

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 2: Purpose, objectives and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points) | 5 5 15 20 5 | 5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Report presentation | 20 15 10 10 | Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)? <div>OK</div> |
| PART I: REPORT DETAILS | | | | | |
| Report title | Connecter le global au local renforcer des femmes pour la localisation de la resolution 1325 | | | Geographical Coverage | National |
| Sequence number | 15 | Evaluators | [Female] [Male] | Year | 2025 |
| Region | Eastern and Southern Africa | Country(ies) | Burundi | 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 | | | Review Date | 29 October 2025 |

| 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? | 67% | Executive Feedback on Section 1 |
| <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> | Mostly | <p>In addition to the ToC, the description of the intervention should have included the expected results and the key project activities to be considered complete. The context is generally described should have contained more details about why the project and its specific activities were needed - e.g. factors with direct bearing on the evaluation object. More details on the roles of the key partners/stakeholders in the project and its activities should have been included upfront in the document. The information about the implementation status is also complete.</p> |
| <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.</p> <p><i>Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.</i></p> | Partly | |
| <p>1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> | Mostly | |
| <p>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.</p> <p><i>Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.</i></p> | 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 |
| <p>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.</p> | Fully | The purpose, objectives, use and scope of evaluation are clearly outlined. |
| <p>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).</p> | Fully | |
| SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%) | RATING | Fair |
| Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified? | 42% | Executive Feedback on Section 3 |
| <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> | Partly | <p>The methodology is generally described and there are references the evaluation criteria (even though the evaluation questions are only included in the Annex). The description should have referenced the evaluation matrix (in the Annex) and triangulation of information, and the various lines of evidence to show that the methodology was appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions. The report contains detailed information about the sampling strategy but the presentation of the information about stakeholders participating in KIs and FGD jointly (Table 3) is not clear for the reader,</p> |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| <p>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.</p> <p><i>Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIs, 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.</i></p> | Partly | <p>specially since more detailed explanations about the lines of evidence are missing. Each of the methods (KI, FDGs, surveys, site visits) should have been also described in detail, with an appropriate rationale to justify their use as lines of evidence. There are also limited descriptions of the analysis process to show how triangulation was done. There are references to adherence to ethical principles. In addition to describing the limitations and mitigation strategies, it would have been important to fully also describe the extent in which the mitigation strategies were effective and provide the reader with an indication of their overall impact on the evaluation and the data collected.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> | Partly | |
| <p>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.).</p> | Mostly | |
| <p>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).</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> | Fully | |

| SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%) | Rating | Good |
|--|--------|--|
| Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence? | 67% | Executive Feedback on Section 4 |
| 4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities). <i>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.</i> | Mostly | The Findings section contains sets of "findings statements" in response to the evaluation questions/criteria. The statements are generally clear and provide direct responses to most evaluation questions. Evaluations with high score in this criterion consistently and systematically address all evaluation questions put forward in the evaluation matrix or the ToRs. In some cases, the narrative should also have included more details to substantiate the findings, going beyond descriptions but with examples showing how the achievements took place and how the activities undertaken led to the results (attribution). Data sources should have been included throughout the document and the evidence and sources of data for Table 5, for example is missing and should have been included. The assessment of completion of indicators should have also included the data sources. The ratings take into consideration that the coverage is comprehensive, the case studies presented are illustrative and the findings organized in line with the evaluation questions. Cause-effects links should also have been more clearly outlined, beyond stating that results were in place. More details and explanations about how the activities were implemented and how their implementation led to the outputs and contributed to the outcomes should also have been included, specially in the Effectiveness section. |
| 4.2 The evaluation findings are well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address the evaluation questions and criteria. <i>Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.</i> | Mostly | |
| 4.3 Findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments. <i>Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.</i> | Mostly | |
| 4.4 Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted? <i>Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results</i> | Mostly | |
| SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%) | Rating | Good |
| Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence? | 67% | Executive Feedback on Section 5 |
| 5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. <i>Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.</i> | Mostly | The Conclusions statements are clearly presented. Conclusions related to some evaluation criteria (e.g. Effectiveness) are too summarized and should have better reflected the Findings analysis, specially related to the results achieved in each of the 3 project objectives. The conclusions are generally reasonable evaluative judgements but should have addressed all evaluation criteria (in line with evaluation matrix). The success factors and implementation challenges present additional analysis, beyond the findings with some insights but more analysis should have been included to explain some of the recommendations that follow. A set of lessons are included but need to be better articulated as "lessons" showing the intervention experience and how it can be implemented in other initiatives. |
| 5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. <i>Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.</i> | Mostly | |
| 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. | Mostly | |
| 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 gen-eralizing from single point observations. <i>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.</i> | Mostly | |
| SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%) | Rating | Good |
| Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order? | 70% | Executive Feedback on Section 6 |

| | | |
|--|--------|---|
| <p>6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.</p> <p><i>Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.</i></p> | Mostly | <p>The recommendations should have been better articulated with more detailed explanations and references to their rationale. They contain references to the findings but limited information to substantiate them and clearly show they derived from the analysis presented in the earlier sections. Most recommendations are too summarized and "high level" and should have included more detailed action-oriented steps, with references not only to what should be done, but also how they should be implemented. There are references to the process and the recommendations are prioritized.</p> |
| <p>6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> | Fully | |
| <p>6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.</p> | Partly | |
| <p>6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.</p> | 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. | | 78% | 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. <i>Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.</i> | | Fully integrated (3) | GEWE is satisfactorily integrated. Gender is an evaluation criteria and gender/HR related evaluation questions are included. The methodology is partially gender-responsiveness since it uses mixed data collection methods and contains references to confidentiality and ethical guidelines. However, even though there are references to gender factors, there is no indication of the adoption of a gender-responsive methodology, and detailed information about it entailed is missing. There are also references to the inclusion of women in the sample, but it is not clear that the sampling strategy targetted women for data collection specifically. Gender analysis is fully reflected in the report. Background section contains analysis of several gender issues and findings contain gender-related analysis. No unanticipated effects were identified. GEWE aspects are included in the conclusions and recommendations in references mostly to operational issues on a gender-related intervention. |
| 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology , methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. <i>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</i> | | Partially integrated (1) | |
| 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. <i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion</i> | | Fully integrated (3) | |
| SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) | | Rating | Good |
| Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? | | 70% | 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. <i>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).</i> | | Mostly | Report is complete and the structure is generally appropriate. It should have been shortened to about 40 pages (from its 55 pages excluding Annexes) to encourage evaluation use and the formatting (paragraph spaces) should have been adjusted to facilitate reading. All key annexes are included but the list of people interviewed should have included all names and gender of participants as opposed to only titles (or contain justification to lack of thereof). Opening pages are complete. The Ex. Summary is too summarized. To be considered a stand alone section, the executive summary should have contained more details about the methodology used by the evaluation, as well as more detailed information of the findings in each of the evaluation criteria. |
| 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. <i>Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long</i> | | Mostly | |
| 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). <i>Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long.</i> | | Mostly | |
| Additional Information | | | |
| Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation <i>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.</i> | | N/A | |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| [Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION (weight: 5%) <i>* The score for Section 9 will be 'bonus points' (5%), on top of the existing 100% weight.</i> <i>** Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).</i> | SCALE (No, Partially, Yes) | OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION (Missing, Partial, Sufficient) |
| Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion? | | Partial |
| 9.1 The evaluation questions include references to disability inclusion. | No | Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): Disability inclusion is not included in the evaluation questions. The methodology contains references to the inclusion of people with disabilities in the sample but the sampling strategy was not fully explained (see comments above in Methodology section) and the topic was not covered in findings or 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. | No | |

| 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? | 67.35 | Good | This is a good evaluation report. It contains good assessments but there are some gaps in addressing the criteria related to the Methodology, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations sections as described above. |