			UN			d Audit Services (IEAS) ality Assessment and Rating	WOMEN	
Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisf	factory	Reviewer Guidance :		
	The report can		Partially meets	Misses out the m			a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which	
	e used with	with certain degree of	requirements with	guality standards.		is an aggregated rating of eight par	ameters.	
hi	igh level of	confidence.	some missing			÷.	ted against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at	
	onfidence and		elements. The report			all).		
	s considered a good example.		can be used with caution.				ethodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are	
explanation	,oou enampier		cuucioni			given more weight. - Fxecutive feedback - provide su	immary of the extent to which the report meets or fails to meet	
-							arameter. Please also include suggestion on how to improve	
		1				future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating , and the executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.		
	1: Object and	5	5: Conclusions and les	sons learned	20			
Donomoton Woight	2: Purpose and	5	6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and (UN-SWAP)	15		Are weightings equal to 100%?		
(%) 3	ເດກe 3:	15		d Human Rights		ок		
	Aethodology							
4: Findings 20 8: Presentation			10					
				P/	ART I: REPOF	T DETAILS		
	inal Evaluati	on of the project "Stan				Geographical Coverage	National	
Sequence number			Evaluators Country(ies)	Maja Barisic Herzegovina	John Vijghen		2019 Project	
Region Portfolio Budget (USI	(D)	Europe and Central Asia 1,969,840.00	Country(ies) Evaluation Budget	Herzegovina 25,000.00	<u> </u>	Type of intervention evaluated Reviewer	Project Claudia Marcondes	
Strategic Plan Thema	-	Prevent VAW&G and	Evaluation budget	23,000.00	T	Reviewer Review Date	09 December 2019	
(select all that apply)						notion batt	0, 5000mb012017	
		·			*	·		
				PART II:	THE EIGHT I	XEY PARAMETERS		
	-	VTEXT OF THE EVALUATI		RATI	ING		Good	
Does the report press evaluation?	sent a clear an	d full description of the '	'object' of the	589	%	1	Executive Feedback on Section 1	
		ject of the evaluation, and					ained and a good overview is provided but more details could have been	
		tion's logic or theory of cha hic location(s) as well as re		Part	tly		uman resources and the types of activities undertaken upfront (in line	
				Mostly		with the ToC), to help the reader understand the analysis provided in the findings section. Good contextual information is provided along with high level explanations of challenges related to the programme problematic is included. More details could have been provided related to the local level context of the interventions.		
		hat have a direct bearing omic, demographic, and i	• •					
		ontextual gender equali					lders involved in the implementation is included in the report. More	
issues, roles, attitude		• · ·					rs at the local level could be added to provide the reader with a clearer and situate the reader to follow the analysis presented in the Findings	
		ed in the implementation	n, including the				the status with explanations of the implications to the evaluation.	
		ners, other stakeholder		Part	tly			
described.								
		mentation status of the						
		v significant changes (e.g curred over time and ex	JI - 0 -					
implications of those			plains the	Eul	1			
implications of those	e enanges for	the evaluation.		Fully				
SECTION 2:	2: PURPOSE, O	BIECTIVES AND SCOPE ((weight 5%)	RATI	ING		Very Good	
		BJECTIVES AND SCOPE (tives and scope sufficient		RATI 100			Very Good	
		,					Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti	urpose, object	tives and scope sufficient	tly clear to guide the			Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati		
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan	tives and use	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti	aluation report ives of the evaluation				Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intende	tives and use anation of the led use and use	tives and scope sufficient	aluation report ives of the evaluation		9%	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan	tives and use anation of the led use and use	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti	aluation report ives of the evaluation	100	9%	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intende information will be u	tives and use anation of the led use and us used.	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation id how the	100	9%	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explar including the intendo information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop	urpose, object tives and use anation of the ded use and us used. pe: The evalu	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an nation report provides cl	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of	100	9%	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu-	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an uation report provides cl ding justification of wha	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation	100	9%	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intendo information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu cover (themat	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an nation report provides cl	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the	100	W	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explat including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi	urpose, object tives and use anation of the ded use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for p	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation d how the lear description of t the evaluation c) as well as the k of access to s at the time of the	100 Ful	W	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explat including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi	urpose, object tives and use anation of the ded use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for p	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically ete ications by the ToRs, lac	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation d how the lear description of t the evaluation c) as well as the k of access to s at the time of the	100 Ful	W	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclus cover (themat pe (eg., specifi ic areas for pe lata/evidence	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention).	100 Ful	ly ly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for p lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically et ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%)	100 Ful Ful RATI	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval the scope of the eval the scope of the eval covers and did not cc reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dz SE is the methodology u	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg, specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the evalue	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically ete ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%)	100 Ful	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclue cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the event	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically ete ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). %) ed and appropriate,	100 Ful Ful RATI	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of de SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Ti relevant design and	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu cover (themat pe (eg, specific ic areas for pp lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the event r the methodo The report spe l sets of method	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ Jogical choice justified? cifies and provides com ods including the chosen	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of at the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plete description of a a vealuation criteria,	100 Ful Ful RATI	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 s presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Th relevant design and questions, and perfo	<pre>urpose, object tives and use nation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg, specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo 'he report spe sets of metho formance stam</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? exifies and provides com ods including the chosen udards. The methods em	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plptet description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are	100 Ful Ful RATI	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intende information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr relevant design and : questions, and perfo appropriate for analy	<pre>urpose, object tives and use nation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg, specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo 'he report spe sets of metho formance stam</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ Jogical choice justified? cifies and provides com ods including the chosen	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plptet description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are	100 Ful Ful RATI 809	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 s presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Th relevant design and questions, and perfo	<pre>urpose, object tives and use nation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg, specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo 'he report spe sets of metho formance stam</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? exifies and provides com ods including the chosen udards. The methods em	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plptet description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are	100 Ful Ful RATI 809	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of erly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of de Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Ti- relevant design and questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope.	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and us used. pe: The evalu luation, inclu cover (themat pe (eg, specific ic areas for pp ic areas for pp ic areas for pt et ata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the event the methodo The report spe l sets of metho primance stam lyzing gender</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? exifies and provides com ods including the chosen udards. The methods em	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of at the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plete description of a a vealuation criteria, ployed are fifed in the evaluation	100 Ful Ful RATI 809	ly ly ING	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to si beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visit	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly tale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cord reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology und and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: The relevant design and is questions, and perfor appropriate for analy scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data	<pre>urpose, object tives and use nation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ev r the methodo of the report spe sets of method ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an ation report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com ods including the chosen idards. The methods emi- and rights issues identi and rights issues identi ionale for their selection	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the characteristic of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plete description of a ne evaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful	ly ly ING ly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage).	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 represented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the evaluation. Agood description of rely positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview of	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Th relevant design and scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Th	urpose, object tives and use nation of the ded use and use used. pe: The evalution, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pri- lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ev- r the methodo The report species la sets of methodo a set of methodo a set of methodo a set of methodo a sources, rat The report incomestion a sources, rat Set of the report incomestion the report incomesti	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an ination report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically etr ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com idards. The methods em, and rights issues identi- ionale for their selectior cludes discussion of how	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choices to s at the time of the of the intervention). %) ed and appropriate, in evaluation criteria, ployed are affied in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data	100 Ful Ful RATI 809	ly ly ING ly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visil selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly tale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intende information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not co reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da sevaluation, lack of da and the rationale for appropriate for analy scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. T	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalue luation, inclue cover (themat pe (eg., specifi ic areas for pre lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo The report speel sets of method ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a dives</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an ation report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com ods including the chosen idards. The methods emi- and rights issues identi and rights issues identi ionale for their selection	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choices to s at the time of the of the intervention). %) ed and appropriate, in evaluation criteria, ployed are affied in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful	ly ly ING ly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 spresented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for to of these sof evidence could have been included. A good overview oo nts is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: TT relevant design and questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. TT sources was used to and overcome data li	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalue luation, inclue cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pp lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo The report spe l sets of methor promance stam lyzing gender , analysis ana a sources, rat he report inco o obtain a dive limitations.</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ logical choice justified? cifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi d sampling: The report ionale for their selection cludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of at the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are and a collection and v the mix of data asure data accuracy	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful	ly ly ING ly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visit selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: The relevant design and i questions, and perfor appropriate for analy scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. The sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat Che report inc a sources, rat Che report in dive limitations.</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an ination report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically etr ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com idards. The methods em, and rights issues identi- ionale for their selectior cludes discussion of how	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the choice as the choice as the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a a evaluation criteria, ployed are fified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data usure data accuracy ives a complete	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful	ly ly ING ly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: The relevant design and for appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. The sources was used to and overcome data In 3.3 Stakeholders Co description of stakeholders Co	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME used for the evalut or the methodo of the report spen- sets of method ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a dive- limitations. tholder's cons	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? cifies and provides com ods including the chosen and rights issues identi d sampling: The report ionale for their selection cludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plete description of a nevaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data nsure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful	% ly ly ly ly tly tly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: The relevant design and - questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. The sources was used to and overcome data li 3.3 Stakeholders Co description of stakeholders co	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME used for the evalut or the methodo of the report spen- sets of method ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a dive- limitations. tholder's cons	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically et ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- ological choice justified? ecifies and provides com odds including the chosen idards. The methods emi- and rights issues identi d sampling: The report ionale for their selectior ludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plete description of a nevaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data nsure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful Mos	% ly ly ly ly tly tly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: The relevant design and : questions, and perfor appropriate for analy scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. The sources was used to and overcome data li 3.3 Stakeholders Co description of stakel the rationale for sele	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclut cover (themat pe (eg, specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME methodo 's est of methodo 's ests of methodo ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inc o obtain a dive limitations. onsultation: holder's cons ecting the par</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically et ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? cifies and provides com ds including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi inde for their selectior cludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e rticular level and activiti	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a a evaluation criteria, ployed are fified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and r the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including iss for consultation.	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful Mos	% ly ly ly ly tly tly	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and - questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr- sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakeh the rationale for selec- 3.4 Limitations: The	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME eECTION 3 : ME used for the evalut or the methodo The report spe sets of metho formance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divec limitations. onsultation: -holder's cons ecting the part e report preso e repor</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eto ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com ods including the chosen idards. The methods emi- and rights issues identi d sampling: The report ionale for their selectior iudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e- ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are fied in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation.	100 Ful RATI 80 ⁰ Ful Mos	% ly ly ly ly thy thy thy	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and - questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co description of stakef the rationale for sele 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and constitutions.	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ECTION 3 : ME used for the evalut of the report spe is ets of method ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o brain a dive bimitations. onsultation: -holder's cons ecting the par e report presest straints faced</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically et ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com ods including the chosen idards. The methods em or and rights issues identi d sampling: The report ionale for their selectior cludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu-	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, plete description of a nevaluation criteria, ployed are and appropriate as the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the	100 Ful Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos	% ly ly ly ly thy thy thy	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation pu evaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intende information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cc reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tf relevant design and : questions, and perfo appropriate for analy scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tf sources was used to and overcome data li 3.3 Stakeholders Co description of stakef the rationale for sele imitations: The limitations: The eval	urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalu- luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pre- lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the ev- r the methodo The report spec- sets of methodo ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco- o obtain a divec- limitations. onsultation: sholder's cons- ecting the par- e report presses straints faced aluation report	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eto ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com ods including the chosen idards. The methods emi- and rights issues identified totale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e- ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete	 ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation of a well as the ck of access to as at the time of the of the intervention). as well as the ck of access to at a the time of the of the intervention). ad and appropriate, and appropriate are if if a the evaluation criteria, ployed are if if a the evaluation clearly description of a not a collection and the mix of data ascuracy ives a complete evaluation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to 	100 Ful Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos	% Iy Iy Iy Iu	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 a presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on ns is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to inducted in line with UREG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and - questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr sources was used to and overcome data li 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selec 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and consi 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that y	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg, specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME eECTION 3 : ME used for the ever r the methodo of he report spe sets of metho formance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divec limitations. onsultation: endoder's conse ecting the par e report preses straints faced iluation report n design inclu- were implem</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? excifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi ionale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- ti includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the choice as the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, ployed are fifed in the evaluation clearly description of a nevaluation criteria, ployed are fifed in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data nsure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process.	100 Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos	W Iy Iy Ing Market of the second seco	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 as presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rrly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for so of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on its is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to onducted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and - questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr- sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selec- 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and const 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that was the selec- and measures that was the selec- selec- and measures that was the selec- and measures that was the selec- and measures that was the selec- and measures that was the selec- selec- and measures that was the selec- and measures that was the selec-	urpose, object tives and use nation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the evalut or the methodo of he report spention is sets of methodor ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divac- no design inclu- e report presson straints faced aluation report n design inclu- were implem SECTION 4:	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically et ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? ecifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em or and rights issues identi ionale for their selectior ludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, includ t includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards ented to ensure that the FINDINGS (weight 20%)	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, ified and appropriate, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process.	100 Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos Ful	W Iv Iv Iv Iv ing	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rely positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of ts selection is included. More information about the rationale for hos is included. highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to and the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line Fair	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of da SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and - questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr- sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selec- 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and const 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that was	urpose, object tives and use nation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specific ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME used for the evalut or the methodo of he report spention is sets of methodor ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divac- no design inclu- e report presson straints faced aluation report n design inclu- were implem SECTION 4:	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? excifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi ionale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- ti includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, ified and appropriate, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process.	100 Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos	W Iv Iv Iv Iv ing	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 as presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rrly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of t selection is included. More information about the rationale for so of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on its is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to onducted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and : questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr sources was used to and overcome data li 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selection 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and consi 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that y Are the findings clean 4.1The evaluation repor-	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME methodo The report spe sets of metho ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divec limitations. onsultation: -holder's cons ecting the par e report presest straints faced aluation report n design inclu- were implem SECTION 4: Irty presented ovt findings pr</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? excifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi ionale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- t includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards ented to ensure that the FINDINGS (weight 20%) , relevant and based on e	ty clear to guide the aluation report tives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process evidence? igh quality evidence to	100 Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos Ful	W Iv Iv Iv Iv ing	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to si beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Propriate for the reaport with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rry positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of ts election is included. More information about the rationale for hos of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on his is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to broducted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line Fair Executive Feedback on Section 4 valuation questions and criteria, the findings could be better	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and : questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr sources was used to and overcome data li 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selection 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and consi 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that y Are the findings clean 4.1The evaluation repor-	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME methodo The report spe sets of metho ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divec limitations. onsultation: -holder's cons ecting the par e report presest straints faced aluation report n design inclu- were implem SECTION 4: Irty presented ovt findings pr</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically et ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? cifies and provides com dods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi includes the selection cludes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e rticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- tincludes a discussion of dided ethical safeguards ented to ensure that the FINDINGS (weight 20%) , relevant and based on o	ty clear to guide the aluation report tives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process evidence? igh quality evidence to	100 Ful Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos Ful Mos	Iv Iv Iv Iv Iv ing %	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 Ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rrly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of to fet hese lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on this is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to producted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line Fair Executive Feedback on Section 4 valuation questions and criteria, the findings could be better g systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence.	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and : questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selec 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and consi 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that y Are the findings clean 4.1The evaluation repor-	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME methodo The report spe sets of metho ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divec limitations. onsultation: -holder's cons ecting the par e report presest straints faced aluation report n design inclu- were implem SECTION 4: Irty presented ovt findings pr</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? excifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi ionale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- t includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards ented to ensure that the FINDINGS (weight 20%) , relevant and based on e	ty clear to guide the aluation report tives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process evidence? igh quality evidence to	100 Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos Ful	Iv Iv Iv Iv Iv ing %	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sh beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly lale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good overview of ts election is included. More information about the rationale for of these lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview of not solve the selection of the overall conduct of the evaluation in line Fair Executive Feedback on Section 4 Valuation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line valuation questions and criteria, the findings could be better g systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence. led information as well as supportive evidence presented. In many	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: Tr- relevant design and : questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. Tr sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for selec 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and consi 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that y Are the findings clean 4.1The evaluation repor-	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME ection 3 : ME methodo The report spe sets of metho ormance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report inco o obtain a divec limitations. onsultation: -holder's cons ecting the par e report presest straints faced aluation report n design inclu- were implem SECTION 4: Irty presented ovt findings pr</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? excifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi ionale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- t includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards ented to ensure that the FINDINGS (weight 20%) , relevant and based on e	ty clear to guide the aluation report tives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the ck of access to s at the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a n evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are an evaluation criteria, ployed are ified in the evaluation clearly describes the n, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including ies for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process evidence? igh quality evidence to	100 Ful Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos Ful Mos	Iv Iv Iv Iv Iv ing %	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ratior information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 Ion are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Presented in the report with details presented in the Annex. The data propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rrly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of to fet hese lines of evidence could have been included. A good overview on this is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to producted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line Fair Executive Feedback on Section 4 valuation questions and criteria, the findings could be better g systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence.	
Are the evaluation puevaluation? 2.1 Purpose, objecti provides clear explan including the intended information will be u 2.2 Evaluation Scop the scope of the eval covers and did not cor- reasons for this scop particular geographi evaluation, lack of dat SE Is the methodology u and the rationale for 3.1 Methodology: The relevant design and 3- questions, and perfor appropriate for analy- scope. 3.2 Data collection, methods for the data analysis methods. The sources was used to and overcome data II 3.3 Stakeholders Co- description of stakef the rationale for sele 3.4 Limitations: The limitations and consi 3.5 Ethics: The evaluation and measures that y Are the findings clear 4.1The evaluation repor- systematically address	<pre>urpose, object tives and use anation of the led use and use used. pe: The evalut luation, inclu- cover (themat pe (eg., specif ic areas for pe lata/evidence ECTION 3 : ME methodo The report spe sets of metho- for he report spe sets of metho- formance stan lyzing gender , analysis and a sources, rat The report ing a sources, rat the report ind a sources, rat the report ind a sources, rat the report ind setting the par e report prese- straints faced aluation report ind design inclu- were implem SECTION 4: irly presented ort findings pr s all of the eval</pre>	tives and scope sufficient of evaluation: The eva purpose and the objecti sers of the evaluation an attion report provides cl ding justification of wha ically, geographically eta ications by the ToRs, lac olitical or safety reasons on particular elements THODOLOGY (weight 15 valuation clearly describ- logical choice justified? excifies and provides com ods including the chosen dards. The methods em and rights issues identi ionale for their selection idudes discussion of how ersity of perspectives, er The evaluation report gi ultation process in the e ticular level and activiti ents clear and complete by the evaluation, inclu- t includes a discussion of ided ethical safeguards ented to ensure that the FINDINGS (weight 20%) , relevant and based on e	ty clear to guide the aluation report ives of the evaluation ad how the lear description of it the evaluation c) as well as the choice as the choice as the time of the of the intervention). (%) ed and appropriate, uplete description of a the evaluation criteria, ployed are fifed in the evaluation clearly describes the a, data collection and the mix of data asure data accuracy ives a complete evaluation, including les for consultation. description of ding gaps in the of the extent to a evaluation process evidence? igh quality evidence to ria.	100 Ful Ful RATI 809 Ful Mos Ful Mos Ful Mos	% ly ly ly Mark ly thy thy ly thy	Purpose, objectives and use of evaluati and geographic coverage). A good overview of the methodology is collection and analysis methods are ap specific results, considering this is the outlined and contain a high level ration information about sampling helps to sl beneficiaries in survey results is prope stakeholders consultation and site visi selection of the Key Informants in each the evaluation limitations and constrai ethics per se, but the evaluation was co- references to the inclusion of ethics in with those.	Executive Feedback on Section 2 In are clearly outlined. Scope is properly outlined (including thematic Very Good Executive Feedback on Section 3 Propriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. Data sources are clearly hale for the selection of the country visits and case studies. More how robustness of the evaluation approach. Limited representation of rrly positioned as limitations of the evaluation. A good description of ts selection is included. More information about the rationale for is is included, highlighting evidence gaps. There is no reference to anducted in line with UNEG Guidelines. Suggest including some specific the evaluation design and the overall conduct of the evaluation in line Fair Executive Feedback on Section 4 valuation questions and criteria, the findings could be better g systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence. led information as well as supportive evidence presented. In many in the statement of the findings and the analysis backing it. The findings	

		and present an assessment of their magnitude and importance. Findings could be better at itculated and more
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Partly	clearly respond to the evaluation criteria and questions. The narrative is not always logic and coherently and i is difficult for the reader to follow the rationale and the arguments presented in many sections.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Partly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by	72%	Frankins Facility of a first of f
evidence?		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 are directly connected to the findings. However, conclusions are very summarized and more information to properly demonstrate the substantiation could have been included.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and		Even if too summarized, the conclusions provide good insights and properly ground and go beyond the findings. Conclusions put forward a good balance between strengths and weaknesses identified and represent
analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	a range of views. A few lessons are included but not all are properly articulated as such, in a generalized way
5.3 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses 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-	Fully	as to enable their applicability in other contexts.
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	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly	50%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
presented in a priority order? 6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Mostly	Most recommendations derive from the analysis, but some issues (re: R.1 - HR based approach) could have benefited of a more comprehensive analysis in the findings section and references under conclusions. Process
6.2 The repor t describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	for developing the recommendations is described but consultations involved only the Project Team. Suggest ensuring that all recommendations are actionable, targeted and contain clear directions for implementation. Not all do and they should contain enough information to enable implementation. Some prioritization is provided (longer/short term).
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Partly	provideu (tonger) sitor (term).
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:	78%	Executive Feedback on Section 7
this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards. 7.1 GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and	Fully integrated (3)	GEWE is fully integrated in the evaluation scope. The evaluation objectives are gender-related. No specific
questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.		GEEW criterion was included but gender was mainstreamed as appropriate considering the topic of the
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender		intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender		intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerions. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly rovided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations and recommendations relate and reflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well 	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations relate and reflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations relate and treflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? 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 be followed by 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating 73%	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to dward adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? 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 subtiles; 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 unit wising a recommendations, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating 73% Partly	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not excessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations relate and reflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? 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 recommendation; and written in an accessible hamaneouth mismismed resummation constitution, 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 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. 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 questionnaries), list of documentary evidence. 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating 73% Partly Fully	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not excessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations relate and reflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? 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 and well presented? 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 purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive summary should be reasonably concise. 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, 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating Rating Partly Fully Fully	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation contains references to adherence to UNEG guidelines and UN Women Evaluation Policy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Data collected was disaggregated by sex. Gender analysis is partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not excessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations relate and reflect gender analysis, consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is assessing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? 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 hamone with mismore and presentation, table of contents -including, as 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. 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. 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating Rating Partly Fully Fully	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KIs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy principles but no specific information is presented to demonstrate how data and analysis partially reflected. The background section contains analysis of VAW in the country as appropriate for evaluation topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are not sections are not strong.
 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? 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 and well prevented basiense housing 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 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. 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, Additional Information 	Satisfactorily integrated (2) Rating Rating Rating Partly Fully Fully Fully Fully	intervention. The evaluation noted data gaps during the implementation period, including no data on prevalence of Violence Against Womeni. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. Methodology was comprehensive using mixed methods of data collection and generally they are appropriate for analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results, considering this is the topic of the overall UN Women evaluation. A diverse range of data sources was used. Some explanation is provided regarding the sampling frame but more details are needed to better justify the selection of KLs. Also suggest adding more details about the representation of the beneficiary population in the total universe of survey, the response rate obtained and the statistically significance of the survey results. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation Policy The valuation adopted UN Women Evaluation Folicy. The evaluation adopted UN Women Evaluation to pic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are geared towards improvements in GEEW related issues, however, the findings are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. Unanticipated effects have been identified. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are not encommendations relate and reflect gender analysis. Consistent with the fact that the project evaluation is pressing gender related outcomes. While the criteria was met satisfactorily, the analysis in these sections (e.g. Findings, particularly) do not read well and are not clearly artitue. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report, including table of contents and foreword, as well as timeframe and names of evaluators. Suggest also adding a list of tables/figures and graphs. The executive summary is complete. A complete set of Annexes is included in the report.

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?	63.52	Fair	Overall this report needs to be used with caution as the analysis and assessments provided in the Findings section are not always properly substantiated by the evidence, the arguments are not clearly articulated and the explanations for all elements of the findings are not necessarily properly provided. This and the fact that there is limited information about the project activities and interventions at the local level (upfront) makes it difficult for the reader to follow the assessments made.
---	-------	------	---