

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	<p>Are weightings equal to 100%?</p> <p>OK</p>

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Independent Evaluation Of Un Women's Fund For Gender Equality (2009-2017)			Geographical Coverage	Global
Sequence number	1	Evaluators	3	Year	2018
Region	Corporate (HQ)	Country(ies)	Global	Type of intervention evaluated	Corporate
Portfolio Budget (USD)	64,000,000.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	148,700.00	Reviewer	Glaiza Veluz
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to	Women's leadership and	Global norms,	Review Date	06 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	<p>1.1 The evaluation shared the Fund for Gender Equality's (FGE) theory of change, and evaluators also created a theory-of-change-and-action which provided a more comprehensive analysis framework. The evaluation noted that the three pillars (sustain, support, and strengthen) has been the external focused of the FGE. The FGE utilizes competitive and independent global grant-making combined with multi-lingual assistance technical assistance for programming and RBM support. The report noted that FGE was managed by 1) the FGE Secretariat in New York, 2) FGE management and reporting specialists out-posted to UN Women regional offices, 3) UN Women focal persons in decentralised offices (regional, multi-country and country), and 4) a Steering Committee (until 2015) working together for communications and fundraising, grant provision, accountability, knowledge management and reporting, technical assistant and grants evaluation.</p> <p>1.2 The report discussed the financing gap faced by women's rights CSOs and the policy frameworks that aim to address this financing gap. It is upon this backdrop that the FGE was created to contribute to address the funding shortfalls of women' rights organizations.</p> <p>1.3 The report clearly discussed the roles of the FGE stakeholders, such as the UN Women Headquarters, UN Women regional and country offices, women's civil society organisations, development partners (donors), and, technical committee members. However, the role of other stakeholders (such as right-holders) was not clearly discussed.</p> <p>1.4 The evaluators noted that the timing of the evaluation was too late to inform the decision making. Thus, the inception phase refined the purpose of the evaluation to address the main need for new evidence expressed by decision-makers - which is - determining whether the general value proposition represented by FGE has a place in the future; and, if so, to better understand how to sustain it.</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.	Fully	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly	
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	2.1 The evaluation was guided by six objectives which were aimed at assessing: the relevance of FGE and the grantees' approach and contributions, added value of the FGE's contribution to the UN women's mandate, FGE's organizational efficiency, how the FGE informed and influenced UN women; good practices and lessons learned; and actionable recommendations. The primary users are FGE staff and grantees, UN Women Senior Management Team, FGE and UN Women, women-led organizations, development actors, and gender advocates to support learning and their guidance for decision-making and accountability.
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 scope was fully covered and highlighted the need to respond to UN Women Senior Management's question regarding the FGE's future scale and ambitions. The evaluation scope covered the years from 2009-2017, and assessed the FGE fund, the 121 grants it made, and intersections with UN Women's strategies, operations, and programmes.
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?	92%	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 OECD DAC evaluation criteria was used for this study: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, potential for sustainability and potential for impact. The evaluation team streamlined the 42 questions from the TOR based on stakeholders consultation identified 15 final questions that aligned with the evaluation objectives and criteria. The evaluation also employed a "hypothesis-based evaluation framework". The evaluation used a feminist evaluation approach, focused on empowerment.
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 used a mixed method approach, gathering qualitative and quantitative data, including Country Case Studies, Social Learning, Grantee Guided Self Reviews, and Portfolio analysis (cross-case analysis). Specific focus was dedicated to Democratic evaluation practices and outcome harvesting as methodologies. Outcomes were analyzed at three levels: systemic, indirect and outcomes. Data were triangulated. The methodology was well-described with justification of why each method was used. The sampling methodology for case studies, utilized the Collaborative Outcomes Reporting Technique to craft a narrative about how the outcomes were achieved, however the sampling choice to select Bolivia and India as country case studies was not clear.
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.	Mostly	3.3 A stakeholders' consultation was done but was discussion was limited. 3.4 There was no discussion of limitations and how these data issues could be mitigated.
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.	Not at all	3.5 The section on ethical considerations was strong and clear.
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.	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	100%	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	4.1 High-quality evidence supported the findings in diverse forms, e.g. data tables, charts, case studies, quotes and stories. The presentation of data enabled a clear visualization of what the FGE achieved per evaluation criteria. The findings were clear on the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability etc. of the FGE, noting challenges encountered and weaknesses of the FGE, producing an overall comprehensive evaluation report.
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.	Fully	4.2 The analysis and findings were backed up by evidence and did not appear subjective. With their presentation of evidence based results, this evaluation did well in clearly presenting output, outcome and impact level information despite the volume of data and scope (80 countries) reviewed.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	4.3 The achievement or non-achievement of outcomes was linked to the activities/stories which illustrated the contributing factors for outcomes.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	4.4 With strong data presentation, the findings were always clear and coherent. The findings section was also divided into 3 parts: 1.) Did the Fund do things right?; 2.) Did the Fund do the right things?; and 3.) Evaluation Case Studies and in each part, specific evaluation criteria aligned with the part was discussed (i.e. effectiveness and efficiency criteria was discussed under the Did the Fund do the right things part). This allowed for a very clear and systematic and contextualized discussion of the findings.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	100%	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. Aside from having the conclusions arranged per evaluation criteria, each conclusion also noted which finding it is derived from providing a well-substantiated conclusion. This has likewise made the conclusions contextualized making it easy to understand.

5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	5.2 The evaluators synthesized high-level findings in the conclusion, adding deeper insights on the progress made based on the objectives. For example, its conclusion number 1 "The Fund for Gender Equality implemented everything it set out in Programme Documents covering 2009-2017" addresses the evaluations findings #1-3.
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	5.3 The conclusions highlighted both the strengths and weakness of FGE and frame areas of focus for the future. It highlighted limitations in the initial Fund's attention to funding sustainability, identified the business case for the FGE and the future of the Fund.
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.	Fully	5.4. The lessons learned were based on the findings and were further substantiated by explaining its context and how this should be applied in terms of the FGE programme and by the UN Women.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	87%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations are based from findings/evidence and the conclusions they have made.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	6.2. The recommendations were validated with the Reference Group, but the consultation process was not described.
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Fully	6.3 The recommendations were clear, realistic and actionable noting the limitations and the capacities of the stakeholders targeted to carry out the recommendations.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	6.4 There was a classification of recommendations (e.g. recommendation sto management, recommendation to organizational effectiveness and efficiency etc), which made the recommendation section easy to follow. Each recommendation included a target group and a recommendation for management action to support its use.
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.	100%	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 was fully reflected on the evaluation scope, criteria, and questions. Gender and human rights are mainstreamed into the evaluation questions.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	7.2. The evaluators used the feminist lens framework, employed mixed methods, and ensured that various relevant stakeholders were part of the data gathering (includes vulnerable women).
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	7.3 The report highlighted a number of outcomes from different perspectives, assessing the Fund's outcomes and efficiency as well as articulating grantee outputs and outcomes in a meta-analysis format, and diving deeper exploring particular grantees' experiences of success such as Bolivia's School of Depatriarchalizing. The evaluators also cited some weaknesses of the Fund which suggested that all stakeholders' voices were accounted for.
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	#ERROR!
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 had a logical flow which was easy to read and navigate. The report contained graphic aesthetics (artwork, colored charts and tables) which also made data presentation pleasing.
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 evaluation timeframe and date of report were present. The information about the evaluators were found in the annex. It had a complete table of contents with list of tables, graphs, annex, etc.
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 The executive summary is concise, but sufficiently covers the important dimensions 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 Relevant information was included in the annex. They had a separate file for annex, which was helpful and organized.
Additional Information		

Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	The methodology and the feminist and participatory analytical lens of results and recommendations were particularly strong in this evaluation and could be read as inspiration for other evaluations.
--	---

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?	96.32	Very Good	This was a strong analysis and evaluation, with diverse and creative feminist methodology.