

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 of UN Women Project "Advancing the Implementation of UNSCR 1325 in the oPt"			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	20	Evaluators	Nadia Saad	Year	2019
Region	Arab States	Country(ies)	Territories	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	\$ 670,000.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in			Review Date	06 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?	50%	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.	Mostly	The evaluation object is the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 project in Palestine focusing on a variety of interventions designed to address issues related to violations against women in restricted areas. Information about the intervention is properly included with a good overview of the overall project, goals and objectives, the key activities and stakeholders/partners (and their role) as well as resources and geographical locations. Suggest to include information about the project implementation status. Also, include some information about the context and the rationale for the intervention along with a ToC to help the reader understand the analysis provided in the findings section. And a reference in the body of the document to the logic model included in the Annex.
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.	Partly	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	
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. Proper information to the evaluation scope, including thematic and geographic coverage, is also provided.
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?	83%	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. The number of people consulted seems appropriate for the scope of the evaluation and high level information about the sampling strategy is provided. Suggest to add more details about the rationale for the selection of site visits and key informant interviews (which are very generally described) in addition to citing purposive sampling only. The details provided in the Annex help to demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The report refers to the adoption of ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct, and specifically references to respect to people's right to provide information in confidence during interviews and focus group sessions 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.	Mostly	
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	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 Findings address all evaluation questions and criteria and are presented with clarity and logic. Some of the findings, however need more explanations, related to the activities undertaken (e.g. training), their intended goals and detailed information on specific results achieved by them along with explanations of causal factors. Overall, the findings are well substantiated and show the evidence for the statements but more in-depth explanations are needed to fully demonstrate the complexities of the situations described and more properly situate the results obtained by the intervention.
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	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	65%	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 criteria. The conclusions are good but could provide more insights and analysis beyond the findings, providing more explanations to them as to pave the way for the recommendations. It is important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. A few lessons are included but they need to be better articulated and generalized, to show how they can be used and applied 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.	Mostly	
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.	Partly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	63%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	Recommendations flow from findings and conclusion and are geared to specific agencies, but need to be prioritized. They are also too summarized and should be broadened to more clearly articulate what needs to be done, why and 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.	Mostly	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Mostly	

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Not at all	
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)		Meets Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	Score 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)	Gender was fully integrated in the evaluation scope. The evaluation object is the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 project in Palestine focusing on a variety of interventions designed to address issues related to violations against women in restricted areas. As such, GEEW is integrated into the evaluation objectives and evaluation questions related to gender/HR. No references are made to data collected to measure GE results. The methodology was fully gender-responsive. The evaluation was based on gender and human rights principles, as defined in the UN Women Evaluation Policy and adhered to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. Measures were taken within the evaluation process to promote inclusion, minimize discrimination, and promote participation and fair co-construction of knowledge. The report refers to the adoption of ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct, and specifically references to respect to people's right to provide information in confidence during interviews and focus group sessions are included. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to gather data that promotes inclusivity, extends understandings of equality and rights of beneficiaries and supports the development of co-learning and the co-construction of knowledge, according to the report. The evaluation shows satisfactory gender analysis. The background section could provide better explanations to the gender problematic that the project attempt to address (focusing mostly on the project description). Findings contain gender-analysis related to the evaluation questions, but some need more in-depth explanations to fully demonstrate the complexities of the situations described and more properly situate the results obtained by the intervention. Unanticipated effects were not identified. GEEW aspects also included in conclusions and recommendations, even though recommendations are very summarized.
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%)		Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	Rating 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 (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. The structure is appropriate but the report is only 30 pages long. Page numbers are not included. Key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, list of interviewees, evaluation matrix) This helps to show the robustness of the work undertaken. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report. Lists of tables and figures were not included but only a few tables are presented in the report. The figures and tables need to be numbered. The executive summary is concise but should also have contained information about the project to help situate the reader.
8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluator, 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.	Mostly	
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		

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?	75.38	Good	This is a good evaluation report. The findings address the evaluation questions and criteria, and are well substantiated, even if more explanations are needed on the complex situations found in the PT. There is a good set of conclusions and the recommendations are appropriate, but need more details to enable full implementation.