

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 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	Final Evaluation Report Mali Country Programme 2014 – 2019			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	17	Evaluators	Guennolet Boum/Cheick	Year	2019
Region	Western and Central	Country(ies)	Mali	Type of intervention evaluated	CPE
Portfolio Budget (USD)	\$ 10,530,657.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership	Women's access to economic	Prevent	Review Date	05 January 2020
	Gender response plans				

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?	83%	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	Information about the political context and description of the CP is included along with an overview of the portfolio geographical distribution and resources. Suggest to add more information about the portfolio upfront, including the activities/projects undertaken (in line with the ToC and/or goals and objectives), the key stakeholders/partners (and their role). References to the Annex 17 (which contains a summary of the portfolio) could also be included. Information about gender issues in the country is also included which explains the rationale for CP. This helps the reader understand the analysis provided in the findings section. Add a logic model if possible and situate the CP as to its implementation stage.
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.	Mostly	
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. Complete information about the evaluation scope is presented, including unit of analysis, timing 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?	100%	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	Methodology is well described with good information about data collection, analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. The details provided in the Annex help to show the quality of the work. The sampling strategy is well explained. The data collection methods and number of people interviewed seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. This evaluation provides a good description of the gender-responsive methodological approach, with the detailed steps taken (pp. 46-47). Also, references to adherence to specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines, UN Women Evaluation Policy) during the evaluation design and conduct are included.
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.	Fully	
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	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	83%	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	The analysis provided is comprehensive and addresses the evaluation questions and criteria. The findings are well articulated and presented with clarity and logic. They are grounded on evidence and in-depth analysis, but some references to certain achievements lack the backing information and explanations of causal factors (e.g. the report cites key role played by UN Women in certain achievements but no explanation is provided about the role per se). It is important to demonstrate systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence, specially where there is a large volume of information presented (e.g. CP).
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.	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	Fair
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	48%	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 relate to the findings, in line with some evaluation questions/criteria but they are too summarized (2 1/2 pages). The conclusions could contain more information to summarize findings (building on their granular level). There seems to be a gap between the level of granularity in the findings (30 pages of analysis) and the conclusions, which could better reflect the findings analysis, particularly regarding the insights related to results obtained by the CP in each of the thematic areas of intervention. Conclusions should also provide a better balance between strengths and weaknesses (currently more aligned with strengths). It is also important to show that they represent a range of views. Good lessons are included but more information about some of them is needed to enable their applicability in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	
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 generalizing from single point observations.	Mostly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Fair
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	33%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partly	Only 4 recommendations are included mostly focusing on design, M&E. They flow from findings and conclusions but more recommendations would be needed to address other issues identified, specially regarding programming. They are prioritized, and geared to UN Women, but they should be broadened to tackle more issues and include more information about what needs to be done, how it should be done and improvement is expected from them (what they are supposed to address). They should contain enough details to enable their implementation. Suggest to also add a description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for their formulation.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	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.	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)	GEEW is integrated into the evaluation, evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included and gender is a standalone criteria. No references are made to the lack of indicators to measure gender progress. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods. The sampling frame does not specifically refer to focus on beneficiary/target groups but the report mentions that the evaluation was guided by the need to respond to gender issues and specifically describes the 10 principles set by UN Women for gender-responsive evaluations. Details on the methods used to ensure the use of the approach are provided. The data collection methods and number of people interviewed seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. Also, references to adherence to specific evaluation standards (e.g UNEG Guidelines, UN Women Evaluation Policy) during the evaluation design and conduct are included. The gender problematique is well explained in specific sections of the report, but little information is provided in the background section. The report assesses gender related outcomes and findings analyze results related to implementation of gender initiatives, showing improvements at CP level. However, GEEW aspects could be better reflected in the conclusions and recommendations, which are generally too summarized.
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	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	87%	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 (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.	Mostly	The report is well written and presented but it should be shortened to about 40-50 pages max (current about 85). The first chapters (Introduction, Evaluation Scope, Gender Context, Strategic Note) could be better summarized (about 30 pages long). Key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, list of interviewees and evaluation matrix among others). 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	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation		This evaluation provides a good description of the gender-responsive methodological approach, with the detailed steps taken (pp. 46-47).

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?	71.94	Good	This report presents comprehensive analysis based on sound methodological approach. The findings are well articulated and presented with clarity and logic addressing the evaluation questions and criteria, but could perhaps better aggregate the results of the CP portfolio (of about 17 projects). The Conclusions are well formulated but too summarized. There seems to be a gap between the level of granularity in the findings and the conclusions, particularly regarding the insights related to results obtained by the CP in the thematic areas of intervention. More recommendations are needed to address other issues identified, specially those related to programming.