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.	- Overall reports are rated against a four-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a four-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 suggestions on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating and 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% (excluding a DI criteria)?*
	2: Purpose, objectives and scope	5	6: Recommendations	15	**OK**
	3: Methodology	15	7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP)	10	
	4: Findings	20	8: Report presentation	10	
	9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points)	5			

PART I: REPORT DETAILS						
Report title	Final Evaluation of UN Women's project on empowering women and girls for enhanced gender-based violence prevention				Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number		19	Evaluators	[Female]	[Male]	Year	2024
Region	Western and Central Africa		Country(ies)	Nigeria		Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)			Evaluation Budget (USD)			Reviewer	C. Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Prevent VAW&G and		Women's access to economic			Review Date	18 October 2024

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS		
SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	**RATING**	**Good**
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	**50%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 1**
1.1 The report clearly specifies the **object** of the evaluation, and provides a clear and complete description of the intervention's original logic (e.g. expected results chain or theory of change), timeframe, intended beneficiaries by type, geographic location(s) as well as the planned budget of the intervention. *Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criteria. If the project did not have a ToC, clearly outline the expected results of the intervention and how the activities were expected to lead to the results.*	Mostly	The intervention is described at high level. Information on the ToC and expected results is included but more details are needed upfront, regarding the project activities planned to achieve the expected results and budget. More details should also have been provided on the context, to explain the direct bearing factors affecting the project (e.g. related to needs in the project outcome areas) which clearly demonstrate its rationale. Information about the key partners, stakeholders and intended beneficiaries is limited to their participation in the evaluation and more detailed information about their participation in the project should have been included. The timeframe is outlined at high level upfront in the document but it should have also reflected the changes in the implementation status (e.g. no-cost extension), as indicated later in the report.
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. *Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.*	Partly	
1.3 The **key stakeholders** involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described. *Note: Remember to include not only a list of partners but also a description of their main activities and/or the role they had in the implementation of the intervention in the body of report. Detailed description and stakeholder analysis can be provided in annexes.*	Partly	
1.4 The report identifies any changes in the **timeframe and/or implementation plans** (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation. *Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.*	Mostly	
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 a 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 scope, purposes, objectives and use of the evaluation are clearly outlined.
2.2 **Evaluation Scope:** The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the timeframe and outputs/outcomes covered, and not covered (thematically, geographically etc.) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g. specifications by the ToR, 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?	**83%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 3**
3.1 **Methodology:** The report provides a complete description of the methods used for data collection and analysis, the chosen evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and demonstrate that the methods chosen are appropriate to inform the responses to the criteria and questions. *Note: An evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions in each evaluation criteria, the indicators, the data sources and methods for data collection is useful to show these, but it is still important to include some explanations in the body of the document to clearly demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for triangulation. Remember to keep this section succinct and use annexes to provide detailed information.*	Fully	The methodology is well described, with clear information about the data collection and analysis used. The lines of evidence are generally well explained and more details should have been included regarding the rationale for their selection and the processes used for stakeholder consultations (specially since there is limited information provided about the project activities undertaken). Overall, the methods seem appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions and for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results. Sampling strategy is generally well explained along with ethics and gender responsiveness

3.2 **Data collection, analysis and sampling:** The report clearly describes the tools used for data collection and the rationale for their selection as well as the sampling strategy and methods used for data analysis. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, to guide the assessments of GE/HR specific results and to ensure data accuracy and completeness. *Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIIs, desk review) but also how the data was collected (where, when, who, how) and what steps were taken to analyze it. Remember to include a description of original sampling strategy and the extent to which it covers the range of stakeholders involved in the intervention, with a clear justification of the selection of the targeted sample. Use annexes to provide detailed description.*	Mostly	approaches. Limitations describe the mitigation strategies and the impact they had in the overall data collection and resulting findings.
3.3 **Stakeholders Consultation:** The evaluation report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation. *Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.*	Mostly	
3.4 **Limitations:** The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation and if/how these were mitigated (e.g. gaps in the evidence, biases due to limits in stakeholder consultations, etc.).	Fully	
3.5 **Ethics:** The evaluation report makes explicit references to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and shows evidence that data collection and tools adhered to these ethical principles, (e.g. mechanisms and measures were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards, including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations). *Note: Mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to sufficient evidence that the data was actually collected with sensitivity to ethics and discrimination. It is a good practice to provide a clear explanation as to how the evaluation adopted these, showing examples of tools and processes used were sensitive to ethical considerations (e.g. consent, confidentiality) and were not discriminatory against particular group's participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders). Use annexes to provide detailed description.*	Fully	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Fair
Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	43%	**Executive Feedback on Section 4**
4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities). *Note: It is a good practice to clearly outline the findings in the report, preferably using a "set" of findings statements, with clear articulation and conciseness, followed by substantiation and full demonstration of the evidence used to formulate the findings' statements.*	Mostly	Finding statements are presented in line with each evaluation criteria but should have also directly and consistently responded to the evaluation questions. The findings analysis is presented in line with the Indicators data (in the evaluation matrix), however, these do not necessarily respond to the questions directly. The narrative should also have consistently and systematically present the evidence for the statements (with clear explanations, beyond simply stating the evaluator's findings, but showing the evidence for the finding). Many evaluation questions are left without responses. In some cases, the narrative contains clear assessments regarding lack of results, but these are not clearly and directly articulated in the findings statement (e.g. Finding 12). It is important (specially in the effectiveness section) to ground the assessments on achievement of the outputs, outcomes and the indicators, with adequate substantiation of the achievements documented, showing the evidence for their achievements. It is not clear for the reader if some of the information presented (e.g. Table 5 - reasons for deviation) shows the project "expected" outputs or those "achieved", as the language is in the present tense. It is important to document the contributions made by the interventions, with analysis of the progress made towards the expected results at the output and outcome levels, presenting details about the work undertaken, showing how they led to the results (cause and effect links).
4.2 The evaluation findings are **well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence** to systematically ad-dress the evaluation questions and criteria. *Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.*	Partly	
4.3 Findings reflect systematic and **appropriate analysis** and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments. *Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.*	Partly	
4.4 Are **cause and effect links** between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted? *Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results*	Partly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Fair
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	35%	**Executive Feedback on Section 5**
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. *Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.*	Partly	The Conclusions section contains summaries of some findings and is structured around the evaluation criteria, however, a set of conclusions statements presenting the key responses to the evaluation questions in the criteria should also have been included. While there are references to the findings they are linked to, the conclusions do not cover many important findings resulting from the assessments presented earlier the findings section (specially regarding effectiveness and lack of results), and should have more consistently presented an overview of the findings in line with the evaluation criteria and provide more analysis and insights, beyond the findings to explain the recommendations that follow. They should have also presented more balance between strengths and weakness identified. A good and comprehensive set of lessons is included but more information about the project experience should have been included to enable the lesson to replicated in other projects
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. *Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.*	Partly	
5.3 Conclusions present the **strengths and weaknesses** of the object (policy, programmes, projects or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	Partly	
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. *Note: The lessons learned from an evaluation comprise the new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (initiative, context outcomes and even evaluation methods) that is applicable to and useful in other similar contexts. They should demonstrate the intervention experience and be generalized to enable applicability by other interventions.*	Mostly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	60%	**Executive Feedback on Section 6**
6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically **derived from the findings and/or conclusions.** *Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.*	Partly	A reasonable number of recommendations are put forward. They are realistic and contain linkages to the findings in some cases, but they should have also contained explanations about their rationale as well as detailed steps to guide their implementation, presenting not only what should be done but how it should be implemented and the benefit expected from their

6.2 The report **describes the process** followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders. *Note: Include a relevant explanation on the extent to which the evaluation participants were specifically consulted for the formulation of the recommendations and/or the level of participation of stakeholders in this evaluation stage.*	Fully	implementation. The process used to formulate them is described and they are presented in the order of priority for implementation.
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.	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. *Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.*	Fully integrated (3)	Gender is fully integrated in the scope. There is no assessment of data on specific gender results but the evaluation scope integrates gender and evaluation questions related to gender are included. Gender is also a standalone criteria. Methodology is fully gender responsive. Detailed information on the gender-responsive approach used is provided and the report describes the data analysis and triangulation and identification of limitations. The number of people consulted was appropriate. The methodology used mixed data collection methods, appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results and contain references to ethics and confidentiality. Gender analysis is satisfactorily reflected in the report as appropriate considering the project topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations contain gender-related analysis but data was not disaggregated by sex. Unanticipated effects were not clearly outlined. The background section presents gender issues in a very summarized way and should have contained more analysis.
7.2 A **gender-responsive methodology,** methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. *Note: it is not enough to simply describe the methodology as "gender-responsive", it is important to demonstrate that the data collection and analysis integrated gender considerations; that data was collected disaggregated by sex; that methods/tools were designed to enable GEWE assessments; and/or that processes employed (i.e. sampling, triangulation, validation) ensured inclusion and enabled data for GEWE analysis.*	Fully integrated (3)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. *Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion.*	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?	97%	**Executive Feedback on Section 8**
8.1 Report is **logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented** with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (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 is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. *Note: Reasonable length for project/programme and CPE evaluations is about 40 pages (excluding Annexes 60 pages); and 50 pages for institutional and thematic evaluations (excluding Annexes 60 pages).*	Fully	Report is logically structured and complete. It is well presented and the lenght is reasonable. All key anexes are included but the lists of people consulted should have include the names of the participants in FGDs and KIIs as opposed to only the names of the organizations. The executive summary is a stand-alone section. The first pages are complete.
8.2 The **title page and opening pages** provide key basic information on the name of evaluators and, 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. *Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long.*	Fully	
8.4 **Annexes** should be of reasonable length and include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, 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). *Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long.*	Mostly	

Additional Information		
Identify aspects of **good practice** of the evaluation *Note: This section is to be populated by the QA Reviewer only, based on the overall Evaluation Report. No need to identify specific elements related to this section.*	N/A	

[Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION (weight: 5%) * *The score for Section 9 will be 'bonus points' (5%), on top of the existing 100% weight.* ** *Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).*	SCALE (No, Partially, Yes)	OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION (Missing, Partial, Sufficient)
Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion?		**Sufficient**
9.1 The evaluation **questions** include references to disability inclusion.	Yes	Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): Disability inclusion is among the evaluation questions. The methodology does not contains specific references to the inclusion of people with disabilities in the sample of KIs but some references are included regarding evaluation criterion. There are references to DI in the findings and conclusions.
9.2 The evaluation **methodology** includes references to disability inclusion.	Partially	
9.3 The Evaluation **findings, conclusions and/or recommendations** contain references to disability inclusion.	Yes	

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING			
Key Guiding Question	**Total weighted score %**	**Overall Rating**	**Other reviewer's comments**
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	67.38	**Good**	This is a good evaluation report. The overall ratings reflect some gaps in the Findings section, as highlighted above related to substantiation and clearly presenting responses to the evaluation questions. The conclusions are also too summarized and could be broadened to ensure a better overview of the issues and analysis presented earlier in the Findings section (see comments above). The overall rating also reflects the fact that the report contains a good presentation of the evaluation methodology.