

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 2: Purpose, objectives and scope : 5 3: Methodology : 30 4: Findings : 20 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points) : 5		5: Conclusions and lessons learned : 10 6: Recommendations : 10 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) : 10 8: Report presentation : 10		Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)? <div>OK</div>
PART I: REPORT DETAILS					
Report title	Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project to Strengthen the Capacities of Women's Organizations and Build a Strong Women's M			Geographical Coverage	Regional
Sequence number	20	Evaluators	[Female] : [Male]	Year	2025
Region	Western and Central Africa	Country(ies)	Kenya	Type of intervention evaluated	Regional/Thematic
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)		Reviewer	C. Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in			Review Date	24 November 2025

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?	75%	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.	Mostly	The intervention is clearly described with information on the ToC, project activities, geographical location, budget, etc, however, more information about the results chain, including indicators, should have been included. The context, which is generally described, should have also contain more detailed information about the direct bearing factors (e.g. related to needs in each project component) to enable the reader to understand the project rationale. Information about the key partners, stakeholders and intended beneficiaries is generally included but more details are needed specially about the partners' roles in the project, should have been included. The timeframe is also clearly outlined.
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. <i>Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.</i>	Mostly	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described. <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</i>	Mostly	
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. <i>Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes</i>	Fully	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		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?	98%	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.	Fully	The methodology is well described, with clear information about the data collection and analysis used. The detailed information in the Annex helps to show the methodological work. The lines of evidence are generally well explained and overall, the methods seem appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions and for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results. The sampling strategy is also well explained and included information about the rationale for data collection tools and the selection of those consulted for KIIs and FGDs, demonstrating proper coverage of all project activities in each country. References to Ethics are included. The Limitations are also clearly articulated and describe the mitigation strategies, but more information on their effectiveness should have been included to clearly communicate the overall impact the limitations had in the overall data collection and resulting findings.
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.	Fully	
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. <i>Note: Include a stakeholder mapping showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection</i>	Fully	
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.).	Mostly	

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).	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	57%	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’</i>	Mostly	The findings section contains systematic analysis and responses to the evaluation questions/criteria but the report does not contain "finding statements" answering the questions concisely and directly. The ratings take into consideration that the first paragraph in each criteria contain an overall summary of the narrative, in response to the criteria. The findings contain supportive narrative but the evidence for the findings is not always mentioned and sometimes the analysis to support the "regional" assessment references shows data related to only one country or contains limited explanations (e.g.
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</i>	Partly	

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	Q4 describes that adjustments were needed in the project but does not clearly explain what adjustments were introduced and why they were needed). The project results framework, showing planned outputs, outcomes and indicators was not included but the indicators were assessed individually. Data sources of the tables to populate this assessment was not included and some graphs need to be better explained to enable proper substantiation. The report also should have more clearly provided and assessment of the quality of the products in addition to the assessment of their completion. More explanations on the rate of delivery of the activities (taux de realisation) should also have been included. Also, more explanations on the variations between the project expenditures against the project initial budget should have been included with some analysis on the extent to which the planned budget will be spent in the time left for project implementation. Cause-effect links are well explained. Unintended results were reported.
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?	63%	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 are clearly presented in line with the evaluation criteria but they 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 presented additional analysis, beyond the findings with some insights to explain some of the recommendations that follow (the ratings took into consideration that some of these - and the weaknesses) are referenced in the recommendations section. The conclusions section should have also contain a better balance of strenghts and weaknesses, currently stirred towards presenting strenghts. A good set of lessons is included clearly articulated as "lessons" showing the intervention experience.
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.	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 gen-eralizing from single point observations.	Fully	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	80%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions . <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>	Fully	The recommendations are well grounded and clearly derive from the findings and are realistic and action-oriented. There are no references to the process used to formulate them but they are prioritized.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders. <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>	Not at all	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Fully	
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. <i>Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.</i>	Fully integrated (3)	Gender is fully integrated. There is no assessment of data on specific gender results but the evaluation scope integrates gender and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Gender is also a standalone criteria. Methodology is satisfactorily gender responsive. Detailed information on the gender-responsive approach was not specifically included but the methodology used mixed data collection methods, appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results and contain references to targetting women as key informants as well as to ethics and confidentiality.
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</i>	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	

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)	Gender analysis is satisfactorily reflected in the report. The background section describes the gender problematic generally and the findings section provides responses to the gender-related evaluation questions. Unanticipated effects were not specifically identified. Gender is covered in the conclusions and recommendations since this is a gender-related project.
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	83%	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, pur-pose 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.	Mostly	Report is complete, contain proper structure and formatting. but it is too long and should have been shoredtmed to about 40 pages (currently 80 pages excl. Annexes - about 70 pages long) to encourage evaluation use. The table of contents should have included both the headings and the subheadings and the Annexes should have been also itemized in the ToC. The opening pages should have also included the name of the evaluators and the list of acronyms. Key annexes are included but the Annexes should have been listed in the Table of Contents. The list of people consulted should have been numbered and include the gender breakdown. The executive summary is a complete stand-alone section.
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>	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).	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>		
[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?		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 contains references to the PWD but not specifically refers to inclusion of people with disabilities in the sample of KIs/FGDs. The topic was covered in findings, conclusions and recommendations.
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?	82.80	Good	This is a good evaluation report. It contain good findings and analysis systematically addressing all the evaluation questions, even though there are some gaps in the presentation of the evidence and cause-effect explanations. The report is also too summarized in certain sections (e.g. Conclusions) which pushed the ratings down. An excellent set of recommendations is