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

UN WOMEN

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

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Livelihoods Through Participation And Equal Access To Water			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number		18 Evaluators	2	0 Year	2018
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Kyrgyzstan	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	1,084,419.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	20,000.00	Reviewer	Glaiza Veluz
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to			Review Date	07 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?	92%	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	1.1 The evaluation clearly explained the object by providing a background of the project. It also noted the focus on reaching vulnerable women, men, and children who needed to have livelihood access through participation in water governance. With the explanation of the project, the geographical coverage of the intervention was also tackled - seven municipalities in Kyrgyzstan. The reported noted the project aim to increase access to resources (such as water) to facilitate access to livelihoods. Evaluators added a visual map of the ToC for better illustration. The report included corresponding outcome and outputs along with the funding source, the Government of Finland (1M euros).
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.	Mostly	1.2 The evaluation provided context analysis of the problem being addressed. It highlighted the gender and human rights inequities related to water supply, which served as a backdrop on why the project was developed. However, the discussion was rather brief and lacked details such as more data (figures, previous study, etc.) for a deeper understanding of water inequities in this context.

1.3. The evaluation had a discussion of the implementing agencies per component of the project. This was further expanded by including a narrative of the project management roles among the stakeholders of the project. |
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 There was a detailed account of the project implementation and adjustments that had to be made in order to adapt to the context. However, there was no discussion on how this has affected the evaluation work. The evaluators however noted reconstructing the prose-style theory of change of the project into a visual map for clarity and to foster common understanding. The reconstructed theory of change was agreed upon by the stakeholders. It was also underscored that the M&E framework did not offer an explicit measure of gender-based change and hence, the evaluators mined quantitative data, beyond the M&E framework and the qualitative data from data gathering to measure gender related changes.
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's 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	2.1 The evaluation ensured that the purpose, objective, and use were tackled, devoting a chapter for this. Its purpose is to assess performance and progress aimed at providing key insights for programming, approaches and contribute to Strategic Note of the UN Women Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2018-2022. Users that will benefit in the evaluation were likewise presented (UN Women Kyrgyzstan Country Office, the Responsible Party, government counterparts at local and national levels, CSOs, other UN agencies, development partners present in Kyrgyzstan and the ECA region, and the donor, Finland) together with the use of evaluation (engage policy makers and other stakeholders in advocating gender-responsive strategies.

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	2.2 The evaluation had a devoted section to discuss its scope which informed the sites it will and will not assess, the justification for selecting/excluding these sites. Essentially it noted, "The evaluation process included a data collection mission in Bishkek, Osh and three selected project sites within three provinces (two in the south and one in the north). Project sites were selected to ensure geographic and agro-ecological diversity as well as variations in socio-cultural patterns and accessibility to natural resources. Project sites that were evaluated under the BCP project in 2016 were excluded on the basis of secondary data availability. Site selection was also limited by logistical
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?	**82%**	**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 objectives and criteria were clearly discussed with separate sections for these aspects. The evaluation questions were explained in details through the annex. There was no discussion of a particular gender lens used for the methodology though it was mentioned that they put in extra data gathering (looking for other quantitative data aside from the M&E framework that did not necessarily measure gender change) to ensure that gender related changes surfaced in the FGDs and KIIs.
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.	Mostly	3.2 There was justification on choosing sites for the evaluation to ensure diversity of data collection. However, the rationale for the data collection method was not explained fully. There was a mention of "Broad Stakeholder and Beneficiary Participation to ensure the findings reflect the different interests and perspectives of diverse partners" but there was no detail on how this was done.
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 Consultation was said to be conducted with the stakeholders during the evaluators' recreation of the theory of change. There was also discussion with stakeholders on which sites to observe to ensure a balance of the performing sites and the non-performing sites. It was also noted that recommendations were to be validated with stakeholders.
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.	Mostly	3.4 A separate section on "Limitations" allowed for a thorough discussion of the limitations and how the evaluators managed to mitigate this. The limitations noted were time constraint and language issues.
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.	Mostly	3.5 The report mentioned alignment to the United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. However, there was no extensive discussion about this. But it noted that "Details on respondent ages, locations or titles were not provided in line with commitments to ensure anonymity of responses. "
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	**Rating**	**Good**
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	**73%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 4**

Criteria	Rating	Feedback
4.1The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.	Mostly	4.1 The report was able to capture the gains and outcomes of the project. However, quotes are minimal and figures/statistics from data gathering was not applied as necessary (e.g. Students, teachers and heads of schools that participated in the MSPS and MPF components also expressed high degrees of satisfaction in regard to the relevance of the courses to the needs of the students and communities. Numerous examples were offered of parents expressing 'distrust' at the beginning of the project, and not fully supporting the involvement of their son/daughter.) In this particular example, the data could have been better presented if there was an indication of how many are the students, teachers, and heads of schools expressing high degrees of satisfaction and how this is demonstrated. Further "numerous examples" could have been better discussed if this was expounded by actually presenting examples of parents expressing distrust at the beginning of the project.
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	4.2 The report was able to document the effects and outcomes though some of the findings were not backed up by evidence, and hence, it appeared subjective and/or without ample basis for supporting the result. An example of this is: "The project was highly successful in integrating the gender and human rights based focus across each component. The project was furthermore able to strengthen the impact of activities within a single component by making linkages between institutions so that, for example, students worked with WUAs on advocacy campaigns that included gender equality messaging on water users rights, and SHGs members became active members at WUA meetings. The recurrence of activities that focus on women and vulnerable community members within the sustainability plans designed by participants from all components across the seven communities is strong testimony to the strength of the messaging and the impact on behavioural change."
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).	Mostly	4.3 There was a dedicated section on entitled "Big Picture Overview and Small Picture Overview by Component." This allowed for the discussion of factors that contributed to
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	58%	**Executive Feedback on Section 5**
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Fully	5.1 The conclusions were all based on the findings presented. All the more, it was arranged per evaluation criteria providing a clearer link between the findings and the conclusions.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Not at all	
5.3 Conclusions present **strengths and weakness**es 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	5.2 The conclusions appeared to be a shortened version of the findings. No added insights were provided.

5.3 The conclusions had a robust discussion by noting the project's strengths and weakness which were substantiated by using information from the findings. |

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	5.4 Lessons learned were based on the project. It appeared to be more of a key takeaway from the project, and hence, there was no clear and explicit discussion on how this could be applied to different contexts or sectors.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	**Rating**	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	**63%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 6**
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations were aligned to the conclusions and findings. In this section, the report noted that key recommendation, including: reinforcing good practices of the project such as consistent engagement of stakeholders from project inception, use of the water governance system, and addressing gaps in the project such as ensuring a better M&E system.
6.2 The repor**t describes the process** followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Mostly	6.2 It only mentioned that it was consulted with stakeholders, but the complete process was not discussed.

6.3 The recommendations were specific, however it was unclear how actionable they are and needed additional information on other key considerations (potential limitations). |
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partly	6.4 The report included recommendations on what stakeholders should undertake but no clear prioritization levels or categorization.
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 GEWE is central to the scope, criteria and questions of the evaluation.

7.2 It was mentioned that there was special focus on gender change measurement in the data gathering process. Voices of vulnerable women were also present in the evaluation. |
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)	7.3 The findings reflected gender analysis but they could have also included the perspective of men and the non-performing site which, would have made the diversity of the data and analysis richer. Recommendations were specific, but could have been more detailed by taking into account specific timeframe factors and barriers in carrying out the recommendations.
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	**Rating**	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	**97%**	**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 follows a logical format that can be easily navigated and the way it was written was clear.

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.	Mostly	8.2 The timeframe of the evaluation, date of report and location were showed and table of contents were sufficient. However, it lacked information about the evaluators (only provided their names).
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	8.3 There is an executive summary, which is concise but is able to provide an ample overview of the vital content of the report.
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	8.4 Annexes are found at the end, providing additional information about the evaluation.

Additional Information	
Identify aspects of ***good practice*** of the evaluation	- Underscored strongly throughout the report the value of consulting with the community in identifying project sites. Such emphasis provided a good case that when the approach is bottom-up, the community has more ownership and the project becomes more effective. - Overall there was a detailed description of the project which helped orient the reader to understand the project and its outcomes. - The project had a component where they raised awareness of girls and boys from selected schools related to efficient water use, climate change etc. In the project implementation, there were schools that performed while there were schools that did not perform well (in terms of students who were able to influence their households' water use). The evaluators noted in the limitation sections how they were cautious that there is a balance in their analysis on the performing and non-performing schools.

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?	**76.21**	Good	