



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. - <b>Executive feedback</b> - 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	Are weightings equal to 100%? OK		

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Mid-term evaluation of UN Joint Programme For Gender Equality			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	13	Evaluators	Bunafsha Gulako; Silvia Gurrola	Year	2019
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Georgia	Type of intervention evaluated	Joint
Portfolio Budget (USD)	8,177,048 USD	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to	Prevent VAW&G and expand		Review Date	01 January 2020

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
1.1 The report clearly specifies the object of the evaluation, and provides a 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 human resources, budgets and modalities.	Fully	Good description of the intervention, its context and rationale is included. Add more details about the activities undertaken (in line with the ToC and/or goals and objectives described). The role of the key stakeholders/partners could also be expanded in addition to only listing them. Considering this is a Mid-term evaluation, it is also important to include information about the implementation status of the project.
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	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly	
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.	Not at all	
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 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation are clearly outlined along with good overview of the evaluation scope, including thematic and geographic coverage.
2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides a 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 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?	97%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
3.1 Methodology: The report specifies and provides a complete description of the relevant design and sets of methods including the chosen evaluation criteria, questions, and performance standards. The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.	Fully	The report contains a good overview of the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. One of the annexes provides detailed description of the methodology. The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results with the structuring of FGDs with due consideration for gender. The number of people consulted is appropriate for the scope of the evaluation and there are indications that they are representative of the universe of project stakeholders. More details about the geographical distribution of these stakeholders and the project sites would be useful for further assurance of this. Also, the report mentions that the Evaluation followed the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants.
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	
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.	Mostly	
3.4 Limitations: The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias.	Fully	
3.5 Ethics: The evaluation report includes a discussion of the extent to which the evaluation design included ethical safeguards, mechanisms and measures that 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	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	90%	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.	Fully	Generally, the findings are presented with clarity and logic, and are properly grounded on evidence, addressing all evaluation criteria. Some supporting data lacks sources or references and attribution of results to project activities is not always clear. It is important to include/ensure these. For the most part, findings are supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors and show that they are based on multiple lines of evidence.
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.	Mostly	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	
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?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Fully	Conclusions are well formulated and are directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation questions. The conclusions provide good insights and there is a good balance between strengths and weaknesses but it is important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. A few but good lessons are included and generalized for application in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	
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.	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.	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 logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	Recommendations flow from findings and conclusion. They are clearly articulated, prioritized and directed to specific agencies for implementation. While they are actionable, they could contain more details to guide implementation, with a focus not only on what needs to be done but also on how it should be done. A description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for their formulation is included.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	
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	
<b>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Meets Requirements</b>
<b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 7</b>
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)	The evaluation fully integrated gender in the scope as appropriate for an evaluation of a gender equality programme. Assessment of data on gender related results was not referred to in the report but GEEW was included in the evaluation scope, it was a standalone criteria and evaluation questions related to gender/HR were included. Methodology is fully gender-responsive. The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results with the structuring of FGDs with due consideration for gender. The number of people consulted is appropriate for the scope of the evaluation and there are indications that the sample is representative of the universe of the project stakeholders and vulnerable stakeholders. There are references to assessments conducted during the inception phase regarding the extent of integration of the HRBA both in the design and in implementation of the project and the adaptation of methodologies of the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation during the Inception Period. Gender analysis was satisfactorily reflected in the report. A background section explains the gender problematic. The report assesses gender related outcomes and findings analyze results related to implementation of gender initiatives but supporting data lacks sources or references and attribution of results to project activities is not always clear, as mentioned above. No unanticipated effects were identified. GEEW aspects also included in conclusions and recommendations are geared to improvements to gender programme.
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)	
<b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>
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 (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.	Fully	The report is well written and presented, with appropriate structure. Ideally, the report length would be shortened to about 50 pages (from current 60 pages). Ensure all graphs and figures contain information about their sources. Key annexes are included (the ToRs, the mission agenda, the evaluation questionnaires and matrix, list of interviewees). This shows the robustness of the work undertaken. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is complete and concise.
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.	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: 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).	Fully	
<b>Additional Information</b>		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	N/A	

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?	91.71	Very Good	This is a very good evaluation report, providing in-depth assessments in response to the evaluation criteria. The findings and conclusions are presented with clarity and logic, and are properly grounded on evidence. Good sets of recommendations and lessons are also included.