

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



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"> <li>- Overall reports are rated against a four-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 four-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 suggestions on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating and executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.</li> </ul>
Parameter Weight (%)	1: Object and context 2: Purpose, objectives and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points)	5 5 15 20 5	5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Report presentation	20 15 10 10	<p><i>Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)?</i></p> <p>OK</p>

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

Report title	UN Women AUC MoU Evaluation Final Report				Geographical Coverage	Regional
Sequence number	22	Evaluators	[Female] ; [Male]	Year	2024	
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa	Country(ies)	Multiple (Africa Union Liaison Office)	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme	
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)		Reviewer	C. Marcondes	
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership and	Women's access to economic	Prevent VAW&G	Women's	Review Date	02 October 2024

## PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
<b>Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</b>	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 1
<p>1.1 The report clearly specifies the <b>object</b> of the evaluation, and provides a clear and complete description of the intervention's original logic (e.g. expected results chain or theory of change), timeframe, intended beneficiaries by type, geographic location(s) as well as the planned budget of the intervention.</p> <p><i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criteria. If the project did not have a ToC, clearly outline the expected results of the intervention and how the activities were expected to lead to the results.</i></p>	Fully	The evaluation object is clearly described including all key elements. Information about the key partners, stakeholders and intended beneficiaries is also included. The description of the context is adequate, and includes references to the key issues with direct bearing on the intervention. The changes related to timeline and implementation status are also referenced.
<p>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.</p> <p><i>Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.</i></p>	Fully	
<p>1.3 The <b>key stakeholders</b> involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.</p> <p><i>Note: Remember to include not only a list of partners but also a description of their main activities and/or the role they had in the implementation of the intervention in the body of report. Detailed description and stakeholder analysis can be provided in annexes.</i></p>	Fully	
<p>1.4 The report identifies any changes in the <b>timeframe and/or implementation plans</b> (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation.</p> <p><i>Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.</i></p>	Fully	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
<b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>	83%	Executive Feedback on Section 2
<p><b>2.1 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:</b> 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.</p>	Fully	The purpose, objectives and use of the evaluation are clearly outlined. The scope should have contained references to output/outcomes covered along with some references to geographical coverage. The rationale for the initiatives to be covered (Section 2.3) should have been presented.
<p><b>2.2 Evaluation Scope:</b> The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the timeframe and outputs/outcomes covered, and not covered (thematically, geographically etc.) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g. 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).</p>	Mostly	
SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	Good
<b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b>	70%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
<p><b>3.1 Methodology:</b> The report provides a complete description of the methods used for data collection and analysis, the chosen evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and demonstrate that the methods chosen are appropriate to inform the responses to the criteria and questions.</p> <p><i>Note: An evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions in each evaluation criteria, the indicators, the data sources and methods for data collection is useful to show these, but it is still important to include some explanations in the body of the document to clearly demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for triangulation. Remember to keep this section succinct and use annexes to provide detailed information.</i></p>	Fully	The methodology is generally well described and shows that the methods were appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions. The methods were appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results. The data analysis process should have contained more details and explanations showing how triangulation was done. The sampling and the stakeholder consultations are also too generally explained but more information about the low participation of the KIs in the interviews should have been better explained, and the implications this has had to the evaluation should have been clearly outlined. References to

<p><b>3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling:</b> The report clearly describes the tools used for data collection and the rationale for their selection as well as the sampling strategy and methods used for data analysis. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, to guide the assessments of GE/HR specific results and to ensure data accuracy and completeness.</p> <p><i>Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIs, desk review) but also how the data was collected (where, when, who, how) and what steps were taken to analyze it. Remember to include a description of original sampling strategy and the extent to which it covers the range of stakeholders involved in the intervention, with a clear justification of the selection of the targeted sample. Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>adherence to ethics and specific ethical evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG guidelines) during the evaluation should have been included. Only one limitation is presented, and more should have been identified, specially considering possible bias due to the small number of people interviewed, most of whom represented UN Women or AUC.</p>
<p><b>3.3 Stakeholders Consultation:</b> 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.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item 1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	<p>Partly</p>	
<p><b>3.4 Limitations:</b> The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation and if/how these were mitigated (e.g. gaps in the evidence, biases due to limits in stakeholder consultations, etc.).</p>	<p>Partly</p>	
<p><b>3.5 Ethics:</b> The evaluation report makes explicit references to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and shows evidence that data collection and tools adhered to these ethical principles, (e.g. mechanisms and measures 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 of harm considerations).</p> <p><i>Note: Mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to sufficient evidence that the data was actually collected with sensitivity to ethics and discrimination. It is a good practice to provide a clear explanation as to how the evaluation adopted these, showing examples of tools and processes used were sensitive to ethical considerations (e.g. consent, confidentiality) and were not discriminatory against particular group's participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	<p>Partly</p>	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
<b>Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</b>	87%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 4</b>
4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities). <i>Note: It is a good practice to clearly outline the findings in the report, preferably using a "set" of findings statements, with clear articulation and conciseness, followed by substantiation and full demonstration of the evidence used to formulate the findings' statements.</i>	Fully	The findings are logic and coherent presented in line with the evaluation criteria in response to the evaluation questions, systematically. The finding statements are clear and concise, based on a well-substantiated narrative, providing quality evidence. In-depth analysis is included. Cause-effect links should have been more consistently presented, to explain, for example the lack of a budget, yet, the implementation of several activities, including some indications of costing and resources leveraged.
4.2 The evaluation findings are <b>well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence</b> to systematically address the evaluation questions and criteria. <i>Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.</i>	Fully	
4.3 Findings reflect systematic and <b>appropriate analysis</b> and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments. <i>Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.</i>	Fully	
4.4 Are <b>cause and effect links</b> between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted? <i>Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results</i>	Partly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
<b>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</b>	80%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 5</b>
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. <i>Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.</i>	Fully	The Conclusions are clear and logic, flowing from the evaluation findings. While the conclusions are linked to the findings, some are too summarized and should contain more detailed explanations, insights and analysis beyond the findings, following the the rationale for the recommendations presented in the sequence. Some of the weaknesses identified (and tackled by the recommendations) should have been better explained in this section. Some good Lessons are included but should have been more clearly articulated as "lessons", clearly showing what/how it worked in the case of the programme and with some guidance for further replication.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. <i>Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.</i>	Mostly	
5.3 Conclusions present the <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> 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 <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. <i>Note: The lessons learned from an evaluation comprise the new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (initiative, context outcomes and even evaluation methods) that is applicable to and useful in other similar contexts. They should demonstrate the intervention experience and be generalized to enable applicability by other interventions.</i>	Mostly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
<b>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</b>	90%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 6</b>
6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically <b>derived from the findings and/or conclusions</b> . <i>Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.</i>	Fully	A comprehensive set of recommendations is included, clearly linked to the findings and conclusions. Their rationale is well presented, however, they should have been formulated as more "action-oriented" and contain practical guidance, specially where the goal is to avoid "repeating the same mistakes". References to their formulation process are included along with

<p>6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a relevant explanation on the extent to which the evaluation participants were specifically consulted for the formulation of the recommendations and/or the level of participation of stakeholders in this evaluation stage.</i></p>	Fully	prioritization.
<p>6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.</p>	Mostly	
<p>6.4 Clear <b>prioritization and/or classification</b> of recommendations to support use.</p>	Fully	

SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Meets Requirements
<p>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</p>	89%	Executive Feedback on Section 7
<p>7.1 GEWE is integrated in the <b>evaluation scope</b> of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.</p> <p><i>Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.</i></p>	Fully integrated (3)	<p>GEWE is fully integrated. Even though there is no assessment of data on specific gender results, the evaluation scope integrates gender and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Gender is also a standalone criteria. The methodology was satisfactorily gender-responsive. Even though there are references to gender-responsiveness, explanations about how this was incorporated in the evaluation are not clearly outlined. However, mixed data collection methods were applied, the sampling frame was mostly made by women as informants and the evaluation used confidentiality which are appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. Also, there are references to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct. Gender analysis is satisfactorily reflected in the report. Background section contains good explanations on the gender-related issues the intervention was tackling. Findings, conclusions and recommendations contain gender-related analysis to the extent in which it contains analysis related to a project to build capacities for gender-related initiatives. Unanticipated effects are referenced but not specifically identified.</p>
<p>7.2 A <b>gender-responsive methodology</b>, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p><i>Note: it is not enough to simply describe the methodology as “gender-responsive”, it is important to demonstrate that the data collection and analysis integrated gender considerations; that data was collected disaggregated by sex; that methods/tools were designed to enable GEWE assessments; and/or that processes employed (i.e. sampling, triangulation, validation) ensured inclusion and enabled data for GEWE analysis.</i></p>	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
<p>7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p><i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion.</i></p>	Fully integrated (3)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Good
<p>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</p>	73%	Executive Feedback on Section 8
<p>8.1 Report is <b>logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented</b> 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.</p> <p><i>Note: Reasonable length for project/programme and CPE evaluations is about 40 pages (excluding Annexes 60 pages); and 50 pages for institutional and thematic evaluations (excluding Annexes 60 pages).</i></p>	Mostly	<p>Report is complete and well structured. The report is a little long (54 pages) and it could be shortened to about 40 pages to fully meet the criteria. Most key annexes were included but a list of documents consulted should have also been included in the Annex. Opening pages are complete. To be considered a stand-alone piece, the executive summary should have included additional information about the methodology (such as for example, references to lines of evidence that informed the evaluation).</p>
<p>8.2 The <b>title page and opening pages</b> provide key basic information on the name of evaluators and, 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.</p>	Fully	
<p>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.</p> <p><i>Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long.</i></p>	Mostly	
<p>8.4 <b>Annexes</b> should be of reasonable length and 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).</p> <p><i>Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long.</i></p>	Fully	
Additional Information		

Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation <i>Note: This section is to be populated by the QA Reviewer only, based on the overall Evaluation Report. No need to identify specific elements related to this section.</i>	The recommendations table, including a justification/rationale for the recommendation is a good practice used in this evaluation.	
<b>[Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION</b> (weight: 5%) * The score for Section 9 will be 'bonus points' ( 5%), on top of the existing 100% weight. ** Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).	<b>SCALE</b> (No, Partially, Yes)	<b>OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION</b> (Missing, Partial, Sufficient)
<b>Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion?</b>		<b>Sufficient</b>
9.1 The evaluation <b>questions</b> include references to disability inclusion.	Yes	Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): Disability inclusion is among the evaluation questions. The methodology contains references to the participation of people with disabilities in consultations, but details related to their inclusion in the sample of KIs was not included. The topic was referenced in the findings, conclusions and recommendations.
9.2 The evaluation <b>methodology</b> includes references to disability inclusion.	Partially	
9.3 The Evaluation <b>findings, conclusions and/or recommendations</b> contain references to disability inclusion.	Yes	

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?	86.88	Very Good	This evaluation report is well written, contains solid findings based on in-depth analysis. Even though there are some gaps in the methodology description, it contains properly grounded conclusions and recommendations.