

Background

Basic info	
<i>Activity number</i>	4000004258
<i>Programme</i>	LEAP4Peace
<i>Lead partner/implementer</i>	Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD) (Consortium partners: BLTP, Gender Equality Network (GEN), and GAPS)
<i>Budget as stated in the TOR</i>	€60,000
<i>Indicate the Funding Instrument (Power of Women, Power of Voices, SHRH, WPS, Leading from the South fund):</i>	Power of Women
Draft ETE Assessment	
<i>Overall assessment of risk:</i>	☐ Low ☒ Medium ☐ High

Re-assessment for criteria 1 – 5:

This phase also includes a re-assessment of the first five criteria. The composition and role of the reference group (criterion 1) and the independence of the actual evaluators (criterion 2) will be re-assessed. In addition, the final report should also present a description of the context (criterion 3) and a description of the intervention (criterion 4). The report, finally, should be focus on the evaluation period, geographical focus and specific policy domain as requested in the ToR (criterion 5). The following assessment grid guides the assessment:

2	Independence of evaluators		
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the ToR. The draft or final report is in line with what was asked in the ToR.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the ToR, the draft or final report differs slightly from what was asked in the ToR. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√√ Adequate	
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the ToR, the draft or final report significantly diverges from what was asked in the ToR and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
3	Description of the context		
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the ToR. The draft or final report is in line with what was asked in the ToR.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the ToR, the draft or final report differs slightly from what was asked in the ToR. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√√ Adequate	
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the ToR, the draft or final report significantly diverges from what was asked in the ToR and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
4	Description of the intervention		
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the ToR. The draft or final report is in line with what was asked in the ToR.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	While the this criterion has been positively assessed for the ToR, the draft or final report differs slightly from what was asked in the ToR. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√√ Adequate	

	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the ToR, the draft or final report significantly diverges from what was asked in the ToR and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
5	Scope of the evaluation		
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the ToR. The draft or final report is in line with what was asked in the ToR.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the ToR, the draft or final report differs slightly from what was asked in the ToR. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√√ Adequate	
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the ToR, the draft or final report significantly diverges from what was asked in the ToR and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
Reassessment: Criterion 2: Confirmed as Good Criterion 3: Changed to Good A description of the programmatic ToC has been added. The rating has been changed. Criterion 4: Changed to Good A description and a flow diagram of the ToC have been added, so the rating has been changed. Criterion 5: Confirmed as Good			

Re-assessment for criteria 9 – 14:

This phase also includes a re-assessment of the second subset of criteria, to make sure the draft or final report are in line with pre-specified methods. This means that the research design (criterion 9), the plausibility of the causal claim (criterion 10), the utilized indicators (criterion 11), the sampling and case selection (criterion 12), the information sources (criterion 13) and the description of bias (criterion 14) will be re-assessed. The following assessment grid guides the assessment:

			Assessment
9	Research Design		
	Is what is written in line with the accepted inception report and/or inception report feedback?	Yes / No	Yes
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology. The draft or final report is in line with what the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology.	√√ Good	
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report differs slightly from the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√√ Adequate	√√ Adequate
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report significantly diverges from the intentions presented and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
10	Plausibility of the Causal Claim (10a – Qual; 10b – Quant)		
	Is what is written in line with the accepted inception report and/or inception report feedback?	Yes / No	Yes
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology. The draft or final report is in line with what the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology.	√√ Good	

	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report differs slightly from the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√v Adequate	
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report significantly diverges from the intentions presented and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	X Inadequate
11	Indicators or description of results area		
	Is what is written in line with the accepted inception report and/or inception report feedback?	Yes / No	No
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology. The draft or final report is in line with what the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology.	√v√ Good	
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report differs slightly from the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√v Adequate	√v Adequate
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report significantly diverges from the intentions presented and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
12	Sampling & Case Selection Criteria		
	Is what is written in line with the accepted inception report and/or inception report feedback?	Yes / No	Yes
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology. The draft or final report is in line with what the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology.	√v√ Good	
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report differs slightly from the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√v Adequate	
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report significantly diverges from the intentions presented and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	X Inadequate
13	Sufficient and external information sources		
	Is what is written in line with the accepted inception report and/or inception report feedback?	Yes / No	Yes
	This criterion has already been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology. The draft or final report is in line with what the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology.	√v√ Good	
	While this criterion has been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report differs slightly from the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√v Adequate	√v Adequate
	Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report significantly diverges from the intentions presented and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	
14	Description of limitations and bias		
	Is what is written in line with the accepted inception report and/or inception report feedback?	Yes / No	Yes

This criterion has already been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology. The draft or final report is in line with what the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
While this criterion has been positively assessed for the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report differs slightly from the intentions presented in the elaborated methodology. However, it still aligns with the 'adequate' requirements.	√√ Adequate	
Despite the positive assessment of this criterion in the elaborated methodology, the draft or final report significantly diverges from the intentions presented and no longer meets the minimum requirements.	X Inadequate	

Reassessment:

Criterion 9: Changed to Adequate

The evaluation matrix in the annex has been edited to add two separate columns for data source and analytical method. It has also been modified to reflect the actual scope of the evaluation. The data analysis section has been revised to include details on the process of analysing FGD and KII data. The assessment against the program ToC section, assessment of ToC assumptions and the additional outcomes identified by the evaluation section are clear and comprehensive now to understand progress of the program. A section on verification of harvested outcomes has been added.

To meet Good rating address the following outstanding points:

- On page 19-20, please add a line to mention that the initial finding briefing was used to help frame the interview guides and the evaluation approach, as previously mentioned.
- Additionally, it would be helpful to **elaborate in the findings section on how contextual sense-checking and refinement of the analysis were conducted** using the briefing data, with some examples. "While this did not replace the originally envisaged participatory validation approach, it allowed for some contextual sense-checking of findings and contributed to refining the analysis."

Criterion 10: Remains Inadequate

- A detailed section on the thematic analysis of qualitative data has been added.
- Step-by-step validation of the ToC has been added.
- A section on triangulation has been added.

To meet Good rating address the following outstanding gaps:

- The contribution analysis process is still not clear. We suggest **adding a paragraph on the process and the steps** in the methods/data analysis section. Moreover, **present the 5 steps as required under IOB Criteria 10a:**
 2. The results chains tested, including assumptions;
 3. Alternative theories/explanations tested
- The reporting against the ToC now shows that many intended results were not achieved, so there is less emphasis on only positive findings. However, we still encourage **adding a section explaining how data from different sources were weighted** to minimise the risk of cherry-picking findings. This could also be briefly described in the triangulation section, where you talk about how discrepancies in findings are handled.

Criterion 11: Changed to Adequate

The assessment against program ToC section, assessment of ToC assumptions and the additional outcomes identified by the evaluation section are clear and comprehensive now to understand progress of the program. **To meet Good rating address the following points:**

- **Report on the MFA basket indicators.** This can be a table in the annex if not in the main report. This would help us understand which indicators were assessed as part of the evaluation.

Criterion 12 - Sampling: Remains Inadequate

The evaluation used a purposive, convenience sampling approach. **To meet this criterion, you must address the following outstanding gaps:**

- The number of external stakeholders was added. However, in the table in the sampling strategy section, we request you to **provide details on the type or category of external stakeholder**.
- We understand the consulted participants column is the number of individuals. However, for FGDs, it is not clear whether 18 individuals were a part of 1 FGD or 2/3. **Please clarify.**

The following gaps continue to be outstanding:

- **Provide justification for how you determined target sample sizes** (e.g., power calculations, qualitative sampling techniques, and/or references to the literature on adequate sampling); **Provide intended target sample sizes, final actual sample sizes, and discuss reasons for and implications of any deviations;**
- Please **transparently describe the selection process, including how the respondents in each category were identified, selected, and contacted**. It is not clear which criteria were employed for identifying the respondents (for example, stratification criteria) and the reasons underpinning the choice of the number of participants. Please explain how the respondents were identified.

Criterion 13 - External data sources: Changed to Adequate

To meet Good rating add the following points:

- The number of external stakeholders has been mentioned but it is not clear which stakeholder is covered by the category stakeholders. **Please provide details on who the stakeholders were or the category of stakeholders.**
- The limited or small number of external stakeholders should also be mentioned as a limitation.

Criterion 14 - Limitations and biases: Changed to Good

- The limitations and mitigation strategies section is now fairly comprehensive, so the rating has been changed.

IOB Criterion 15: Transparency

Describing the analysis in a transparent manner allows for scrutiny, replicability, and a good understanding of the entire research process. The evaluation report should therefore present all research methods, data collection methods, data sources, and data analysis techniques employed in a systematic, transparent and complete yet accessible manner, either in the main report or in appendices to the report.

In case different research methods, data collection methods, or data sources provide contradictory findings, the evaluator should be transparent about the differences and the assessment thereof. Transparently presenting the range of evaluation findings prevents cherry-picking of certain results or the selective presentation of findings to fit a specific narrative. The report should explain how the evaluator has weighted and combined findings from sources and methods to come to an overall judgement and conclusion.

15.a	The evaluation report presents all research methods, data collection methods, data sources and data analysis techniques in a systematic, complete and transparent manner (e.g. in an evaluation matrix).	✓✓✓ Good	
	The evaluation report mentions the most important research methods, data collection methods, data sources and data analysis techniques.	✓✓ Adequate	✓✓ Adequate
	It remains unclear which research methods, data collection methods, data sources have been used.	X Inadequate	

15.b	The report (or annex) discusses and compares all findings from all different research methods, data collection methods and data sources. It transparently describes how it weighed the evidence and how it addressed discrepancies between findings.	√√√ Good	
	The report (or annex) presents the different results from the different research methods, data collection methods and data sources. The report describes how evidence has been weighed in general terms.	√√ Adequate	√√ Adequate
	The report is not transparent about which results are from which research methods, data collection methods or data sources. It remains unclear how evidence has been weighed.	X Inadequate	
Additional feedback	Reassessment: Criterion 15a: Confirmed as Adequate - Details on analyses processes have been added. However, as mentioned previously, please add more details on the contribution analysis process. - Outcome harvesting verification data has been added. However, monitoring indicators (including MFA basket indicators) have not been added to the report. - Please add more information on the contribution analysis and on monitoring indicators. Criterion 15b: Changed to Adequate - A section on triangulation has been added. The rating has been changed to "Adequate." - To meet Good rating, consider adding a section explaining how data from different sources were weighted to minimise the risk of cherry-picking findings. This could be described in the triangulation section, where you talk about how discrepancies in findings are handled.		

IOB Criterion 16: Answers to evaluation questions

The draft and final report should provide an answer to all evaluation questions. Although the main and sub-conclusions may not be structured according to the evaluation questions, in principle they all must be answered in the text in a recognizable way. If evaluators faced unforeseen limitations during the evaluation process that prevented them to answer all evaluation questions, as a minimum the report must highlight which evaluation questions it did not answer and explain the reasons for this.

16	The draft of final report provides an answer to all evaluation questions.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	The report does not provide an answer to all evaluation questions, but mentions which questions could not be answered and why.	√√ Adequate	
	The report does not provide an answer to all evaluation questions and does not mention which questions could be answered or why	X Inadequate	
Additional feedback	Reassessment: Criterion 16: Changed to Good - EQs have been added to the text to make it more systematic and clearer. - A description of outcomes that were achieved and not achieved has been added to make the program's progress clear.		

	- Challenges and constraints have also been added. The rating has been changed.
--	---

IOB Criterium 17: Logic of conclusions and recommendations

There should be a clear and rational connection in the evaluation report from findings to conclusions, and from the conclusions to the recommendations.

Each conclusion should be supported by specific findings. It is important that the final report takes possible limitations and bias (criterion 14) sufficiently into account. For example, the authors state that evaluation has will have limited external validity, the report's conclusions should not generalized beyond the selected cases.

Recommendations, in turn, must logically follow from the conclusions presented in the evaluation report. If the ToR identified an action objective (criterion 5), the recommendations should be in line with the stated evaluation objective.

17.a	The conclusions follow logically from the research findings	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	The conclusions do not follow logically from the research findings	X Inadequate	
17.b	The implications of the mentioned limitations or biases have been sufficiently taken into account in the conclusions;	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	Implications of limitations or biases have not been sufficiently taken into account in the conclusions.	X Inadequate	
17.c	The recommendations follow logically from the conclusions presented in the evaluation report, and are in line with the stated evaluation objective.	√√√ Good	√√√ Good
	The recommendations do not follow logically from the conclusions presented in the evaluation report, or are not in line with the stated evaluation objective.	X Inadequate	

Additional feedback	Reassessment: Criterium 17a: Confirmed as Adequate - The report has been revised to include details on outcomes that were not achieved as well. Criterium 17b: Changed to Good - A paragraph that discusses the limitations of the study and how these affect the confidence of the findings has been added to the conclusions section, so the rating has been changed. Criterium 17c: Confirmed as Adequate - The rating remains "Good"
---------------------	--