

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



Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Reviewer Guidance :
<b>Rating explanation</b>	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"> <li>- Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters.</li> <li>- Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all).</li> <li>- Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight.</li> <li>- <b>Executive feedback</b> - 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Parameter Weight (%)</b>	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><i>Are weightings equal to 100%?</i></p> <p><b>OK</b></p>

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

<b>Report title</b>	Burundi Country Portofolio Evaluation			<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	National
<b>Sequence number</b>	19	<b>Evaluators</b>	1	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Eastern and Southern	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Burundi	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	CPE
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>	13 959 000	<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>	19,000.00	<b>Reviewer</b>	Benoit Conti
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Women's leadership Global norms, policies	Women's access to economic Prevent VAW&G and expand	Gender Women's	<b>Review Date</b>	12 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?	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	1.1. Strategic results of the intervention are outlined and the logic of intervention is presented later in the report. The introduction section clarifies at length the object of the evaluation. The Strategic note and analysis is helpful as well as the portfolio of projects. Resources are also explained.
1.2 The <b>context</b> 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	1.2 There is a full chapter dedicated to the context, gender and human rights. Historical causality is well plotted along a few main thematic axes: 1. Norms 2. Women participation 3. Women, peace and security and 4. Violence against women and girls.
1.3 The <b>key stakeholders</b> involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	1.3 A map of stakeholders with roles and areas of intervention are presented with an informative narrative.
1.4 The report identifies <b>the implementation status of the object</b> , 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	1.4 There is a note on modification of the implementation trajectory and analysis of risks and their influence on the project's course.
<b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 2</b>
2.1 <b>Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:</b> 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.	Mostly	2.1 The goal of the evaluation is clearly stated although flat (accountability and lessons). There are more details in the section on users of the evaluation. Objectives are outlined.
2.2 <b>Evaluation Scope:</b> 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).	Mostly	2.2 The scope is addressed, and mentions the political as well as operational level strategy. There is no geographical limitation, and no explicit mention of what falls outside of scope.
<b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
3.1 <b>Methodology:</b> 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 methodology is clearly outlined. Methods of data collection and analysis are explained in details and appropriate. Quality standards have been used. Evaluation criteria and questions respected and they integrate gender all along. A specific section is included on the integration of gender and HR into methodology.
3.2 <b>Data collection, analysis and sampling:</b> 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 Data collection and sampling methods are described. Diversity, triangulation, contribution vs attribution and data limitations (quality checks) are taken into consideration.
3.3 <b>Stakeholders Consultation:</b> 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 Stakeholders and processes are shared, but no specifics given on the rational of choice for consultations.
3.4 <b>Limitations:</b> 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 Limitations are addressed in a separate section and through quality mechanisms (reference group and quality of sources and data).
3.5 <b>Ethics:</b> 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 Ethical considerations go slightly beyond consent, confidentiality and no-harm: vulnerability, freedom of speech are also highlighted.

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	4.1 Findings are of quality overall. The specific section on gender and HR contained useful findings. All criteria and questions were addressed.
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 Most of the findings were implicitly linked to data collected but evidence was not always mentioned or referenced. It was hard to really get a full sense of the total objectivity. However, some findings are well-developed.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	4.3 Many contextual and organizational factors are presented.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	4.4 Findings are clear and coherently presented overall.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	63%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	5.1 Conclusions are well connected to the findings. The conclusion on gender could have been better elaborated given the detailed findings and previous sections.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	5.2 Conclusions do provide a deeper sense of analysis overall, although sometimes it falls short - see for example the conclusion on HR.
5.3 Conclusions present <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> 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	5.3 Conclusions are nuanced and the authors do make an effort to provide qualifications, as we all positive and negative points.
5.4 <b>Lessons Learned:</b> 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.	Not at all	5.4 No lessons learned were presented.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from conclusions. Categories of analysis are followed through (organizational matters, conception etc.). Links to conclusions are included for each recommendation.
6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	6.2 The process for recommendations was described, using the reference group.
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 is clear list of points to follow to be achieved in the recommendations section.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	6.4 Prioritization of recommendations is particularly well presented, and described by urgency, difficulty, and impact for each recommendation.
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 included specific and mainstreamed objectives on gender equality and HR. The evaluation is also framed around GEEW and aimed to systematically address these questions. 7.2 Data is collected on women and on the place of women in peacebuilding mechanisms.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	But no specific attention is paid to disaggregation. No quantitative approach is mentioned in the methodology and the diversity of stakeholders is not mentioned in the sampling frame, but the qualitative approach is partly suited for GEEW. Also, ethical standards are mentioned and overall the approach tries to be gender-responsive. 7.3 There is a background section on gender, the findings do include triangulation from different social groups. The report also examined the unanticipated effects on gender. Finally, it is clear that specific recommendations address GEEW issues.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	
<b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Very Good
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>
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 Report well-structured and presented, easy to navigate 8.2 Key basic information are pre
8.2 <b>The title page and opening pages</b> 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	
8.3 The <b>Executive Summary</b> 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 <b>Annexes</b> 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	
<b>Additional Information</b>		

Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Impeccable presentation: a very clear and detailed table of content. The evaluation addresses all aspects needed for the evaluation in separate sections, which is easy to access and exhaustive.</li> <li>-The analysis methodology is well-presented and reflected on specific considerations (attribution/contribution for example) showing the level of thinking involved in preparing the evaluation.</li> <li>-Evaluators made a point in addressing gender issues separately (context, evaluation methods etc.) and use of thematic axis (on gender themes) as the backbone of their analysis.</li> <li>-Links between conclusions and recommendations is made clear as it is specified from each recommendation. Numbering of all findings, conclusions and recommendation is very useful for cross-reference.</li> <li>-The various sub-sections for each recommendation are useful and make them more actionable (Description, urgency, impact, difficulty, anchor in conclusion).</li> </ul>
--	---



**PART III: THE OVERALL RATING**

<b>Key Guiding Question</b>	<b>Total weighted score %</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Overall Comments</b>
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	86.88	Very Good	