



UNEG

United Nations Evaluation Group

Guidance
Document

UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note

Oversight

5. Evaluation Performance Indicator				
Not Applicable	Missing	Approaches requirements	Meets requirements	Exceeds requirements
5a. Performance indicator is not relevant to a UN entity	5b. None of the UNEG gender-related norms and standards are met	5c. Meets some of the UNEG gender-related norms and standards	5d. Meets the UNEG gender-related norms and standards	5ei. Meets the UNEG gender-related norms and standards and 5eii. Demonstrates effective use of the UNEG guidance on evaluating from a human rights and gender equality perspective

Mandate to Integrate Gender Equality in Evaluation:

ECOSOC Resolution 2007/33¹ requests the United Nations system, including United Nations agencies, funds and programmes within their organizational mandates, to strengthen institutional accountability mechanisms, including through a more effective monitoring and evaluation framework for gender mainstreaming based on common United Nations evaluation standards.

Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review Resolution A/RES/67/226¹ notes the development of the **norms and standards** for evaluation by the **United Nations Evaluation Group** as a professional network, and encourages the use of these norms and standards in the evaluation functions of United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies, as well as in system-wide evaluations of operational activities for development; *encourages* the United Nations development system to institute greater accountability for gender equality in evaluations conducted by country teams by including gender perspectives in such evaluations; and *welcomes* the development of the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, under the leadership of UN-Women, as an accountability framework to be fully implemented by the United Nations development system.

I. Introduction

This note is meant to support the Evaluation Offices of UN entities to comply with the annual reporting process against the CEB-endorsed UN SWAP¹ Evaluation Performance Indicator. It is also meant to support more systematic and harmonized reporting through the use of a common tool that also allows for improved comparability across UN entities.

UN entities are expected to meet UN SWAP performance standards by 2017, with an extended timeframe to 2019 for those entities with a mainly technical focus. Furthermore, the recent Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review Resolution (A/RES/67/226) adopted by the General Assembly in December 2012 requests ‘the Joint Inspection Unit to undertake a system-wide evaluation of the effectiveness, value added and impact of the System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women as a tool for performance monitoring and accountability for submission to the General Assembly following its full implementation.’ Accordingly, this requires that systems to report against this performance indicator are developed and in place so that progress can be shown by UN entities and as an input to the evaluation.

The ultimate goal is that all UN system entities “meet requirements” related to this Performance Indicator in terms of integrating gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW) in their respective evaluations. However, achieving this is only considered a starting point to fully integrating gender dimensions in evaluation processes, rather than an end in itself. UN entities should continually strive to “exceed requirements” if the UN system is to truly benefit from gender responsive evaluation practice.

Nevertheless, integrating gender dimensions in evaluation is still a relatively new area of practice in evaluation. Institutional and methodological challenges exist and a shift in the way evaluations are conducted is required. The development and testing of new gender responsive approaches and methods must also be undertaken and fully implemented. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that UN entities may not be in a position of ‘meeting requirements’ for this indicator immediately, and a 3-5 year period is more realistic.

It is expected that the act of monitoring and reporting against this indicator will provide constructive momentum for reviewing progress made and reflecting on continuing challenges so as to improve performance over time, at both the level of the individual entity and the UN system.

II. Implementing and Reporting Against the UN SWAP Evaluation Indicator

To report on progress against the UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator, UN entities will need to:

- Implement the gender-related UNEG Norms, Standards and Guidance in their evaluation practice

¹ For more information on the UN SWAP and the full introduction to performance indicators and technical notes please consult: <http://www.unwomen.org/2012/04/un-women-welcomes-a-landmark-action-plan-to-measure-gender-equality-across-the-un-system/>

- Conduct a meta-review/evaluation of a portion of the evaluations that they have managed and/or conducted during a one-year period that assesses the level of integration of gender dimensions in their evaluation processes.

The use of the UN SWAP Evaluation Scorecard (see Annex 1 and Section V for further detail) provides a basis for harmonising the meta-reviews/evaluations conducted by different entities by assigning an overall aggregate score for reporting against the UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator's scaled rating system: *missing, approaching requirements, meeting requirements, or exceeding requirements*. In rare cases, some criteria of the scorecard may "*not be applicable*" and clear justification should be provided for entities reporting as such.

N.B.

- UN entities that have already established meta-review/evaluation processes (conducted internally or externally) should seek to incorporate all elements of the guidance provided in this note and the Scorecard into their existing processes so as to institutionalize the review of these elements and avoid parallel or duplicate reporting processes.
- Those UN entities that have no such processes in place should use the Scorecard to report against this performance indicator.

It is important that Evaluation Offices conduct an annual meta-review/evaluation in order to report on their performance by the UN SWAP reporting deadline. Respective evaluation units should assess whether they have the capacity to undertake the meta-review/evaluation internally or whether there is a need to utilize external resources to undertake the exercise.²

III. What are the UNEG gender-related Norms, Standards and Guidance?

The UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation³ were developed in response to General Assembly resolution A/RES/59/250⁴. While the UNEG Norms seek to facilitate system-wide collaboration on evaluation by ensuring that evaluation entities within the UN follow basic principles, the UNEG Standards are intended to guide the establishment of the institutional framework, management of the evaluation function and the conduct and use of evaluations. The following box outlines the specific UNEG gender-related norms and standards for evaluation.

² For example, WFP has for this first reporting cycle hired an external consultant to conduct a meta-review to report against this performance indicator.

³ For link to full list of UNEG Norms and Standards, please download at:
<http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp>

⁴ Document A/C.2/59/L.63 of 17 December, paragraph 69.

UNEG Gender Related Norms and Standards

Competencies (Standard 2.4) – Evaluators need to have technical knowledge of, and be familiar with, the methodology or approach that will be needed for the specific evaluation to be undertaken, as well as certain managerial and personal skills.

Specialized experience and/or methodological/technical knowledge, including some specific data collection and analytical skills, may be particularly useful in the following areas:

‘Understanding of gender considerations’.

Ethics (Norm 11 and Standard 2.5)

- Norm 11: In light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality.
- Standard 2.5: Evaluators should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders:
‘Evaluators should be aware of differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction and gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations.’

Design (Standard 3.7) - Evaluation methodologies should be sufficiently rigorous to assess the subject of evaluation and ensure a complete, fair and unbiased assessment:

‘... Methodology should explicitly address issues of gender and under-represented groups.’

Design (Standard 3.9) – The evaluation design should, when relevant, include considerations as to what extent the UN system’s commitment to the human-rights based approach has been incorporated in the design of the undertaking to be evaluated with specific consideration of gender issues.

Selection of Team (Standard 3.14) – the composition of evaluation teams should be gender balanced, geographically diverse and include professionals from the countries or regions concerned.

Implementation (Standard 3.15) – Evaluations should be conducted in a professional and ethical manner.
‘Evaluations must be gender and culturally sensitive and respect the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed’.

Report (Standard 4.8) – The evaluation report should indicate the extent to which gender issues and considerations were incorporated where applicable.

- How gender issues were implemented as a cross-cutting theme in programming, and if the subject being evaluated gave sufficient attention to promote gender equality and gender sensitivity
- The report should include an analysis of gender and how the design and implementation of the subject being evaluated addressed the gaps.

In addition to establishing evaluation norms and standards for the UN system, UNEG has developed a number of guidance documents that further elaborate on the specific gender-related norms and standards outlined above. *These documents define gender equality responsive evaluation as one that incorporates the gender equality mainstreaming principles into evaluation such as equality, inclusion and non-discrimination. By doing so, such evaluations contribute to the social and economic change process that is central to most development programming by identifying and analyzing gender inequalities, discriminatory practices and unjust power relations that are central to development problems.*

Conducting gender responsive evaluation can lead to more effective interventions and better and more sustainable results.

It is important to note that existing UNEG guidance covers the integration of both human rights and gender equality (HR & GE) dimensions in evaluation. This is due to the fact that both dimensions are closely interlinked, with women's rights and gender equality an integral part of the human rights framework and the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA). Therefore, gender equality responsive evaluation also calls for attention to the women's rights dimension of the HRBA. The key UNEG guidance documents covering integration of gender equality in evaluation are:

- [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – Towards UNEG Guidance](#)
Approved by the UNEG AGM in 2011, this handbook is a practical, user-friendly guidebook on how to include human rights and gender equality in evaluations. It offers tools and resources to include gender equality in evaluations by providing guidance throughout all phases of an evaluation.
- [UNEG Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference \(TOR\) and Inception Report](#)
Approved at the UNEG AGM 2010, this quality checklist serves as a guideline in the design and conduct of evaluations. The use and application of section 9 of this document provides criteria for assessing the integration of gender equality into TOR and inception reports.
- [UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports](#)
Approved at the UNEG AGM 2010, this quality checklist for evaluation reports serves as a guideline in the preparation and assessment of an evaluation report. The use and application of section 8 of this document provides criteria for assessing the integration of gender equality into evaluation reports.
- [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#) and the [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation](#)
Approved in 2008, these guidelines are based on commonly-held and internationally recognized professional ideals for the conduct of evaluation. The Guidelines and Code include requirements for considering gender roles in cultural context, experience and competency with gender issues, and gender balance among evaluators.

The Scorecard criteria have been drawn from the above UNEG references. In addition, some UN entities have also incorporated the UNEG gender-related norms, standards and accompanying guidance into their own evaluation guidance and tools (e.g. generic TOR, evaluation report outline, internal guidance notes, etc.) and these provide a more customised reference for assessing performance against this indicator for those entities.⁵

IV. What should be included in the meta-review/evaluation?

For the purpose of reporting against this indicator, UN entities should include in their meta-review/evaluation only those assessments that meet the UNEG definition for evaluation:

⁵ For example, ILO has produced a guidance note to [Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects](#), which succinctly sets out the main steps that should be taken through the evaluation cycle and which is applicable to most UN System organizations.

An evaluation is ‘an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance etc. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the organizations of the UN system. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of the organizations of the UN system and its members’.

There are other forms of assessments being conducted in the UN system that vary in purpose and level of analysis, and may have some overlapping elements. Evaluation is to be differentiated from the following: self-assessments, appraisals, monitoring exercises, reviews, inspections, investigations, audit, research and internal management consulting. While useful in their own right, these assessments should not be included in the meta-review/evaluation.

Both evaluations conducted or managed by central evaluation offices and decentralized evaluations undertaken by entities should be included in the meta-review/evaluation.

- For UN entities with a *high number of evaluations*, a minimum of 30 evaluations carried out by the entity for the year should be included in the meta-review/evaluation.
- For UN entities with a *volume of less than 30 evaluations* managed and/or conducted for the year under review, a 100% of evaluations should be included in the meta-review/evaluation.
- Those entities with *established meta-review/evaluation processes* in place should include a 100% of evaluations for the year under review.

Those entities selecting a sample of evaluations for meta-review/evaluation should aim to select a representative sample so as to minimize sample bias. Selection criteria should include:

- Evaluation managed/conducted by both central evaluation offices and decentralized evaluations;
- Balance in terms of mid-term versus final evaluations;
- A mix of evaluation types: project, programme, policy, outcome, impact, evaluation of normative work, strategic, etc.;
- A balanced mix of topics, themes and sectors;
- Widespread geographical coverage;
- Interventions⁶ where gender equality is the primary focus of the interventions and where gender is not the primary focus but mainstreamed throughout the intervention.

⁶ The term ‘interventions’ can be substituted by ‘policies’ or ‘strategies’ depending on the type of evaluation conducted to better reflect the nature and focus of institutional evaluations. Since the reporting tool is organized around standard evaluation practice it is in principle adaptable to different evaluation typologies (e.g. evaluation of normative work, policy, institutional evaluations, etc),

Although the UNEG guidance may at first seem more useful to development evaluation, it is built on general evaluation practice and elements can be extracted, adapted and used for a broad range of evaluation types (e.g. evaluation of normative work, policy, institutional evaluations, etc.).⁷

V. UN SWAP Evaluation Scorecard

The *UN SWAP Evaluation Scorecard (Annex 1)* is a reporting tool organised around 13 scoring criteria which are articulated around 3 headings that capture the overall elements related to mainstreaming gender equality throughout the evaluation process.⁸ Scoring is from 0 to 2. Data sources for reporting against the 13 scoring criteria include: design documents (evaluability assessments, TOR, inception reports), evaluation reports, management responses, and evaluation guidance documents. As relevant, some entities may also include phone interviews in view of collecting data from evaluation managers and evaluation teams.

1. How to score each evaluation criterion

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report using the following rating system for each criterion. Each of the scoring levels below corresponds to a numbered score:

- Not applicable: This rating applies when a criterion is not relevant. Although all UN evaluations should meet the UNEG gender-related Norms and Standards, there may be

How to distinguish between the 'Non Applicable' and 'Missing' categories?

Non-applicable: can pertain to highly technical areas of work where integrating gender considerations may not be possible. For instance, due to the nature of its highly technical work, it is not always possible to integrate gender implications in all of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) areas of work, such as: (i) the introduction of international standards related to the transport of dangerous goods by air or (ii) the production of guidance on the application of market-based measures aimed at reducing the environmental impact of aircraft engine emissions to name only a few. As a result, ICAO identified the 'evaluability' criterion as non-applicable to most of its technical areas of work but recognized the relevance of GEEW measures in their Human Resource function, particularly related to recruitment and stakeholder participation and representation of women in the profession which needs to strengthen its gender balance (the complete response from ICAO on how the applicability of the scorecard can be found in Annex 2)

Missing: applies to a situation where none of the elements under a criterion have been met. This may partly be because the institutional guidance, tools or systems to support the integration of GEEW are not yet in place. The entity should score the criteria as missing and note the need to develop these to improve performance. For instance, before a UN entity considers the assessment of the evaluability of gender equality aspects as non-applicable, it should really question whether this is due to operational/procedural matters or whether it is truly not relevant to the type of evaluation it conducts. If it is a matter of guidance, tools, systems, processes or prioritization not being in place the 'missing' rating would apply whereas if it is a question of not being relevant to the particular work of a given UN entity, the 'non applicable' rating would apply, as in the example of ICAO above.

⁷ UNEG is currently working to develop guidance on both the evaluation of normative work and impact evaluation and these will provide some more specific guidance on the integration of gender in these types of evaluations.

⁸ It has been developed from the principles outlined in the UNEG gender-responsive norms and standards, guidance, existing UNEG checklists, ethical code, etc.

some isolated cases where it may not be possible to integrate gender given the nature of the intervention being evaluated. (N/A.)

- Missing: This rating applies where none of the elements under a criterion are met (0).
- Partially met: This rating applies to a situation where at least one element under a criterion is met, but remedial action to fully meet the standard is required (1)
- Fully met: This rating applies if all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in evaluation processes and no remedial action is required (2).

There is an additional score of ‘exceeding requirements’ which is applicable to an overall evaluation report and meta-review/evaluation scores only. This is due to the fact that a criterion is met by fully implementing the gender-related UNEG Norms and Standards and assessing when a criterion would “exceed requirements” by demonstrating the “effective use of the UNEG guidance” would be difficult. Therefore the score of ‘exceeding requirements’ is not used for individual criterion.

2. How to score each evaluation report

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report by determining the rating for each criterion as outlined above. To calculate the overall individual evaluation score the total number of points for each criterion should be added up and be divided by the total number of criteria.

The overall evaluation rating will be given using the scoring system below:

- 0 – 0.50 points = Missing
- 0.51 – 1.25 = Approaching requirements
- 1.26 – 1.75 = Meeting requirements
- Aggregate meta-review/evaluation score of 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements

For example, if the aggregate evaluation score is 1.76 or above the rating for the evaluation would be ‘Exceeds Requirements’ while an average of 1.5 would be ‘Meeting Requirements’.

It is important to note that the number of criteria scored as ‘Not Applicable’ should be taken out of the overall number of criteria so as not to bring the overall rating down. For example, if 3 out of 13 criteria are not applicable then the total number of points should be divided by 10, which corresponds to number of applicable criteria.

3. How to calculate the meta-review/evaluation score

The scoring system above used to score individual evaluation reports will also provide the aggregate overall rating for the evaluation performance indicator. To calculate the meta-review/evaluation score, the average score for each evaluation under review is added and then divided by the total number of evaluations to give an aggregate average.

The aggregate meta-evaluation scoring system used to report against the evaluation performance indicator is as follows:

- 0 – 0.50 points = Missing

- 0.51 – 1.25 = Approaching requirements
- 1.26 – 1.75 = Meeting requirements
- Aggregate meta-review/evaluation score of 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements

For example, if there are three evaluations in the meta-review/evaluation that have individual scores of 1.10, 1.45, and 1.95 respectively, the sum of the three scores would be 4.50, which divided by 3 (the number of evaluations under review) would give an average of 1.50. This would give a meta-review/evaluation rating of “Meeting Requirements”.

While providing an aggregate score that allows to report against the UN SWAP evaluation performance indicator, the system also allows the calculation of aggregate scores by criterion allowing UN entities to identify where they are doing well and potential bottlenecks in the process of mainstreaming gender throughout the evaluation cycle. To develop an aggregate score by criterion, the results for each criterion under review are added up and divided by the number of evaluations. The same system that is used to develop the aggregate meta-review/evaluation scoring described above is used to determine the aggregate meta-score per criterion.

Examples of completed scorecards on how to report against this performance indicator can be found in Annex 3).

VI. Online Reporting System

During annual UN SWAP reporting, Evaluation Offices are responsible for conducting and sharing their meta-reviews/evaluations and/or completed Scorecards with their UN SWAP focal point, who is responsible for uploading these on the [web-based reporting system](#). Evaluation Offices are also encouraged to include examples of evaluations that demonstrate how entities are approaching, meeting or exceeding requirements for this indicator overall or for specific dimensions. Reporting should outline challenges, barriers and factors supporting implementation. Evaluation Office staff are encouraged to view the web-based reporting system section for the evaluation indicator to familiarize themselves with the different areas for input.⁹

⁹ The web-based reporting system section on evaluation will be updated to align with the UNEG AGM endorsed Scorecard and Technical Note.

ANNEX 1: UN SWAP - Individual Evaluation Scoring Tool

Evaluation Process	Scoring Criteria	Annotations	Scoring per Criteria (0-2) *guidance on	Comment on Scoring (Explanation of why rating has been given, including data sources)	Data Sources/ Evidence Base
1. Evaluation Preparation	Evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention is assessed and steps/measures are taken to maximize the evaluability of GEEW aspects.	The evaluability assessment should determine whether an intervention is ready to be evaluated. It should also determine whether 1) its GEEW aspects can be evaluated or not (i.e. the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention are identified and determined to be either high, medium or low) and 2) identify and implement the measures needed to address/maximize the evaluability of the GEEW aspects. More specifically, the evaluation design documents (i.e.ToR/Inception report) assess the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention and identify evaluation related challenges and mitigating measures. <i>Further guidance on determining the evaluability of GEEW dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation is provided p.17-21 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.</i>			TOR, Inception Report, Evaluation Report
	A gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is undertaken	1) The stakeholder analysis identifies who the different groups in an intervention are, why, how and when they should be included in the evaluation process. 2) Direct and indirect stakeholders of the intervention are identified with an aim to ensure that representatives of women (women's groups), men, boys and girls from different groups (e.g. beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty-bearers) are identified and their level of participation in the evaluation is determined. <i>Further guidance on conducting a gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is provided p.22-25 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.</i>			

	Evaluation Team recruited that has the capacity to conduct gender-responsive evaluation	The Evaluation Team has: 1) GEEW expertise with clear assigned responsibilities and adequate seniority; 2) is gender balanced; 3) is culturally diverse and/or makes use of regional/national evaluators . Further guidance on evaluation teams is provided p.36-37 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			
2. Evaluation Methodology	GEEW is integrated in Evaluation Criteria	GEEW dimensions are integrated into all Evaluation Criteria and/or criteria derived directly from GEEW principles are used (e.g. equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment, etc.). Further guidance on integrating GEEW consideration into OECD-DAC criteria is provided p.26-29 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			Evaluation Report, Debriefing minutes, Management Responses, Evaluation dissemination plan
	Evaluation Questions are included that specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Further guidance on framing evaluation questions is provided p.30-33 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Approach and Methodology is	The method and approach are the overarching framework of an evaluation that will determine what methodologies to employ and how to use the tools in gender-responsive fashion, e.g., a mixed-method approach to make visible diverse perspectives and promotes participation of both women and men, boys and girls from different stakeholder groups; Triangulation of data is done			

	selected.	to ensure that the voices of both women, men, boys and girls are heard and used; additional time or resources (time, staff, funds) to implement a gender-responsive approach is considered and planned for, etc. Further guidance on key elements of an appropriate GEEW responsive evaluation methodology is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			
	Evaluation indicators are included to ensure GEEW-related data is collected	1) Indicators for the evaluation of the intervention include the GEEW dimension and/or additional indicators are identified specifically addressing GEEW. 2) Inclusion of mixed indicators (including quantitative and qualitative indicators); availability of disaggregated data. Further guidance on gender-responsive indicators is provided p.34-36 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			
	Data Collection Methods and Tools are developed to collect GEEW-related data, deployed in a gender-responsive manner, and follow ethical codes of conduct.	Data collection methods including, desk reviews, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. are identified and accompanying tools, e.g. questionnaires, observational tools, interview guides etc. developed integrating GEEW considerations (e.g. interview guides ensure that women and men are interviewed in ways that avoid gender biases or the reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations, etc.) Further guidance on gender-responsive data collection is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			
	Data Analysis techniques were deployed that include gender analysis	Special attention is paid to data and information that specifically refer to GEEW issues, and making the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention. Further guidance on gender-responsive data analysis is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.			

3. Evaluation Report and Use	<p>The Evaluation Report includes findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons on the extent to which 1) the design and implementation of the intervention was gender responsive 2) GEEW results were achieved and 3) a gender-responsive methodology used</p>	<p>Conducting a gender responsive process refers to ensuring that the main steps in conducting an evaluation in a gender-responsive fashion be included and described in the evaluation report. The 'methodological' section in the evaluation report should reflect the methods employed and describe the appropriateness for analyzing gender in the evaluation scope (i.e methodology, data collection and analysis tools integrating a gender lens are described in and annexed to the report). The evaluation reports should also provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluation based on the experience of that particular evaluation. Further guidance on evaluation reports is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation and the UNEG quality checklist for Evaluation Reports http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=607.</p>			<p>Evaluation Report, Debriefing minutes, Management Responses, Evaluation dissemination plan</p>
	<p>The Validation Process of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations includes the participation of women, men, boys and girls from the stakeholder groups identified and particularly include the voice of women's groups.</p>	<p>At the end of the data collection stage, all stakeholder groups are consulted to discuss findings and hear their views on conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.</p>			

	<p>The Management Response to the evaluation addresses the GEEW issues raised in the report and is developed in consultation with a diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues.</p>	<p><i>Further guidance on Management Responses is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the UNEG Good Practice Guidelines for Follow Up to Evaluations</i> http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=610</p>			
	<p>The Evaluation Dissemination Strategy is gender responsive</p>	<p>Dissemination of evaluation findings on GEEW issues to diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues (including women's groups, networks and individuals) in accessible formats. Further guidance on evaluation dissemination is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.</p>			
<p>** Overall Evaluation Rating - Formula included - do not enter number - formula will need to be adjusted manually should any of the criteria be N/A</p>			0.00	<p>0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements 0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements 1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements</p>	

***How to score each evaluation criterion**

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report using the following rating system for each criterion. Each of the scoring levels below will correspond a numbered score (in red)

Not applicable: This rating applies when a criterion is not relevant. Although all UN evaluations should meet the UNEG gender-related Norms and Standards, there may be some isolated cases where it may not be possible to integrate gender given the nature of the intervention being evaluated (N/A)

Missing: This rating applies where none of the elements under a criterion are met (0).

Partially met: This rating applies to a situation where at least one element under a criterion is met but remedial action to fully meet the standard is required (1)

Fully met: This rating applies if all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in evaluation processes and no remedial action is required (2).

**** How to score the overall Evaluation Report**

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report by determining the rating for each criterion as outlined above. To calculate the overall evaluation score the total number of points for each criterion should be added up and be divided by the total number of criteria. It is important to note that the number of criteria scored as 'Not Applicable' should be taken out of the overall number of criteria not to bring the overall rating down. For example, if 3 out of 13 criteria are not applicable, then the total number of points should be divided by 10 which corresponds to number of applicable criteria. The overall evaluation rating will be given using the scoring system below: for example, if the aggregate evaluation score is 1.76 or above the rating for the evaluation would be 'Exceeds Requirements' while an average of 1.5 would be 'Meeting Requirements'.

The overall evaluation rating uses the following scoring system used to report against the evaluation performance indicator:

0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements

0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements

1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements

Aggregate meta-evaluation score of 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements

UN SWAP - Meta-Review/Evaluation Scoring Tool

Number of Individual Evaluations in Meta-review/evaluation (3 is only given as an example: please adjust figure and columns accordingly)						3
Evaluation Process	Scoring Criteria	Annotations	Evaluation n 1: Scoring (0-2)	Evaluation n 2: Scoring (0-2)	Evaluation n 3: Scoring (0-2)	Average/ Criterion
1.Evaluation Preparation	Evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention is assessed and steps/measures are taken to maximize the evaluability of GEEW aspects.	The evaluability assessment should determine whether an intervention is ready to be evaluated. It should also determine whether 1) its GEEW aspects can be evaluated or not (i.e. the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention are identified and determined to be either high, medium or low) and 2) identify and implement the measures needed to address/maximize the evaluability of the GEEW aspects. More specifically, the evaluation design documents (i.e.ToR/Inception report) assess the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention and identify evaluation related challenges and mitigating measures. Further guidance on determining the evaluability of GEEW dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation is provided p.17-21 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00
	A gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is undertaken	1) The stakeholder analysis identifies who the different groups in an intervention are, why, how and when they should be included in the evaluation process. 2) Direct and indirect stakeholders of the intervention are identified with an aim to ensure that representatives of women (women's groups), men, boys and girls from different groups (e.g. beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty-bearers) are identified and their level of participation in the evaluation is determined. Further guidance on conducting a gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is provided p.22-25 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00

	Evaluation Team recruited that has the capacity to conduct gender-responsive evaluation	The Evaluation Team has: 1) GEEW expertise with clear assigned responsibilities and adequate seniority; 2) is gender balanced; 3) is culturally diverse and/or makes use of regional/national evaluators . Further guidance on evaluation teams is provided p.36-37 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				
2. Evaluation Methodology	GEEW is integrated in Evaluation Criteria	GEEW dimensions are integrated into all Evaluation Criteria and/or criteria derived directly from GEEW principles are used (e.g. equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment, etc.). Further guidance on integrating GEEW consideration into OECD-DAC criteria is provided p.26-29 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00
	Evaluation Questions are included that specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Further guidance on framing evaluation questions is provided p.30-33 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Approach and Methodology is selected.	The method and approach are the overarching framework of an evaluation that will determine what methodologies to employ and how to use the tools in gender-responsive fashion, e.g., a mixed-method approach to make visible diverse perspectives and promotes participation of both women and men, boys and girls from different stakeholder groups; Triangulation of data is done to ensure that the voices of both women, men, boys and girls are heard and				0.00

		used; additional time or resources (time, staff, funds) to implement a gender-responsive approach is considered and planned for, etc. Further guidance on key elements of an appropriate GEEW responsive evaluation methodology is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				
	Evaluation indicators are included to ensure GEEW-related data is collected	1) Indicators for the evaluation of the intervention include the GEEW dimension and/or additional indicators are identified specifically addressing GEEW. 2) Inclusion of mixed indicators (including quantitative and qualitative indicators); availability of disaggregated data. Further guidance on gender-responsive indicators is provided p.34-36 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00
	Data Collection Methods and Tools are developed to collect GEEW-related data, deployed in a gender-responsive manner, and follow ethical codes of conduct.	Data collection methods including, desk reviews, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. are identified and accompanying tools, e.g. questionnaires, observational tools, interview guides etc. developed integrating GEEW considerations (e.g. interview guides ensure that women and men are interviewed in ways that avoid gender biases or the reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations, etc.) Further guidance on gender-responsive data collection is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00
	Data Analysis techniques were deployed that include gender analysis	Special attention is paid to data and information that specifically refer to GEEW issues, and making the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention. Further guidance on gender-responsive data analysis is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00

3.Evaluation Report and Use	<p>The Evaluation Report includes findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons on the extent to which 1) the design and implementation of the intervention was gender responsive 2) GEEW results were achieved and 3) a gender-responsive methodology used</p>	<p>Conducting a gender responsive process refers to ensuring that the main steps in conducting an evaluation in a gender-responsive fashion be included and described in the evaluation report. The 'methodological' section in the evaluation report should reflect the methods employed and describe the appropriateness for analyzing gender in the evaluation scope (i.e methodology, data collection and analysis tools integrating a gender lens are described in and annexed to the report). The evaluation reports should also provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluation based on the experience of that particular evaluation. Further guidance on evaluation reports is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation and the UNEG quality checklist for Evaluation Reports http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=607.</p>				0.00
	<p>The Validation Process of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations includes the participation of women, men, boys and girls from the stakeholder groups identified and particularly include the voice of women's groups.</p>	<p>At the end of the data collection stage, all stakeholder groups are consulted to discuss findings and hear their views on conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.</p>				0.00

	The Management Response to the evaluation addresses the GEEW issues raised in the report and is developed in consultation with a diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues.	Further guidance on Management Responses is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the UNEG Good Practice Guidelines for Follow Up to Evaluations http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=610				
	The Evaluation Dissemination Strategy is gender responsive	Dissemination of evaluation findings on GEEW issues to diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues (including women's groups, networks and individuals) in accessible formats. Further guidance on evaluation dissemination is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				0.00
Total Scoring			0	0	0	0.00
Average Scores for Individual Evaluations			0.00	0.00	0.00	
*Average Score for Meta-Review/Evaluation 0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements 0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements 1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements						0.00

*** How to calculate the Meta-Review/Evaluation Score**

The scoring system above used to score individual evaluation reports will also provide the aggregate overall rating for this performance indicator. To calculate the meta-review/evaluation score the average score for each evaluation under review are added up and then divided by the total number of evaluations to give an aggregate average.

The aggregate meta-evaluation scoring system used to report against the evaluation performance indicator is as follows:

0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements

0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements

1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements

Aggregate meta-evaluation score of 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements

Annex 2: Example of Non-Applicable of UN SWAP Evaluation Scorecard Evaluability Criterion

The UN System Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Provision of Feedback by ICAO's Evaluation and Internal Audit Office (EAO)

As part of the UN System Wide Action Plan to the Chief Executives Board (CEB) Policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (CEB2006/2), seven female aviation professionals were interviewed at ICAO with the objective to provide concrete examples that illustrate how a criteria or dimension in the UN-SWAP scoring tool may not always be applicable to all UN areas of work, in this case, that of the technical work of ICAO. Nonetheless, some useful insights on the gender dimension drawn from the experience of the female aviation professionals at ICAO is reported here to provide a gender perspective in civil aviation at ICAO and at the global level.

The following are some concrete examples of ICAO's work programmes provided by the female aviation professionals, which they view as non-applicable in terms of evaluability of gender equality/empowerment aspects.

- Dangerous Goods Section, Air Navigation Bureau: ICAO facilitates the adoption of national legislation by Member States that introduces international standards related to the transport of dangerous goods by air (Dr. Katherine Rooney, Chief, Dangerous Goods Section, <http://www.icao.int/safety/DangerousGoods/Pages/background.aspx>)
- Market-based Measures: ICAO produces guidance material on the application of market-based measures aimed at reducing or limiting the environmental impact of aircraft engine emissions, particularly with respect to mitigating the impact of aviation on climate change. Market-based measures include: emissions trading, emission related levies - charges and taxes, and emissions offsetting (Sam Brand, Environment Officer (Market-based Measures), Environment Section, <http://www.icao.int/environmental-protection/Pages/market-based-measures.aspx>)
- Aviation Safety Management – Significant Safety Concerns: ICAO monitors and facilitates the resolution of Significant Safety Concerns by coordinating and providing direct assistance to ensure air safety in Member States and regions (Jimena Blumenkron, Technical Officer, Safety Management and Monitoring, Air Navigation Bureau)
- Aviation Safety Management – Runway Safety Seminars: ICAO regularly conducts runway safety seminars in all ICAO regions to mitigate current aviation safety management issues. The key expected outcome of these seminars is the formation of inter-disciplinary alliances and collaboration between various disciplines (e.g. air traffic controllers, maintenance engineers, pilots etc.) to ensure more effective mitigation and resolution of air safety management issues (Gnehm Elizabeth, M.Sc., Technical Officer, Integrated Safety Management Section, Air Navigation Bureau)

The “Next Generation of Aviation Professionals” initiative was identified by two interviewees as potentially suitable to have a gender strategy and target in the future. The rationale for the initiative is ICAO's estimation that there will be a global shortage of pilots, air traffic controllers and engineers by 2030. The objective is to increase the recruitment of young professionals in the civil aviation profession to mitigate the risk of such a shortage. Although it is no longer novel to see young female interns pursuing a technical aviation profession, gender representation in the technical profession continues to be

predominantly male, and therefore there is a strong rationale for which the programme could and should pursue a gender-based strategy and targeting.

While all female aviation professionals interviewed concurred that the evaluability of gender equality and empowerment of women (GEEW) issues is non-applicable in their technical areas of work, they acknowledged the relevance of gender balance measures in HR management, particularly recruitment, to which ICAO is accountable and reports to the Council.

Reflecting on their experience, the majority of interviewees made reference to stakeholder participation and representation in the profession being largely gender unbalanced. The following are some specific observations, many of which go beyond ICAO's work programmes and reflect the state of gender equality of Member State stakeholders and beneficiaries with whom they interact.

- Unbalanced gender participation and representation: Males are more represented in ICAO technical meetings, the governing body of ICAO; in interviews for technical positions (particularly as candidates coming from Civil Aviation Authorities), all of which may reflect the relatively low participation and visibility of women in civil aviation governance, management and the technical profession globally. Only three out of 36 members of the ICAO Council currently are female.
- The civil aviation profession is traditionally male dominated but this is slowly changing: According to some of the female civil aviation professionals at ICAO, there is an increased presence of women in traditionally male occupied positions. A female aviation professional at ICAO is no longer perceived as “novelty”, as she may have been twenty years ago. Few visible and highly technical, senior-level positions at ICAO are represented by female professionals (e.g. the Director of the Air Navigation Bureau, the Chief of the Dangerous Goods Section).
- Discrimination towards women who have a technical position in civil aviation: Based on the experience of a female aviation professional from ICAO who visits airports on-site and interacts with aviation inspectors, in some cultures it has proven to be difficult to conduct her work due to the reluctance on behalf of the male counterparts to interact with a female technical officer. As a result, she frequently delegates visits to certain countries to male colleagues.
- ICAO has published security guidelines for women in 2006 as a result of specific requests from women staff members who wanted to have tips on dealing with security issues as they relate to women in the work environment, including when travelling to conduct on-site airport visits.
- ICAO has been involved in formal and informal gender-related outreach activities: Anecdotally, some formal (through the gender focal point) and informal gender-targeted outreach activities have been conducted in the recent past. Examples include “Women in Aviation” thematic events and International Day of Women celebrations highlighting women in aviation. The retired focal point used the Air Navigation Conference registration information to reach out to female participant and establish networks.
- The current gender focal point is the Chief of Policy, Organizational and Staff Development Section in the Human Resources Department. The HR Department is pursuing additional gender outreach activities through: i) the Young Aviation Professional Programme, which is a collaboration between IATA and ACI (Airports Council International) ii) an improved employment website to include testimonials of women in aviation, iii) talent pool management with a gender focus whereby female applicants who were found suitable for ICAO posts will be

kept on a roster for future reference, iv) offering internships in collaboration with The International Aviation Women's Association (IAWA); and v) offering fellowships to female applicants.

ANNEX 3: Example UN SWAP Completed Individual Evaluation Scoring Tool

Evaluation Process	Scoring Criteria	Annotations	Scoring per Criteria (0-2) *guidance on each criteria is provided below	Comment on Scoring (Explanation of why rating has been given, including data sources)	Data Sources/ Evidence Base
1.Evaluation Preparation	Evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention is assessed and steps/measures are taken to maximize the evaluability of GEEW aspects.	The evaluability assessment should determine whether an intervention is ready to be evaluated. It should also determine whether 1) its GEEW aspects can be evaluated or not (i.e. the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention are identified and determined to be either high, medium or low) and 2) identify and implement the measures needed to address/maximize the evaluability of the GEEW aspects. More specifically, the evaluation design documents (i.e.ToR/Inception report) assess the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention and identify evaluation related challenges and mitigating measures. <i>Further guidance on determining the evaluability of GEEW dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation is provided p.17-21 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.</i>	2	The organizational mandate of this UN agency is related to gender equality and women's empowerment. These issues are therefore integrated into the evaluation methodologies (including evaluability) as appropriate.	TOR, Inception Report, Evaluation Report

	A gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is undertaken	1) The stakeholder analysis identifies who the different groups in an intervention are, why, how and when they should be included in the evaluation process. 2) Direct and indirect stakeholders of the intervention are identified with an aim to ensure that representatives of women (women's groups), men, boys and girls from different groups (e.g. beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty-bearers) are identified and their level of participation in the evaluation is determined. Further guidance on conducting a gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is provided p.22-25 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	2	As the organisation's beneficiaries include these groups, they participate in evaluations as appropriate.	
	Evaluation Team recruited that has the capacity to conduct gender-responsive evaluation	The Evaluation Team has: 1) GEEW expertise with clear assigned responsibilities and adequate seniority; 2) is gender balanced; 3) is culturally diverse and/or makes use of regional/national evaluators. Further guidance on evaluation teams is provided p.36-37 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	2	The formulation of the evaluation team is determined, and may be constrained, by the availability of staff with relevant expertise. However attention is paid to ensuring the principles stated in the criteria are adhered to as much as possible.	

2.Evaluation Methodology	GEEW is integrated in Evaluation Criteria	GEEW dimensions are integrated into all Evaluation Criteria and/or criteria derived directly from GEEW principles are used (e.g. equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment, etc.). Further guidance on integrating GEEW consideration into OECD-DAC criteria is provided p.26-29 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	GEEW dimensions are integrated into evaluation criteria (relevance, sustainability, effectiveness) as appropriate. However, we feel that the applicability of GEEW to efficiency is not clear. We recommended further guidance on this criterion in future iterations of the Technical Note to help guide evaluators.	Evaluation Report, Debriefing minutes, Management Responses, Evaluation dissemination plan
	Evaluation Questions are included that specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Further guidance on framing evaluation questions is provided p.30-33 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	Specific evaluation questions on the gender component are formulated as appropriate as determined by the focus of the evaluation, and also addressed at the level of sub-questions. Further consideration will be given to the issue of gender equality in evaluation in future reviews of the evaluation methodology that is currently used by evaluators as appropriate.	
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Approach and Methodology is	The method and approach are the overarching framework of an evaluation that will determine what methodologies to employ and how to use the tools in gender-responsive fashion, e.g., a mixed-method approach to make visible diverse perspectives and	1	The evaluation methodology used by evaluators includes a gender-responsive approach due to the	

	selected.	promotes participation of both women and men, boys and girls from different stakeholder groups; Triangulation of data is done to ensure that the voices of both women, men, boys and girls are heard and used; additional time or resources (time, staff, funds) to implement a gender-responsive approach is considered and planned for, etc. Further guidance on key elements of an appropriate GEEW responsive evaluation methodology is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.		focus on gender within the organization's mandate. Time and resources are allocated for the purpose of ensuring good quality evaluations; however, these are not specifically used for GEEW but for quality requirements in general and as appropriate. Triangulation techniques incorporate GEEW dimensions as appropriate for the purpose of the data collection.	
	Evaluation indicators are included to ensure GEEW-related data is collected	1) Indicators for the evaluation of the intervention include the GEEW dimension and/or additional indicators are identified specifically addressing GEEW. 2) Inclusion of mixed indicators (including quantitative and qualitative indicators); availability of disaggregated data. Further guidance on gender-responsive indicators is provided p.34-36 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	2	This is ensured by verification of the results framework of the intervention and related system of indicators that is part of the evaluation. Furthermore, GEEW dimensions are reflected as appropriate in the indicators selected when evaluators develop the evaluation matrix.	
	Data Collection Methods and Tools are developed to collect GEEW-related data,	Data collection methods including, desk reviews, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. are identified and accompanying tools, e.g. questionnaires, observational tools, interview guides etc. developed integrating GEEW considerations (e.g. interview guides ensure that women and men are interviewed in ways that avoid gender	2	The interview guide used by evaluators is designed to address the issue of gender. The organization of focus groups is also designed in a manner	

	deployed in a gender-responsive manner, and follow ethical codes of conduct.	biases or the reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations, etc.) Further guidance on gender-responsive data collection is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.		that is consistent with these principles.	
	Data Analysis techniques were deployed that include gender analysis	Special attention is paid to data and information that specifically refer to GEEW issues, and making the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention. Further guidance on gender-responsive data analysis is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	0	This is not done at present, and is related to challenges of the integration of disaggregated data in the organisation's programmes.	
3.Evaluation Report and Use	The Evaluation Report includes findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons on the extent to which 1) the design and implementation of the intervention was gender responsive 2) GEEW results were achieved and 3) a gender-responsive methodology used	Conducting a gender responsive process refers to ensuring that the main steps in conducting an evaluation in a gender-responsive fashion be included and described in the evaluation report. The 'methodological' section in the evaluation report should reflect the methods employed and describe the appropriateness for analyzing gender in the evaluation scope (i.e methodology, data collection and analysis tools integrating a gender lens are described in and annexed to the report). The evaluation reports should also provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluation based on the experience of that particular evaluation. Further guidance on evaluation reports is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation and the UNEG quality checklist for Evaluation Reports http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=607 .	2	Gender is addressed in evaluation reports due to the organisation's mandate. Lessons learned in terms of conducting a gender responsive evaluation process will included in the evaluation report where appropriate.	Evaluation Report, Debriefing minutes, Management Responses, Evaluation dissemination plan
	The Validation Process of evaluation	At the end of the data collection stage, all stakeholder groups are consulted to discuss findings and hear their views on conclusions and recommendations of the	2	These groups are involved due to the organisation's mandate	

	findings, conclusions and recommendations includes the participation of women, men, boys and girls from the stakeholder groups identified and particularly include the voice of women's groups.	evaluation.		as beneficiaries and partners.	
	The Management Response to the evaluation addresses the GEEW issues raised in the report and is developed in consultation with a diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues.	Further guidance on Management Responses is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the UNEG Good Practice Guidelines for Follow Up to Evaluations http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=610	2	Gender is addressed in evaluations due to the organisation's mandate, but the specific focus of the management response is dependent on the recommendations of the evaluation.	
	The Evaluation Dissemination Strategy is gender responsive	Dissemination of evaluation findings on GEEW issues to diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues (including women's groups, networks and individuals) in accessible formats. Further guidance on evaluation dissemination is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating	2	Dissemination seminars are held with a broad range of stakeholders, and gender balance and representation are considered. All evaluation reports are made publicly	

		Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.		available and widely disseminated, including translation. However evaluation products are not then tailored further for specific groups, and this is not felt to be appropriate for the evaluations at present.	
** Overall Evaluation Rating - Formula included - do not enter number - <i>formula will need to be adjusted manually should any of the criteria be N/A</i>			1.61	0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements 0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements 1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements	

***How to score each evaluation criterion**

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report using the following rating system for each criterion. Each of the scoring levels below will correspond a numbered score (in red)

Not applicable: This rating applies when a criterion is not relevant. Although all UN evaluations should meet the UNEG gender-related Norms and Standards, there may be some isolated cases where it may not be possible to integrate gender given the nature of the intervention being evaluated (N/A)

Missing: This rating applies where none of the elements under a criterion are met (0).

Partially met: This rating applies to a situation where at least one element under a criterion is met but remedial action to fully meet the standard is required (1)

Fully met: This rating applies if all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in evaluation processes and no remedial action is required (2).

**** How to score the overall Evaluation Report**

UN entities will use the Scorecard to assess each evaluation report by determining the rating for each criterion as outlined above. To calculate the overall evaluation score the total number of points for each criterion should be added up and be divided by the total number of criteria. It is important to note that the number of criteria scored as 'Not Applicable' should be taken out of the overall number of criteria not to bring the overall rating down. For example, if 3 out of 13 criteria are not applicable, then the total number of points should be divided by 10 which corresponds to number of applicable criteria. The overall evaluation rating will be given using the scoring system below: for example, if the aggregate evaluation score is 1.76 or above the rating for the evaluation would be 'Exceeds Requirements' while an average of 1.5 would be 'Meeting Requirements'.

The overall evaluation rating uses the following scoring system used to report against the evaluation performance indicator:

0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements

0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements

1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements

Aggregate meta-evaluation score of 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements

Example Completed UN SWAP - Meta-Review/Evaluation Scoring Tool

Number of Individual Evaluations in Meta-review/evaluation						3
Evaluation Process	Scoring Criteria	Annotations	Evaluation n 1: Scoring (0-2)	Evaluation n 2: Scoring (0-2)	Evaluation n 3: Scoring (0-2)	Average/ Criterion
1.Evaluation Preparation	Evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention is assessed and steps/measures are taken to maximize the evaluability of GEEW aspects.	The evaluability assessment should determine whether an intervention is ready to be evaluated. It should also determine whether 1) its GEEW aspects can be evaluated or not (i.e. the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention are identified and determined to be either high, medium or low) and 2) identify and implement the measures needed to address/maximize the evaluability of the GEEW aspects. More specifically, the evaluation design documents (i.e.ToR/Inception report) assess the evaluability of the GEEW aspects of the intervention and identify evaluation related challenges and mitigating measures. Further guidance on determining the evaluability of GEEW dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation is provided p.17-21 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	2	2	1.67
	A gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is undertaken	1) The stakeholder analysis identifies who the different groups in an intervention are, why, how and when they should be included in the evaluation process. 2) Direct and indirect stakeholders of the intervention are identified with an aim to ensure that representatives of women (women's groups), men, boys and girls from different groups (e.g. beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty-bearers) are identified and their level of participation in the evaluation is determined. Further guidance on conducting a gender-responsive Stakeholder Analysis is provided p.22-25 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	1	0	0.67

	Evaluation Team recruited that has the capacity to conduct gender-responsive evaluation	The Evaluation Team has: 1) GEEW expertise with clear assigned responsibilities and adequate seniority; 2) is gender balanced; 3) is culturally diverse and/or makes use of regional/national evaluators . Further guidance on evaluation teams is provided p.36-37 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	1	0	0.67
2.Evaluation Methodology	GEEW is integrated in Evaluation Criteria	GEEW dimensions are integrated into all Evaluation Criteria and/or criteria derived directly from GEEW principles are used (e.g. equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment, etc.). Further guidance on integrating GEEW consideration into OECD-DAC criteria is provided p.26-29 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	2	2	1.67
	Evaluation Questions are included that specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	Further guidance on framing evaluation questions is provided p.30-33 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	2	1	1	1.34
	A gender-responsive Evaluation Approach and Methodology is selected.	The method and approach are the overarching framework of an evaluation that will determine what methodologies to employ and how to use the tools in gender-responsive fashion, e.g., a mixed-method approach to make visible diverse perspectives and promotes participation of both women and men, boys and girls from different stakeholder groups; Triangulation of data is done to ensure that the voices of both women, men, boys and girls are heard and	1	1	0	0.67

		used; additional time or resources (time, staff, funds) to implement a gender-responsive approach is considered and planned for, etc. Further guidance on key elements of an appropriate GEEW responsive evaluation methodology is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.				
	Evaluation indicators are included to ensure GEEW-related data is collected	1) Indicators for the evaluation of the intervention include the GEEW dimension and/or additional indicators are identified specifically addressing GEEW. 2) Inclusion of mixed indicators (including quantitative and qualitative indicators); availability of disaggregated data. Further guidance on gender-responsive indicators is provided p.34-36 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	1	1	1
	Data Collection Methods and Tools are developed to collect GEEW-related data, deployed in a gender-responsive manner, and follow ethical codes of conduct.	Data collection methods including, desk reviews, focus groups, interviews, surveys, etc. are identified and accompanying tools, e.g. questionnaires, observational tools, interview guides etc. developed integrating GEEW considerations (e.g. interview guides ensure that women and men are interviewed in ways that avoid gender biases or the reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations, etc.) Further guidance on gender-responsive data collection is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	2	1	1	1.34
	Data Analysis techniques were deployed that include gender analysis	Special attention is paid to data and information that specifically refer to GEEW issues, and making the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention. Further guidance on gender-responsive data analysis is provided p.40-42 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	1	1	1

3.Evaluation Report and Use	The Evaluation Report includes findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons on the extent to which 1) the design and implementation of the intervention was gender responsive 2) GEEW results were achieved and 3) a gender-responsive methodology used	Conducting a gender responsive process refers to ensuring that the main steps in conducting an evaluation in a gender-responsive fashion be included and described in the evaluation report. The 'methodological' section in the evaluation report should reflect the methods employed and describe the appropriateness for analyzing gender in the evaluation scope (i.e methodology, data collection and analysis tools integrating a gender lens are described in and annexed to the report). The evaluation reports should also provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluation based on the experience of that particular evaluation. Further guidance on evaluation reports is provided p.38-39 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation and the UNEG quality checklist for Evaluation Reports http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=607 .	2	2	1	1.67
	The Validation Process of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations includes the participation of women, men, boys and girls from the stakeholder groups identified and particularly include the voice of women's groups.	At the end of the data collection stage, all stakeholder groups are consulted to discuss findings and hear their views on conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.	1	2	2	1.67

	The Management Response to the evaluation addresses the GEEW issues raised in the report and is developed in consultation with a diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues.	Further guidance on Management Responses is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the UNEG Good Practice Guidelines for Follow Up to Evaluations http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=610	2	2	1	1.67
	The Evaluation Dissemination Strategy is gender responsive	Dissemination of evaluation findings on GEEW issues to diverse group of stakeholders who have an interest in and/or are affected by GEEW issues (including women's groups, networks and individuals) in accessible formats. Further guidance on evaluation dissemination is provided p.44 in the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.	1	1	1	1
Total Scoring			17	18	13	1.23
Average Scores for Individual Evaluations			1.3	1.38	1	
*Average Score for Meta-Review/Evaluation 0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements 0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements 1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements						1.23

*** How to calculate the Meta-Review/Evaluation Score**

The scoring system above used to score individual evaluation reports will also provide the aggregate overall rating for this performance indicator. To calculate the meta-review/evaluation score the average score for each evaluation under review are added up and then divided by the total number of evaluations to give an aggregate average.

The aggregate meta-evaluation scoring system used to report against the evaluation performance indicator is as follows:

0 - 0.50 points = Missing requirements

0.51 - 1.25 = Approaching requirements

1.26 - 1.75 = Meeting requirements

Aggregate meta-evaluation score of 1.76 and above = Exceeds Requirements