

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



Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Reviewer Guidance :
<b>Rating explanation</b>	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"> <li>- Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters.</li> <li>- Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all).</li> <li>- Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight.</li> <li>- <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.</li> </ul>
<b>Parameter Weight (%)</b>	1: Object and context 2: Purpose and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings	5 5 15 20	5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Presentation	20 15 10 10	<p><i>Are weightings equal to 100%?</i></p> <p><b>OK</b></p>

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

<b>Report title</b>	Final Evaluation – Regional Project “Preventing Exploitation Of Women Migrant Workers”		<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	Regional	
<b>Sequence number</b>	10	<b>Evaluators</b>	1	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Asia and the Pacific	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Thailand, Cambodia, Myanmar, 1	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	Project
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>	1,873,000.00	<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>	75,000.00	<b>Reviewer</b>	Glaiza Veluz
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Gender response plans	Global norms, policies and		<b>Review Date</b>	06 February 2019

**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?	100%	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 specified the objective of evaluation which is to assess the overall goal of the project to prevent ASEAN women workers exploitation. The evaluation also included a discussion of budget and donors noting that the US\$1.87M project was implemented by UN Women throug ROAP. The project took place in Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Myanmar, Thailand and Malaysia.
1.2 The <b>context</b> 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 The evaluation provided a detailed background section, sharing the current statistics on women migrants together with the vulnerable situation they are in. Further, the challenges for gender sensitive migration programming were highlighted and there was a call for more projects such this from UN Women.
1.3 The <b>key stakeholders</b> involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	1.3 The list of project stakeholders and their role in the project were provided in Annex E. The evaluation team conducted a thorough stakeholders' analysis (in Annex E), which provided information about key roles and key roles of each identified stakeholder.
1.4 The report identifies <b>the implementation status of the object</b> , 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 The project did not have a clearly defined Theory of Change (despite having a logical framework), and thus, the evaluators recreated the project ToC. The ToC explains the use of the inputs technical support, financial resources, and convening capacity to achieve outcomes towards reducing exploitation of women migrant workers.
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><b>2.1 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:</b> 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.</p>	Fully	2.1. The report clearly laid out the purpose specifying that the evaluation serves to provide direct feedback to the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) which is the funder of the project and what it will look at (e.g. project relevance, overall performance, management arrangement etc.). The audience for the evaluation was identified as the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), UN Women, the International Labour Organisation (ILO), ASEAN Mechanisms, and ASEAN Governments. Essentially, the evaluation team noted that these stakeholders are in a position to influence future strategic decisions on advancing the rights of migrant women in the ASEAN region. More detailed information on the use of the evaluation for key stakeholders are outlined in the stakeholder mapping on ANNEX E.
<p><b>2.2 Evaluation Scope:</b> 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).</p>	Fully	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b></p>	RATING	Very Good
<p><b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b></p>	93%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
<p><b>3.1 Methodology:</b> 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.</p>	Fully	3.1 The evaluation was clear in the methodology with its detailed discussion of the criteria and the questions and sub-questions it employed for the data gathering. The evaluation ensured the integration of gender lens by discussing the use of a Feminist Evaluation and a Gender Equality Approach, which guided analysis of the extent to which the program reduced gender inequities. They also used a "critical instance case approach" to analyze how the project influenced women's migration from Myanmar (source country) to Thailand (destination country).
<p><b>3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling:</b> 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.</p>	Fully	3.2 The report clearly explained the data collection strategies (KII, FGD, stakeholder self-review, and open letter) and the rationale for employing these methodologies. The data collection strategies were robust enough to facilitate multiple lines of evidence.
<p><b>3.3 Stakeholders Consultation:</b> 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.</p>	Fully	3.3 Consultation and a mapping with key stakeholders were conducted. In the session, the stakeholders for the project were identified. The evaluators took advice from stakeholders on how efficiency and sustainability of the project would be assessed. Data validation checks took place, where key data points and findings from data collection were validated with stakeholders.
<p><b>3.4 Limitations:</b> 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.</p>	Fully	3.4 A dedicated section on limitations and mitigation strategies were presented. This includes limitations on the methodologies, stakeholders and evaluation timeframe

<p><b>3.5 Ethics:</b> 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.</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>3.5 There was a section on ethics and in Annex N. However, the statements were rather general. There was no explanation on how ethics was actually applied during data</p>
<p><b>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><b>Fair</b></p>
<p><b>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</b></p>	<p>33%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 4</b></p>
<p>4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>4.1 The evaluation was able to capture the results of the project but in terms of presentation, it seemed to have focused more on the output level rather than the implications of the outputs. Hence, the report appeared to be more of an evaluation of the project implementation, when that was just one of the components to be evaluated as laid out on their objectives and evaluation questions. The evaluators may have noted low stakeholder participation in the evaluation which hindered maximizing data collection - but outcome level/impact level could have been probed already with those who participated.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>4.2 The report was arranged in a way where outputs were presented and then this would be explained further by citing what transpired due to the activities (e.g. lifting of ban). Essentially, there were pieces of evidence presented in their findings. However, the qualitative evidence could have been further coded which could provide a deeper level of analysis.</p>
<p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Not at all</p>	<p>4.3 There was a section called "<i>Factors contributing to or hindering project efficiency</i>", which explored different elements of efficiency. However this analysis of factors was not included in the effectiveness section.</p>
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>4.3 There was a section called "<i>Factors contributing to or hindering project efficiency</i>", which explored different elements of efficiency. However this analysis of factors was not included in the effectiveness section.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><b>Very Good</b></p>

<p><b>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</b></p>	<p>87%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 5</b></p>
<p>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>5.1 The conclusions were all based on the findings.</p>
<p>5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>5.2 . There were five conclusions presented and although the section synthesizes knowledge - the conclusions appeared to be limited and did not cover all programmatic areas.</p>
<p>5.3 Conclusions present <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> 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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>5.3 The conclusions highlighted both project gains and points of improvement, incorporating the roles the stakeholders played.</p>
<p>5.4 <b>Lessons Learned:</b> 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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>5.4 The lessons learned are derived from the findings. It also takes into account context where the lessons learned will be applied, providing greater clarity.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p><b>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</b></p>	<p>80%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 6</b></p>
<p>6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>6.1 Recommendations were derived from conclusions and findings.</p> <p>6.2 The report mentioned that recommendations were validated with stakeholders. But there was no description of the process for this.</p>

6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Mostly	6.3 The recommendations were clear, taking into account possible barriers, making the recommendations realistic and actionable.
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 It was explained that that the recommendations are arranged based on priority. The recommendations also had proper categories and it was clear which group the recommendations is targeted for.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partly	
<b>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Approaching 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>67%</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)	7.1 The scope and evaluation ensure that GEWE data would be collected.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2 There was a good mix of stakeholders, which ensured that the voice of vulnerable women/sector were aired.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated (1)	7.3 Most of the findings reported were on the output level and the management level of UN Women. The report lacked data on the actual impact of the project, on the lives of the migrant women and outcomes of awareness and mobilization activities (although they explained that they attempted to reach out but that migrant women workers were not available for data gathering).

SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	100%	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	<p>8.1 The report was organized and logically arranged in a user friendly format. The report writing was also easy to understand.</p> <p>8.2 The report provided the basic information such as date, evaluation location, and details about the profiles of the evaluators (in annex)</p> <p>8.3 The executive summary was concise yet it was able to provide an overview of the report's content.</p> <p>8.4 The annexes are present and supplement the report.</p>
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: 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).	Fully	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	Very detailed Annex	

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?	76.66	Good	