made.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.2 The findings were supported by the evidence found through the field work. Triangulation of data in each finding were observed through the analysis of what different stakeholders mentioned and other relevant data found.</p>
<p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.3 The most relevant causal factor identified throughout the document was the government commitment and the UN Women flexibility to adapt to and respond to changes.</p>
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.4 Findings were presented using the evaluation criteria logic.</p>
<p>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</p>	<p>67%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 5</p>
<p>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>5.1 The conclusions were logically connected to the evaluation findings but did not cover all the relevant findings presented in the finding sections.</p> <p>5.2 There were some subjective words used such as greatly, evident, small but evidence was not presented to clarify what these words meant. The conclusions were just a summary of the main findings presented.</p>

5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	<p>Summary of the main findings presented.</p> <p>5.3 The conclusion was a very brief summary of the findings-- relevant strengths and weaknesses were not described.</p> <p>5.4 There was a specific lessons learned section but they were not logically connected to the findings.</p>
5.3 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, project's or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	Mostly	
5.4 Lessons Learned: When presented, the lessons learned section stems 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.	Mostly	
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	Rating	Fair
	27%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partly	<p>6.1 The section of recommendations seemed to have low importance and less focus in the evaluation report overall. The recommendations were only statements of one or two sentences so the connection derived from the findings were hard to follow.</p> <p>6.2 The report did not describe the process followed in developing the recommendations.</p> <p>6.3 Because of the short narrative in each recommendation they are weaker and some of them are hard to understand.</p> <p>6.4 Recommendations were only in a list format and not connected with specific section of the evaluation.</p>
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Not at all	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Partly	

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partly	
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Meets Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	89%	Executive Feedback on Section 7
7.1 GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.	Fully integrated (3)	7.1 The evaluation assessed the theory of change from the regional office's programs and concluded that the narrative explanation of the theory of change developed by UN Women, does not clearly distinguish between the outputs and planned outcomes. The narrative logic did not communicate the causal link between outputs (such as the strengthened public and civil society capacities, enhanced opportunities and capacities for participation in NAP development) and outcomes. The evaluation also includes specific objectives to assess human rights and gender equality such as to assess the relevance of the project at the national level and regional level, and to the needs and priorities of conflict-affected women focused on policy making, and to analyse how human rights approach and gender equality principles were integrated in the project approach and implementation. There is a standalone criterion on gender and human rights included in this evaluation with specific evaluation questions such as: "To what extent does the Women Peace and Security project undertaken by UN Women address the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination?" and " To what extent were human rights-based approach and gender equality incorporated in the design and implementation of UN Women's humanitarian action?"
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	7.2 The overall approach of the evaluation was based on the theory of change as stated in the project documents as well as the robustness of pathways of change. The evaluation also assessed the related assumptions in order to identify the underlying factors affecting change. The evaluation also adopted an integrated human rights-based approach and gender equality principles in both the methodological process and results assessed. The evaluation only used qualitative methods such as key Informant Interviews, focus groups

7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	discussions in four countries of the Arab region. 7.3 The evaluation presented findings under each of the assessed criteria, and included data provided by different stakeholders such as government officials, UN women country office staff and representatives of civil society organizations. Quotes and analysis of content were used to analyze and triangulate the different voices of social groups. The evaluation did not mention any unanticipated (positive or negative) effects of the interventions on human rights and gender equality.
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 8
8.1 Report is logically structured, well written and presented with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles; context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations) and written in an accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Fully	8.1 The report is logically structured and well-written.
8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluand, 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.	Fully	8.2 The title page and opening pages provide basic information of the evaluation. 8.3 The executive summary is a stand-alone section.
8.3 The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that includes an overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive summary should be reasonably concise.	Fully	8.4 The annexes includes evaluation matrix, stakeholders mapping, and a list of people interviewed.
8.4 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).	Fully	

Additional Information	
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	This evaluation is a good example of how the evaluation methodology integrated GEWE concerns. In this case, particular care was taken to keep data private and lower the risk of participants in the evaluation, particularly considering the context of crisis in the Arab States.

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING			
Key Guiding Question	Total weighted score %	Overall Rating	Overall Comments
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	80.38	Good	