

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 2: Purpose and Scope: 5 3: Methodology: 15 4: Findings: 20		5: Conclusions and lessons learned: 20 6: Recommendations: 15 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP): 10 8: Presentation: 10		<p>Are weightings equal to 100%?</p> <p>OK</p>

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Final Evaluation of the project "Standards and Engagement for Ending Violence"			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	14	Evaluators	Maja Barisic John Vijghen	Year	2019
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Herzegovina	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	1,969,840.00	Evaluation Budget	25,000.00	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Prevent VAW&G and			Review Date	09 December 2019

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?	58%	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	Partly	The intervention is generally well explained and a good overview is provided but more details could have been included regarding the financial and human resources and the types of activities undertaken upfront (in line with the ToC), to help the reader understand the analysis provided in the findings section. Good contextual information is provided along with high level explanations of challenges related to the programme problematic is included. More details could have been provided related to the local level context of the interventions. General description of the key stakeholders involved in the implementation is included in the report. More details about the implementing partners at the local level could be added to provide the reader with a clearer sense of the intervention and its scope and situate the reader to follow the analysis presented in the Findings section. The report properly describes the status with explanations of the implications to the evaluation.
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.	Mostly	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Partly	
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	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
Are the evaluation 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	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic and geographic coverage).
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	
SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	80%	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	A good overview of the methodology is presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data collection and analysis methods are appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly outlined and contain a high level rationale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More information about sampling helps to show robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of beneficiaries in survey results is properly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of stakeholders consultation and site visit selection is included. More information about the rationale for selection of the Key Informants in each of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview of the evaluation limitations and constraints is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to ethics per se, but the evaluation was conducted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific references to the inclusion of ethics in the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line with those.
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.	Mostly	
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	
3.4 Limitations: The report presents clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the	Fully	
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	Mostly	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	RATING	Fair
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	33%	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.	Partly	While there is an effort to address all evaluation questions and criteria, the findings could be better substantiated by the evidence, showing systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence. Findings should be supported by detailed information as well as supportive evidence presented. In many cases, there is little connection between the statement of the findings and the analysis backing it. The findings are too high level and lack clear explanations of causal factors and substantiation of the statements made. Findings should include more in-depth assessments (as opposed to simple descriptions). The results achieved by the interventions should show specifically the contributions (what was done, how it was done), their result and present an assessment of their magnitude and importance. Findings could be better articulated and more
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	Partly	

4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Partly	and present an assessment of their magnitude and importance. Findings could be better articulated and more clearly respond to the evaluation criteria and questions. The narrative is not always logic and coherently and it is difficult for the reader to follow the rationale and the arguments presented in many sections.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Partly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	72%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	Conclusions are well formulated and are directly connected to the findings. However, conclusions are very summarized and more information to properly demonstrate the substantiation could have been included. Even if too summarized, the conclusions provide good insights and properly ground and go beyond the findings. Conclusions put forward a good balance between strengths and weaknesses identified and represent a range of views. A few lessons are included but not all are properly articulated as such, in a generalized way as to enable their applicability in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	
5.3 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses 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-	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.	Mostly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	50%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Mostly	Most recommendations derive from the analysis, but some issues (re: R.1 - HR based approach) could have benefited of a more comprehensive analysis in the findings section and references under conclusions. Process for developing the recommendations is described but consultations involved only the Project Team. Suggest ensuring that all recommendations are actionable, targeted and contain clear directions for implementation. Not all do and they should contain enough information to enable implementation. Some prioritization is provided (longer/short term).
6.2 The report 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.	Mostly	
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.	Fully integrated (3)	GEWE is fully integrated in the evaluation scope. The evaluation objectives are gender-related. No specific GEEW criterion was included but gender was mainstreamed as appropriate considering the topic of the intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Women. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations relate and reflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections are not strong.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	73%	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.	Partly	Report is properly structured and length is appropriate (about 50 pages) but certain sections (e.g Findings, particularly) do not read well and are not clearly written. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report, including table of contents and foreword, as well as timeframe and names of evaluators. Suggest also adding a list of tables/figures and graphs. The executive summary is complete. A complete set of Annexes is included in the report.
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	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.	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,	Fully	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	No specific good practice identified.	

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?	63.52	Fair	Overall this report needs to be used with caution as the analysis and assessments provided in the Findings section are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. This and the fact that there is limited information about the project activities and interventions at the local level (upfront) makes it difficult for the reader to follow the assessments made.
--	-------	------	--