



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.	- 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 :5 2: Purpose and scope :5 3: Methodology :15 4: Findings :20	5: Conclusions and lessons learned :20 6: Recommendations :15 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) :10 8: Presentation :10	Are weightings equal to 100%? OK		

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Programme Presence Portfolio Evaluation			Geographical Coverage	Multi-country	
Sequence number	6	Evaluators	Katherine Garvet/Fernando		Year	2019
Region	Asia and the Pacific	Country(ies)	Bhutan,		Type of intervention evaluated	CPE
Portfolio Budget (USD)	\$ 10,274,498.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A		Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in	Prevent VAW&G and expand			Review Date	31 December 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?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 1
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.	Fully	The evaluation object is well described, covering all aspects, including budget, human resources and geographic location. There is enough information about the context, gender issues, key partners and stakeholders to provide a clear picture of the intervention. Changes taking place over time are also described.
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.	Fully	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	
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.	Fully	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
Are the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 2
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.	Fully	The Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation are properly outlined. There is also a good overview of the evaluation scope, including thematic and geographic coverage.
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).	Fully	
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	The report provides a good overview of the methodology, including all elements (sampling strategy, data collection, analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations). The information provided in the Annex helps to show the robustness of the work. The evaluators followed the ethical evaluation standards outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines as well as UN Women's Evaluation Policy. The report also contains specific considerations regarding ethics (see Gender section below).
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	
3.3 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	
3.4 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	
3.5 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	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	90%	Executive Feedback on Section 4
4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.	Fully	Findings address all evaluation questions and criteria and findings are presented with clarity and logic. The findings are comprehensive, supported by detailed information and in-depth explanations of causal factors are provided in most cases. Suggest to also show evidence for the statements, to demonstrate systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence through citations and the use of sources.
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.	Mostly	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	85%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	Only 3 conclusions are put forward. They are well formulated, provide good insights and present a good balance between strengths and weaknesses. Suggest broadening their scope to include a comprehensive set of conclusions in response to the evaluation questions and/or criteria in line with the findings. It is also important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. A good set of lessons is included and they are properly generalized. Suggest to include more details and explanations of their successes to allow their applicability in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	
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.	Fully	
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	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	90%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Mostly	The recommendations are very well articulated, flow from findings and conclusions and are clearly prioritized, classified and geared to specific agencies. They contain enough information to enable their implementation. However, only 4 recommendations are put forward, and this seems small, considering a much larger number of findings. Consider broadening the number of recommendations to tackle more findings specifically (e.g. challenges related to gender-responsive programming).
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Fully	

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	
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)	Scope fully incorporates gender. Even though an assessment of data on gender related results was not referred to, GEEW is included in the evaluation scope and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Gender is also a standalone criteria and all evaluation objectives relate to gender. The methodology was fully gender-responsive. The methodology description shows the robustness of the work. The evaluators followed the ethical evaluation standards outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines as well as UN Women's Evaluation Policy. The report describes the process used to identify particularly vulnerable groups and ensure their engagement in the evaluation process as well as the use of empowering evaluation processes that take inequities into consideration and that can contribute towards shifting power dynamics. All data collected throughout the evaluation process have been disaggregated by sex and by pre-identified equity group. The report satisfactorily reflects gender analysis. The background section explains the context and the gender issues to be tackled. The report findings relate more to the organizations effectiveness of structures set up to tackle gender issues and some refer to gender-responsive programming. Similarly, GEEW aspects are included in conclusions and recommendations to the extent that the conclusions and recommendations focus on improvements to gender programme but only a small number of conclusions (4) and recommendations (4) are included. No unanticipated effects were identified.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
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	The report is well written, the structure and length are appropriate. Some key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, the list of stakeholders consulted, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators. This helps to show the robustness of the work undertaken. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is complete and concise. The presentation is excellent and the use of infographs to summarize complex issues makes reading easy.
8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluator, 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	
8.3 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 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	To adhere to equity, gender equality, and feminist evaluation principles, this evaluation conducted a preliminary assessment of potential power dynamics and vulnerabilities among and between stakeholders and a stakeholder engagement plan was developed. This enabled the evaluators to use empowering evaluation processes that take inequities into consideration and that can contribute towards shifting power dynamics towards a more equitable equilibrium. The evaluation matrix and all evaluation tools were carefully reviewed by the evaluation team in collaboration with the ROAP Evaluation Specialist using an equity and gender equality lens to ensure that gender biases are not reproduced or reinforced throughout the evaluation process (e.g. sensitivity to wording in interview protocols, thorough mainstreaming of GEEW principles throughout the evaluation matrix, etc).	

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?	92.38	Very Good	This is an excellent evaluation report. The evaluation covers multiple countries and thematic areas, yet the report is concise, provides solid responses to the evaluation questions. The findings are comprehensive, supported by detailed information and in-depth explanations of causal factors are provided. Conclusions and recommendations are in small number and could be broadened to address a larger number of findings. The presentation and the use of tables and creative infographs to summarize complex information are value-added.