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

Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Reviewer Guidance :
Rating explanation	The report can be used with high level of confidence and is considered a good example.	The report can be used with certain degree of confidence.	Partially meets requirements with some missing elements. The report can be used with caution.	Misses out the minimum quality standards.	- Overall reports are rated against a four-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a four-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all). - Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. - **Executive feedback** - provide summary of the extent to which the report meets or fails to meet the criteria provided under each parameter. Please also include suggestions on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating and executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.

Parameter Weight (%)					
	1: Object and context	5	5: Conclusions and lessons learned	20	
	2: Purpose, objectives and scope	5	6: Recommendations	15	***Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)?***
	3: Methodology	15	7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP)	10	**OK**
	4: Findings	20	8: Report presentation	10	
	9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points)	5			

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Evaluation of SIDA Programme Support to UN Women Sudan Country Office (2019-2026)					**Geographical Coverage**	National
Sequence number		23	**Evaluators**	[Female]	[Male]	**Year**	2026
Region		Eastern and Southern Africa	**Country(ies)**	Sudan		**Type of intervention evaluated**	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)			**Evaluation Budget (USD)**			**Reviewer**	C. Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)		**Women's leadership in**				**Review Date**	

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS		
SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	**RATING**	**Very Good**
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	**83%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 1**
1.1 The report clearly specifies the **object** of the evaluation, and provides a clear and complete description of the intervention's original logic (e.g. expected results chain or theory of change), timeframe, intended beneficiaries by type, geographic location(s) as well as the planned budget of the intervention. *Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criteria. If the project did not have a ToC, clearly outline the expected results of the*	Mostly	The intervention is well described with information on the ToC, budget, geographic location and reconstructed expected outcomes. More information on the intervention activities, key partners and stakeholders beneficiaries are still needed to be presented upfront in the document (noting that additional information is presented in the Annex). The context provides a good overview of the direct bearing factors affecting the project (e.g. related to needs in the project outcome areas) which clearly demonstrate its rationale. The implementation changes are clearly outlined.
1.2 The **context** includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic and institutional. This also includes explanation of the contextual gender equality and human rights issues, roles, attitudes and relations. *Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.*	Fully	
1.3 The **key stakeholders** involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described. *Note: Remember to include not only a list of partners but also a description of their main activities and/or the role they had in the implementation of the intervention in the body of report. Detailed description and stakeholder analysis can be provided in annexes.*	Mostly	
1.4 The report identifies any changes in the **timeframe and/or implementation plans** (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation. *Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.*	Fully	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	**RATING**	**Very Good**
Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	**83%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 2**
2.1 **Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:** The evaluation report provides a clear explanation of the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation, including the intended use and users of the evaluation and how the information will be used.	Fully	The purposes, objectives and use of the evaluation are clearly outlined. The description of the evaluation scope should have also confirmed the thematic coverage (or lack of coverage) along with outcomes/outputs covered.
2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the timeframe and outputs/outcomes covered, and not covered (thematically, geographically etc.) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g. specifications by the ToR, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Mostly	
SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	**RATING**	**Very Good**
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	**100%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 3**
3.1 Methodology: The report provides a complete description of the methods used for data collection and analysis, the chosen evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and demonstrate that the methods chosen are appropriate to inform the responses to the criteria and questions. *Note: An evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions in each evaluation criteria, the indicators, the data sources and methods for data collection is useful to show these, but it is still important to include some explanations in the body of the document to clearly demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for triangulation. Remember to keep this section succinct and use annexes to provide*	Fully	The methodology is well described, with clear information about the data collection and analysis used. The lines of evidence are generally well explained and details on the sampling strategy are included. Overall, the methods seem appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions and for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results. Stakeholder consultations are also generally well explained and ethics are referenced. Limitations are clearly outlined and describe well the mitigation strategies and the impact they had in the overall data collection and resulting findings.

3.2 **Data collection, analysis and sampling:** The report clearly describes the tools used for data collection and the rationale for their selection as well as the sampling strategy and methods used for data analysis. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, to guide the assessments of GE/HR specific results and to ensure data accuracy and completeness. *Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIIs, desk review) but also how the data was collected (where, when, who, how) and what steps were taken to analyze it. Remember to include a description of original sampling strategy and the extent to which it covers the range of stakeholders involved in the intervention, with a clear justification of the selection of the targeted sample. Use annexes to provide detailed description.*	Fully	
3.3 **Stakeholders Consultation:** The evaluation report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation. *Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.*	Fully	
3.4 **Limitations:** The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation and if/how these were mitigated (e.g. gaps in the evidence, biases due to limits in stakeholder consultations, etc.).	Fully	
3.5 **Ethics:** The evaluation report makes explicit references to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and shows evidence that data collection and tools adhered to these ethical principles, (e.g. mechanisms and measures were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards, including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations). *Note: Mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to sufficient evidence that the data was actually collected with sensitivity to ethics and discrimination. It is a good practice to provide a clear explanation as to how the evaluation adopted these, showing examples of tools and processes used were sensitive to ethical considerations (e.g. consent, confidentiality) and were not discriminatory against particular group's participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders). Use annexes to provide detailed description*	Fully	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	**87%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 4**
4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities). *Note: It is a good practice to clearly outline the findings in the report, preferably using a "set" of findings statements, with clear articulation and conciseness, followed by substantiation and full demonstration of the evidence used to formulate the findings' statements.*	Fully	A complete assessment is provided in the Findings. The Finding "statements" are specifically referenced in line with each evaluation question, and are also included in the summary of performance ratings in line with each evaluation criteria, directly and consistently responding to the evaluation questions. Comparisons between the reconstructed baseline information and the evaluation findings are clearly outlined. The findings analysis is presented in line with the evaluation questions clearly supporting the statements and providing evidence. The report contains appropriate analysis, well substantiated, consistently and systematically presenting the evidence for the statements (with clear explanations, beyond simply stating the evaluator's findings, but showing the evidence for the finding). Indicators targets and verification status is provided but the project results frameworks of the interventions or a matrix showing the original indicators is missing and should have been included to enable the reader to easily determine the extent in which the coverage is complete. The assessment of efficiency should have contained a more detailed analysis of the likelihood of full use of remaining resources by the end of the intervention cycle. Contribution analysis should have more clearly articulated how the results were achieved, including descriptions of the interventions undertaken to produce the results (cause and effect links) identified in Section 3.2 (noting the detailed analysis at the level of each project). Unintended results are clearly
4.2 The evaluation findings are **well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence** to systematically address the evaluation questions and criteria. *Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.*	Fully	
4.3 Findings reflect systematic and **appropriate analysis** and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments. *Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.*	Mostly	
4.4 Are **cause and effect links** between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted? *Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results*	Mostly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	**Rating**	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	**87%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 5**
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. *Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.*	Fully	The report contains an excellent Conclusions section summarizing and clearly referencing the supporting findings, covering the evaluation criteria. They clearly reflect the analysis presented earlier, present both strenght and weaknesses, and add insights to support some recommendations although some issues in the recommendations still needed additional information to support their rationale. A comprehensive set of lessons is included.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. *Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.*	Mostly	
5.3 Conclusions present the **strengths and weaknesses** of the object (policy, programmes, projects or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	Fully	
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. *Note: The lessons learned from an evaluation comprise the new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (initiative, context outcomes and even evaluation methods) that is applicable to and useful in other similar contexts. They should demonstrate the intervention experience and be generalized to enable applicability by other interventions*	Fully	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	**Rating**	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	**90%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 6**
6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically **derived from the findings and/or conclusions.** *Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.*	Mostly	A reasonable number of recommendations are put forward. They are realistic but some should have contained more explanation of their rationale. They are clearly formulated and are action oriented. The process used to formulate them is described and they are presented in the order of priority for implementation.

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

SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Meets Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	**100%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 7**
7.1 GEWE is integrated in the **evaluation scope** of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected. *Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.*	Fully integrated (3)	Gender is fully integrated in the scope. There is no assessment of data on specific gender results but the evaluation scope integrates gender and evaluation questions related to gender are included. Gender is also a standalone criteria. Methodology is fully gender responsive. Detailed information on the gender-responsive approach used is provided, the methodology used mixed data collection methods, appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results and contain references to the sampling strategy targetting women as well as references to ethics and confidentiality. Gender analysis is fully reflected in the report as appropriate considering the project topic. Findings, conclusions and recommendations contain gender-related analysis but data was not disagregated by sex. Unanticipated effects were clearly outlined. The background section presents a good overview of gender-related issues to be tackled by the project.
7.2 A **gender-responsive methodology,** methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. *Note: it is not enough to simply describe the methodology as "gender-responsive", it is important to demonstrate that the data collection and analysis integrated gender considerations; that data was collected disaggregated by sex; that methods/tools were designed to enable GEWE assessments; and/or that processes employed (i.e. sampling, triangulation, validation) ensured inclusion and enabled data*	Fully integrated (3)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion.	Fully integrated (3)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	**Rating**	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	**80%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 8**
8.1 Report is **logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented** with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles, context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations) and is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. *Note: Reasonable length for project/programme and CPE evaluations is about 40 pages (excluding Annexes 60 pages); and 50 pages for institutional and thematic evaluations (excluding Annexes 60 pages).*	Mostly	Report is logically structured and complete. It is well presented and slightly long (46 pages) and could have been shortened to encourage evaluation use. Initial pages are complete but page breaks could have been better placed. The figures also need better formatting to ensure they are fully readable. Annexes were included in a separate volume but not listed in the ToC. Most key anexes were included (the results frameworks of the projects were not included) but the evaluation matrix does not clearly outline the evaluation questions (even though questions are presented elsewhere in the report). The list of KIs does not provide names (but justification is provided), but still should show the total number of people consulted and the gender of participants. The Ex. Summary is a complete stand-alone section of the report.
8.2 The **title page and opening pages** provide key basic information on the name of evaluators and, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents including, as relevant: tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Mostly	
8.3 The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that includes an overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive summary should be reasonably concise.	Fully	
8.4 **Annexes** should be of reasonable length and include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s). Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long	Mostly	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of ***good practice*** of the evaluation *Note: This section is to be populated by the QA Reviewer only, based on the overall Evaluation Report. No need to identify specific elements related to this section.*	The report contains an ANNEX: Methodological Adaptation Log and GERAAS Checklist Self-Assessment, presenting the consultant's self-assessment against the UN Women GERAAS evaluation report quality checklist which was required to be completed prior to submission of the Draft Evaluation Report (see Annex 8).	

[Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION (weight: 5%) **** The score for Section 9 will be 'bonus points' (5%), on top of the existing 100% weight.*** ***** Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).***	**SCALE** **(No, Partially, Yes)**	**OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION** **(Missing, Partial, Sufficient)**
Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion?		**Sufficient**
9.1 The evaluation **questions** include references to disability inclusion.	Yes	Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): DI was covered in the evaluation questions. The methodology contains specific references to the inclusion of people with disabilities in the sample of KIs. There are references to DI in the findings and conclusions.
9.2 The evaluation **methodology** includes references to disability inclusion.	Yes	
9.3 The Evaluation **findings, conclusions and/or recommendations** contain references to disability inclusion.	Yes	

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING			
Key Guiding Question	**Total weighted score %**	**Overall Rating**	**Other reviewer's comments**
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	**94.49**	**Very Good**	This is an excellent evaluation report. It is very well written and contains a good set of conclusions and recommentations. The number of evaluation questions was extensive and could have been streamline to avoid repetition and enable a more concise report. Nevertheless, the Findings section, is very well substantiated and clearly presents responses to the evaluation questions.