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

UN WOMEN

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 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	5	5: Conclusions and lessons learned	20	*Are weightings equal to 100%?*
	2: Purpose and scope	5	6: Recommendations	15	**OK**
	3: Methodology	15	7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP)	10	
	4: Findings	20	8: Presentation	10	

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Country Portfolio Evaluation				Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number		24	Evaluators	1	1 Year	2018
Region		Eastern and Southern	Eastern and Southern Africa	South Sudan	Type of intervention evaluated	CPE
Portfolio Budget (USD)			Evaluation Budget (USD)	80,000	Reviewer	Zayid Douglas
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)		Women's leadership	Women's leadership in peace,		Review Date	08 February 2019
		Women's access to	Gender response plans and			
		Women's access to	Global norms, policies and			

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	1.1 The report clearly highlighted progress towards results, identify expected outcomes and lessons learned, and support future planning & programming efforts. A Theory of Change (TOC), developed by the evaluation team, informed it by outlining causal pathways but without detailing the specific components (e.g. inputs,outputs, etc.).
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	1.2 A variety of inequalities including those that are gender (e.g., rates of child marriage), highlights of those vulnerable and marginalized populations (e.g., women, girls, internally displaced persons, persons living with HIV/AIDS, persons with disabilities) along with those inter-/national conventions for which South Sudan is a signatory are some elements that pepper the contextual description. While Government of South Sudan (GoSS) activity on gender equality and human rights prior to and during the 2014-2018 period is also presented, some more details regarding the GoSS activity would have been appreciated.
1.3 The **key stakeholders** involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly	1.3 The evaluation's key stakeholders are identified as UN Women South Sudan management and staff, UN partner agencies, Government of South Sudan ministries, donor partners, representatives from civil society, and rights holders. They were involved as participants in data collection and in the evaluation design/planning/validation process.
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	1.4 This evaluation was focused on the four-year (2014-2018) strategic plan (2014-2018) for the UN Women South Sudan Country Office, and through review of the Office's normative/coordination/programmatic work (the 3 UNW mandates), informed strategy and programming for the next Strategic Note period (2018-2021).
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 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 This strategic learning exercise aims to inform future decision making for the UNW South Sudan Country Office through the examination of seven core objectives. Four evaluation objectives apply to OECD/DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability) and the other three evaluation objectives focus on identifying lessons & good practices, program opportunities & synergies among the three UN Women mandates (normative, coordination, programming), and make recommendations for the way forward with the upcoming Strategic Plan (2018-2021). The evaluation's intended users are also its key stakeholders - UN Women South Sudan management and staff, UN partner agencies, Government of South Sudan ministries, donor partners, representatives from civil society, and rights holders.
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	
		2.3 The evaluation focused on the changes occurring when quality changes changes occurred
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?	**93%**	**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 evaluation used a combination of contribution analysis - analysis that focused on a subset of UNW South Sudan interventions implemented during the strategic note period- and case studies -to allow for a deeper assessment of context-specific gender norms and

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	inequalities that affect UNW South Sudan contribution across the 3 pillars/mandates. Gender equality and human rights had been integrated into all evaluation criteria and indicators related to organizational aspects and development results were also examined.
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	3.2 A desk review to lay the context along with key informant interviews with stakeholders, focus group discussions with beneficiaries, and participant observations allowed for triangulation of data, for this evaluation.
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.	Partly	3.3 Within the implementation of the evaluation, its Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) reviewed and prioritized the evaluation questions, and provided inputs to the TOC that was developed by the evaluation team, prior to carrying out the evaluation. The ERG participated in a validation workshop to review emerging findings and recommendations that were developed - and then presented- by the evaluation team as part of the evaluation.
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 of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations.	Fully	3.4 There were some mention of those limitations to receiving/reviewing desk review documentation and internal security concerns while carrying out the evaluation. Time constraints limited opportunities to carry out extended discussion of findings, recommendations with the ERG, which may have influenced their overall contribution to the review process.

3.5 This evaluation report referenced the ethical principles it adhered to under UN Evaluation Group guidelines. Respect for dignity, confidentiality and do no harm were employed during the evaluation. Anonymity was assured and opportunities for redress were noted. |
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	**Rating**	**Very Good**
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	**93%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 4**
4.1The 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 addressing the key evaluation questions and criteria was used to generate the findings. Each finding presented was first organized by evaluation criteria, then by key question. UNW South Sudan activity was aligned to inter/national policies and conventions, and UNW South Sudan was seen as an advocate for certain vulnerable groups and a go-to for humanitarian programming, which is outside of its core competencies. The lack of an explicit TOC lent itself to a series of effectiveness and efficiency challenges but this CPE notes opportunities for the way forward as manifesting in enhanced partnerships and capacity of implementing partners. This evaluation also identified opportunity for promoting social norm change and referenced civil society as as a future constituent for deepened engagement, while bringing attention to findings underpinning both advances in, and roadblocks to gender equality and human rights.

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	and roadblocks to, gender equality and human rights. 4.2 The findings presented focused on UNW South Sudan organizational, and relational functionality, achievement of outcomes, and prioritization of next steps (future Strategic Plan activity) around partnerships, thematic areas and other areas of priority.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Mostly	
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	**Rating**	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	**95%**	**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 The conclusions were logically connected to the findings, and where appropriate, the respective evaluation criteria was also noted. Reflections around the evaluation's relevance and effectiveness as the program plays a strategic role in serving as the UN's voice on women's empowerment was noted, along with its comparative advantage in supporting the implementation of work under the 3 pillars. 5.2 The conclusions made a point to note those elements and insights that could help make the case. For example, protracted insecurity has relegated UNW South Sudan to take on less direct implementation (roles), and instead they should more opportunities around collaboration with capacitated NGOs.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	
5.3 Conclusions present **strengths and weaknesse**s 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	
5.4 **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.	Not at all	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	**Rating**	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	**67%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 6**
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations were developed with rationale, and grounded in evidence. Recommendations pertaining to strategic alignment (of the portfolio), management of the Strategic Note and its achievement, coordination and sustainability were presented. 6.2 The recommendations were developed after data collection and analysis had been completed. Draft recommendations were shared with the ERG and it was an opportunity for this group of stakeholders to contribute to the recommendations' content. However, due to time constraints, there was limited engagement from this group.
6.2 The repor**t describes the process** followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	
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.	Fully integrated (3)	7.1 GEWE was integrated into each evaluation criterion and key question for this evaluation, in addition to gender equality and human rights having its own standalone evaluation criteria, to assess how these had been considered within the UN strategic note's design and implementation.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	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?	**90%**	**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 is presented in a clear, logical, well structured form with the appropriate headers and subheaders.

8.2 The report presents its key basic information - title, opening page,table of contents, and graphics - in complete form. The exception is that the evaluator names are accessible only via the report annexes as opposed to being noted on the report cover or as a signature in the report's introduction.

8.3 The executive summary is a standalone section that is concise in nature and presents the findings organized by evaluation criteria.

8.4 Partly, the annexes include the minimum standards. One notable missing factor from the annexes were the data collection tools used in the evaluation. |
| 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. | Mostly | |
| 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 | |
| 8.4 **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). | Partly | |
| **Additional Information** | | |
| Identify aspects of *good practice* of the evaluation | | -This involved contribution analysis – assessing UN Women's contribution (through its 3 mandates – normative, coordination, and programming) to the South Sudan country portfolio. There was a concerted effort to connect gender equality and human rights implications to findings from the contribution analysis, the result of a deeper level of analysis conducted by the evaluation team. |

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?	**89.13**	Very Good	