GUIDANCE ON QUALITY MANAGEMENT OF IOM EVALUATIONS

GUIDANCE ON QUALITY MANAGEMENT OF IOM EVALUATIONS

CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND

This guidance is part of a common set of guidance document notes issued by the Central Evaluation Unit (EVA) of the Department of Strategic Planning and Organizational Performance (DPP) on issues specific to the management of evaluation at IOM. The work on evaluation is mainly guided by the IOM Evaluation Policy and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards. Guidance notes produced by EVA are technical documents that set IOM standards for the management of evaluation and provide explanations and tools on the processes and methodologies used for conducting evaluation work at IOM.

The present guidance on quality management of IOM evaluations, including the notions of quality assurance and quality control[1], is designed for the use of IOM evaluation commissioners, evaluation managers and recruited evaluators, as well as for donors, governments and other partners interested in the quality management of IOM evaluations. It aims to ensure a common understanding of the requirements related to the quality of IOM evaluations and includes a description of the mechanisms designed to review the terms of reference of evaluations and to rate the quality of inception and evaluation reports, all of them being key documents influencing the overall quality of an evaluation. The guidance describes the processes, tools, roles and responsibilities to ensure the quality of evaluations and provides a framework applicable to all evaluations conducted at IOM.

---

[1] Quality control is defined as "a part of quality management focused on fulfilling quality requirements". It is one activity related to quality assurance, which is "part of quality management focused on providing confidence that quality requirements will be fulfilled" ISO 9000

The UNEG introduced quality as a norm for evaluations in 2005[2] and revised it as a standard in 2015[3]. According to it, the head of evaluation should ensure that an appropriate quality assurance system is put in place, which looks into both the evaluation process and its products. The quality management mechanism should include quality control at the evaluation design stage and at the final stage of the evaluation. It can be operated through internal peer reviews, external reviews, or through the appointment of an expert (internal or external) providing guidance and oversight throughout the evaluation process.[4] For quality control during the evaluation design and at the final stage of the evaluation, UNEG recommends the use of checklists to assess the quality of the terms of reference, of the inception reports[5] and of evaluation reports[6].

The 2017-18 MOPAN assessment of IOM[7] pointed out that more rigorous quality assurance systems are needed, including explicit definitions, criteria, or structured assessment frameworks on quality. Up to now, EVA was suggesting using the UNEG checklists for quality control that are available under the Evaluation Website, but without a clear framework to support their use. According to the MOPAN report, "staff and evaluators have no clear guidance on what constitutes a 'good-quality' evaluation" and "the central evaluation function does not have sufficient capacity to support quality during the design and planning or implementation stages"[8].

To have a better view of the quality of IOM evaluations, EVA commissioned in 2020 an external meta-evaluation[9] of the evaluation reports published between 2017 and 2019. The purpose was to assess the quality and use of internal and external evaluations (centralized and decentralized), with the aim of providing actionable recommendations to enhance the quality and utilization of evaluations. The report also suggested using the tools developed for the meta-evaluation as checklists and rating for ensuring that all key aspects of quality for evaluations are considered.

The development of IOM's Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy 2021-2023 included the findings and recommendations of MOPAN and of the meta-evaluation, stating the need to focus on "developing more systematic quality assurance and quality controls for evaluation capacity, its processes, and its products. This means establishing consistent mechanisms for increasing the likelihood of quality outcomes, as well as for checking whether requirements are met. Quality cuts across the three outcome areas *[of the strategy]* as the standards-based process, staff capacity to conduct them, the M&E evidence that is produced, and good practices in applying lessons are parts of a whole in an evidenced-based learning culture that rely on quality of the evidence."[10]

---

[2] UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System (2005). Page 9

[3] UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2015). Pages 28 and 29.

[4] Idem

[5] UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports (2010)

[6] UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports (2010).

[7] Pages 36 and 40. See: https://dmsportal/PublishedDocuments/Studies%20and%20Reports/MOPAN%202017-2018%20Performance%20Assessment%20of%20IOM.pdf#search=mopan

[8] Idem

[9] Artival Research & Evaluation, FINAL REPORT Meta-Evaluation of IOM's internal and external evaluations (2017 – 2019). April 2020. See https://evaluation.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl151/files/docs/resources/Artival_IOM%20Meta%20evaluation%20report%20FINAL_0.pdf

[10] IOM Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy 2021-2023.

In 2021, a UNEG/OECD-DAC Peer Review of the IOM evaluation function[11] provided a series of recommendations as to how evaluation quality in IOM can be improved, some aligned to the ones of the meta-evaluation and MOPAN reports. The recommendations include (a) the introduction of a quality assurance system for central and decentralized evaluations, ensuring that there is a quality assurance for terms of references, inception, draft and final evaluation reports; (b) introducing an external post-hoc quality assessment of all evaluations; and (c) encourage the use of evaluation reference groups.

To follow up on these initiatives and recommendations, a Feasibility Study on Quality Management Mechanism[12] was conducted in 2021, including a review of systems in place in other UN agencies and of a sample of more recent evaluation reports of 2020 and 2021.[13] The study recommends more precisely the use of a checklist to review the quality of the terms of reference by the evaluation manager, and quality control tools for the review of the inception and final reports by the evaluator. It also recommends a secondary quality review by the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officers (ROMEOs) and a yearly peer or external review of a sample of evaluations.

In parallel to the specific reviews and discussions around the recommendations related to a stronger quality management system at IOM, EVA and the ROMEOs have been regularly referring to the importance of quality through the production and use of other guidelines, for instance, the IOM Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines[14], the IOM Guidance for Evaluation Managers[15] or the IOM Guidance for Evaluators[16], and through technical assistance and coaching, including through EVA managed courses, webinars and training sessions.

This guidance presents the actions needed to ensure a determined level of quality of the terms of reference, inception and evaluation reports. Their quality not only ensures the credibility and success of the evaluation exercise but also the utility and use of the evaluations.

2. PROCESSES, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF IOM EVALUATIONS

As indicated in the IOM Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines[17], a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of all parties directly involved in the different evaluation stages is essential for a sound implementation of high-quality standards for evaluations.

Quality management and control are the primary responsibility of both the evaluation manager and the evaluator, who should ensure that an evaluation is conducted in line with IOM Evaluation Policy and related institutional guidance and templates, as well as in conformity with any requirements and standards agreed upon with other stakeholders, for instance the donor.

---

[11] Available in the IOM Evaluation Repository. https://evaluation.iom.int/guiding-documents
[12] IodParc, Feasibility Study on Quality Management Mechanism. Final Report (2022).
[13] Idem. Page 7
[14] IOM Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (2021)
[15] IOM Guidance for Evaluation Managers
[16] IOM Guidance for Evaluators
[17] Idem, pages 240-241

The main roles and responsibilities to ensure an evaluation of quality include the following:

- **Evaluation Manager**: For guaranteeing some level of independence in quality assurance, the evaluation manager will keep the respective ROMEO(s) updated on the formal quality management steps listed below related to the design of the evaluation and production of checklist and quality control tools (see also the section below for the ROMEOs). There is no need to inform the ROMEO on the 'preparatory' and information steps such as reading existing guidance, briefing of the evaluator(s) or exchange of documents with the evaluation groups.

  During the planning phase:
  - Follow the IOM Guidance for Evaluation Managers for more information.
  - Conduct an evaluability assessment, in particular for complex evaluations, to determine which evaluation type is the most appropriate or whether another evaluative approach is needed.
  - In case the funding is not sufficient to conduct the planned evaluation, reduce the scope while maintaining an acceptable level of quality.
  - Apply the *checklist - terms of reference* when preparing the terms of reference and before their finalization.
  - Include in the terms of reference a statement requesting compliance with the UNEG ethics, norms and standards in evaluation, as well as with IOM's requirements for data protection and protection against sexual exploitation and abuse.
  - Consider setting up an evaluation management/reference group composed of main evaluation stakeholders to provide their perspectives and knowledge during the evaluation exercise and to ensure participatory approach and transparency of the evaluation.
  - Consider the creation of an advisory group of experts on evaluation subject matter if technically needed.
  - Disseminate the final terms of reference and/or request for proposals widely and give applicants sufficient time to apply.
  - Lead the selection process of the evaluator, using the *scorecard for the assessment of applications and selection of the evaluator*, and ensure that the selected evaluator or evaluation team has not been (or expect to be in the near future) involved in any of the activities of the subject under evaluation and is not in a situation of conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest.

  During the undertaking phase:
  - Ensure that the quality requirements are understood by the evaluator.
  - Discuss and ensure agreement on communication protocols from the beginning and with all evaluation actors, as per IOM Guidance on the use of evaluations and follow-up of evaluation recommendations (2022).
  - Ensure that the evaluator(s)and evaluation management/reference/advisory group(s) have full access to information from the beginning of the evaluation[18]. The evaluation commissioner and the ROMEO can also be included in the exchanges of information.

---

[18] A shared Teams group can be created to ensure access to relevant evaluation documents to all relevant internal and external stakeholders, including the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

- Ensure that relevant staff are involved in the evaluation exercise and can provide timely feedback.
- Supervise the production of the evaluation matrix, data collection tools and workplan.
- Ensure the relevance of the different data sources.
- Review the draft inception report and apply the *quality control tool - inception report*.
- Monitor the implementation of the evaluation to address any potential issue and invite the management, reference and/or advisory group(s) for comments whenever relevant (on surveys, interview lists, documentation, draft and final reports).
- Review the draft version of the evaluation report and apply the *quality control tool – evaluation report*.
- Apply again the quality control tool to the final version of the report before publication, in particular if the commenting process on the draft report has led to significant adjustments.

- **Evaluator:**
  - Follow the IOM Guidance for Evaluators [19], the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the IOM data protection principles.
  - Use the *quality control tool - inception report* to review the quality of inception reports before sending the draft and final versions of the inception report to the evaluation manager.
  - Participate regularly in the communication protocols, including kick-off and follow-up meetings to brief relevant parties on progress and findings and to identify any misinterpretation or factual mistake at an early stage before report writing.
  - Report any restriction or limitation encountered in the conduct of duties, including undue pressure and disrespectful behaviour.
  - Maintain transparency in communication with the evaluation manager, management/reference and advisory groups and timeliness in the submission of evaluation products.
  - Use the *quality control tool – evaluation report* to review the quality of reports before sending the draft and final reports to the evaluation manager.

- **Evaluation management/reference group(s)**: As the core groups of stakeholders of the evaluation who can provide different perspectives and knowledge on the subject under evaluation, the management and/or reference group members can support the quality of the evaluation by:

  - Contributing to the evaluation design to enhance its relevance and quality.
  - Reviewing the preliminary findings to enhance their validity and guide the writing of the report.
  - Commenting on the draft evaluation report and its quality.
  - Reviewing the recommendations to enhance their applicability, acceptability and ownership.

- **Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officers (ROMEOs):** During the planning and undertaking phases of the evaluation, the ROMEOs:

  - Assist in the identification of qualified internal or external evaluators.
  - Provide technical support and capacity-building for the planning and conduct of evaluations of relevant quality.

---

[19] See Guidance for Evaluators

o Contribute to the quality review of the evaluation terms of reference and reports in the respective regions in close coordination with the evaluation managers, to guarantee an independent assessment of quality (quality assurance).
o Conduct quality review for complex evaluations in consultation with the evaluation managers.
o Inform and consult with the Central Evaluation Unit (eva@iom.int) on specific technical issues related to quality assurance matters.
o Assist in quality settings to meet quality standards.

- **IOM Central evaluation unit (EVA):** Responsible for Evaluation in IOM, the main activities to contribute to the quality of evaluation include:

o Establishing the framework that provides overall guidance, quality assurance and technical assistance and capacity-building for central and decentralized evaluations.
o Ensuring the quality of centrally managed evaluations.
o Conducting regular meta-evaluations.
o Preparing an annual evaluation report, including considerations on the quality of IOM evaluations.

3. MANDATORY QUALITY CONTROL TOOLS

As indicated in the previous section, three tools are available to assess the completeness and quality of the key documents produced during the different stages of evaluation:

- Checklist for terms of reference,
- Quality control tool for inception reports,
- Quality control tool for evaluation reports.

The checklist of the Terms of Reference is **highly recommended** even if not classified as mandatory during the evaluation planning phase. It lists the requirements for comprehensive terms of reference and for meeting quality standards. Three levels can be considered: *all elements included, elements partially included,* and *elements not included*. If elements listed in the checklist are missing, corrective measures should be taken before publication.

The two quality control tools are **mandatory** for the evaluation manager while undertaking the evaluation and are to be used by the evaluator and the ROMEOs as mentioned in the previous section. Evaluators are required to use these tools to ensure evaluation products meet IOM's requirements and standards. The tools are suitable for both central and decentralized evaluations.

The quality control tool for the final evaluation reports should be included in the submission package for the publication of the evaluation report by the evaluation manager. For evaluations related to projects recorded in PRIMA, this is done by uploading the relevant quality control tools to PRIMA. This will help IOM Central Evaluation Unit to consolidate the information on quality management in its annual report and be useful for the conduct of meta-evaluations, which will use the same rating.

The rating that is required in the quality control tools should be completed considering the following levels:

a) All listed elements are present, complete and interconnected
b) All listed elements are present and complete
c) All listed elements are present but not all of them are complete
d) Some listed elements are present and complete
e) At least one listed element is present but incomplete
f) The listed element(s) are not present

These levels are rated from zero to five, zero if the listed element(s) are not present, and five if all elements are present, complete and interconnected.

For **inception and evaluation reports** the weighted average is calculated and rated as follows:
- highly satisfactory if the value is between 4.13 to 5
- satisfactory between 3.33 to 4.13
- somewhat satisfactory between 2.5 to 3.33
- somewhat unsatisfactory between 1.67 to 2.5
- unsatisfactory between 0.83 to 1.67, and
- highly unsatisfactory from 0 to 0.83.

In addition, the rating for each section is weighted to calculate the overall rating for the report. The relative weight of the components of the **inception reports** are the following:
- introduction (5%)
- evaluation context (10%)
- evaluation purpose, criteria and questions (20%)
- methodology (50%)
- workplan (10%) and
- annexes (5%).

For **evaluation reports** the weights are:
- context and background (7.5%)
- evaluation background, scope and purpose (5%)
- evaluation approach: criteria & questions (5%)
- evaluation methodology (7.5%)
- evaluation findings (25%)
- conclusions (25%) and
- recommendations (25%).

If quality concerns are identified, the ROMEO should be consulted to examine possible recourse for rectifying the situation. In extreme circumstances, both the ROMEO and the IOM Central Evaluation Unit can provide guidance on the termination of the agreement in line with contractual conditions. In the case of termination, LEG would also need to be consulted before informing the evaluator.[20]

For internal evaluators not meeting required quality expectations and if discussions on improvements have not been successful, the evaluation manager can initiate discussions with the ROMEO to identify another IOM staff knowledgeable of evaluation that can complete the exercise satisfactorily.[21]

---

[20] IOM Guidance for Evaluation Managers, page 7.
[21] Ibid.

An overview of the checklist and tools is available in Section 5.

4. META-EVALUATIONS

The IOM Central Evaluation Unit will periodically conduct meta-evaluations and/or peer reviews to judge the quality, merit, worth and significance of evaluations using the criteria and rating tools of the guidance, which are also in line with the rating proposed by the meta-evaluation of 2020. The meta-evaluations/peer reviews may also provide further recommendations on the actions to be taken for the continued improvement of the quality of evaluations in IOM.

The checklist and rating tools on quality have been developed in conformity with the tools used for the meta-evaluation published in 2020 to have the possibility to compare the levels of quality when conducting future annual reviews, peer reviews or meta-evaluations.

5. FORMS

An overview of the checklist and quality control tools is displayed below. To use the tools, please download the Excel version using the hyperlinks provided above.

A. CHECKLIST – TERMS OF REFERENCE

This checklist is to be completed by the evaluation manager to ensure the quality of the Terms of Reference and shared with the ROMEO. Three levels are considered: all elements included, elements partially included, and elements not included. If elements are missing, corrective measures should be taken before publication.

Evaluation Title:		
Project code:		
Date:		Completed by:

SECTION	ELEMENTS	Included
1. Evaluation context	- Summarizes the project, programme, thematic area, strategy or policy that will be evaluated. - Includes a general description of the organizational, local, national and/or international context in which the intervention, strategy or policy operates. - Identifies critical linkages with relevant projects/programmes, thematic areas, strategies, policies or frameworks.	
2. Evaluation purpose and objective	- The evaluation purpose/objective is clearly articulated and achievable, and provides the underlying rationale, why the evaluation will be undertaken (why it is relevant), by whom it will be used (intended users) and how it will be used.	
3. Evaluation scope	- The coverage of the evaluation is explicit (i.e. the period, phase(s) of implementation, geographical area and the levels of stakeholder involvement). - The limitations of the evaluation are acknowledged. - Includes an explanation of relevant cross-cutting themes to the evaluation. - Defines the expectations on recommendations, good practices and lessons learned that could be derived from the analysis (optional).	

4. Evaluation criteria	- The evaluation criteria are spelled out and aligned with the objective/purpose of the evaluation and in line with the OECD/DAC related guidance.	
5. Evaluation questions	- The evaluation questions are grouped and clearly aligned with the evaluation criteria. - The evaluation questions meet the needs of the objective/purpose of the evaluation. - The number of evaluation questions is reasonable, and these can be answered within the evaluation timeframe. - The preparation of the questions involved the key stakeholders (or management/ reference group) and intended evaluation users. - The questions cover human rights, gender equality aspects, and other IOM defined cross-cutting issues relevant to the evaluation.	
6. Evaluation methodology[22]	- The proposed methods are adequate to address the evaluation questions and overall purpose/objective . - The burden of the evaluation methodology on the object of the evaluation and on the stakeholders and affected parties is proportionate to the anticipated benefits of the evaluation. - Methodologies provide what information should be collected, from which source(s), for what purpose and how the collected data will be analysed to answer the evaluation questions. The methodology includes the approaches, data sources, techniques, participation levels, sampling and limitations. - The evaluation approach and methods of data collection and analysis are rights-based and gender-responsive. - Specifies that evaluation data should be disaggregated by social criteria (e.g. sex, ethnicity, age, disability, geographic location, income or education).	
7. Ethics, norms and standards for evaluation	- References the UNEG norms and standards that will guide and frame the evaluation, including the ethical guidelines and IOM data protection principles.	
8. Evaluation Deliverables	- All expected products (deliverables) to be generated at different stages of the evaluation process are listed (inception and evaluation reports, presentations, info graphs, a brief note, management response, etc.).	
9. Specifications of roles	- Outlines the management process of the evaluation, identifying the functional unit or office that will be managing the evaluation. - Explains the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders. - Indicates if an evaluation management, reference, or advisory group will be established.	
10. Time schedule	- Details the estimated dates/duration for each evaluation phase and who is supposed to do what. - The timeline is sufficient to deliver the expected products.	
11. Evaluation budget	- Details the number of days required for each phase and total budget. - Indicate if travels, DSA or data collection costs are to be covered as part of the budget of the evaluation or by IOM separately. - The time and budget are aligned with the proposed scope and methodology.	
12. Evaluation requirements	- Outlines the overall expertise or specific skills required and criteria for selecting the evaluators (including on cross-cutting issues).	
13. Submission procedures	- Provides submission deadline, contact details of the person or entity to whom the application should be sent, and indicates the additional required documents.	

---

[22] A more detailed or alternative methodology could be considered as proposed by the evaluator in its request for proposal and/or inception report.

B. QUALITY CONTROL TOOL – INCEPTION REPORTS

This quality control tool is to be used by the evaluation manager and the evaluator to ensure that all quality requirements are met as per defined rating, while indicating the extent to which each listed element is aligned with the terms of reference.

The cover page of the inception report includes the title of the project, programme, thematic area, strategy, policy or framework being evaluated, name of the evaluator or firm, name of the evaluation commissioner, country(ies) covered (when applicable) and date.

Evaluation Title:		
Project code:		
Date:	Rated by:	

ITEM	ELEMENT	RATING
1. Introduction (5%)	- An introduction of the evaluation assignment is provided.	
2. Evaluation context (10%)	- The context is examined and analysed in sufficient detail (e.g. migration/mobility patterns, humanitarian issues, national policies, institutional capacities and priorities, etc.) - Summarizes the project, programme, thematic area, strategy or policy that will be evaluated. - Identifies key linkages with relevant projects/programmes, thematic areas, strategies, policies or frameworks. - The objectives and purposes or theory of change of the project, programme, policy, thematic area or strategy are mentioned as references for the evaluation.	
3. Evaluation purpose, criteria and questions (20%)	- The evaluation purpose/objective and scope are clearly articulated, achievable and consistent with the terms of reference, or any divergences are explained and well justified. - It provides the underlying rationale, why the evaluation will be undertaken (why it is relevant) and by whom it will be used (intended users). - The evaluation criteria and questions are aligned with the Terms of Reference and meet the needs of the objective/purpose of the evaluation, and a justification is provided for any deviation from the ToRs. - Incorporate an assessment of relevant human rights, gender equality aspects and other IOM defined cross-cutting issues relevant to the evaluation through the selection of the evaluation criteria and questions (i.e., protection, disability inclusion, environmental sustainability, accountability to affected populations).	
4. Methodology (50%)	- The proposed methods are adapted to cover the evaluation questions and objectives described in the terms of reference and are appropriate for the evaluation design. - The evaluation matrix indicates what information should be collected, from which source(s), for what purpose and how the collected data will be analysed to answer the evaluation questions. - Complex questions are broken into sub-questions. - The design provides multiple lines of inquiry and/or data triangulation and explains how this will be approached. If not, there is a clear rationale for doing otherwise. - The burden of the proposed methodology on the object of the evaluation and on the stakeholders and affected parties is proportionate to the anticipated benefits of the evaluation. - Primary and secondary data sources are appropriate, adequate and reliable. - Sampling frame, methods and size(s) are adequate, robust and impartial. - Relevant methodological limitations, evaluability challenges, ethical issues and risks are described, and mitigation strategies are proposed. - The testing and validation of data collection tools are included if relevant. - The proposed evaluation approach and methods of data collection and analysis	

	are rights-based and gender-responsive. - Specify how data will be disaggregated by social criteria (e.g. sex, ethnicity, age, disability, geographic location, income or education). - The approach to adhere to the UNEG Norms and Standards on evaluation and ethical guidelines for evaluation is described. - Highlights and explains any issues or gaps observed during the inception phase that still require discussion with and/or clarification from the Evaluation Manager.	
5. Workplan (10%)	- Detail the estimated dates for each evaluation task and deliverable, and who is supposed to do what. - The timeline is sufficient to deliver the expected products.	
6. Annexes (5%)	- Includes the annexes required such as the evaluation matrix, data collection instruments, list of people to be interviewed and bibliography	
Overall Rating[23]:		
Comments:		

C. QUALITY CONTROL TOOL – EVALUATION REPORTS

This quality control tool is to be used by the evaluation manager and the evaluator to ensure that all quality requirements are met, while indicating the extent to which each listed element is included and aligned with the terms of reference. The quality of the Executive Summary will be reviewed separately and should be in line with the content of the final report (no summary is done for the draft report).

The IOM House Style Manual and the IOM Publication Layout Manual should be applied for all evaluations, noting also the specific requirements concerning references to some countries and use of maps.

Evaluation Title:			
Project code		**Eval. conducted by:**	
Date:		**Rated by:**	
ITEM	**SCORING CRITERIA**	**USER COMMENTS**	**RATING***
Summary (Weight 0%)			
Executive Summary	The summary must include an explanation of the evaluation background (purpose, objectives and intended users), a concise description of the evaluation methodology (methodology, data sources and limitations), and a summary of all evaluation findings, conclusions, and a summary of lessons learned and good practices if relevant.		
Section 4.1: CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND (Weight 7.5%)			
CB1. Outline of contextual factors	1. Provides relevant context (e.g. socio-economic, political, environmental, social, technological, legal...)		
CB2. Clear and relevant description of key stakeholders	1. Rightsholders 2. Implementing agency(ies) 3. Duty bearers/Responsibility holders		
CB3. Explanation of the evaluation subject -background	1. Brief description of the evaluated subject (project, programme, strategy, policy or thematic area). i.e. purpose, objectives, outcomes, time period, geographical scope, etc.		

---

[23] Each level is rated from zero to five, zero if the listed element(s) are not present, and five if all elements are present, complete and interconnected. Based on the selected levels, the weighted average is calculated and rated as follows: highly satisfactory (from 4.13 to 5); satisfactory (from 3.33 to 4.13); somewhat satisfactory (from 2.5 to 3.33); somewhat unsatisfactory (from 1.67 to 2.5); unsatisfactory (from 0.83 to 1.67); and highly unsatisfactory (from 0 to 0.83).

	2. Context and present situation of the subject, including references to relevant programmatic, policy or strategic frameworks (SDGs, GCM, SRF, etc.).		
CB4. Description of intervention logic	1. Logical/results framework of the evaluated subject (project, programme, strategy, policy or thematic area). 2. The description of the causal logic and assumptions is accurate and complete - Theory of Change -.		
CB5. Funding arrangements	1. Reference to funding arrangements. 2. Specific contributions of the IOM.		
Section 4.2: EVALUATION BACKGROUND, SCOPE AND PURPOSE (Weight 5%)			
EB1. Explanation of the purpose/objective of evaluation	1. Purpose (s)/objective. 2. Evaluation purpose(s) /objective (why it is being done) and how it will be used (e.g. accountability, project improvement, organizational learning, promotion, steering and/or fundraising).		
EB2. Description of evaluation scope	1. Geographic coverage 2. Timeframe 3. Thematic coverage		
EB3. List of evaluation clients and main audiences of the report	1. Intended users (donors, implementing partners, etc.) 2. Intended use per client		
Section 4.3 (a): EVALUATION APPROACH: CRITERIA & QUESTIONS (Weight 5%)			
CQ1. Evaluation criteria	1. Evaluation criteria are in line with ToR and Inception report, with justifications if not all criteria are used – main reference are the OECD/criteria. 2. Justification for the use of criteria if different from OCED/DAC (relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact or sustainability). E.g. Use of ALNAP criteria for humanitarian interventions such as appropriateness, coverage, coordination, connectedness or other.		
CQ2. Relevance of evaluation questions	1. The evaluation questions agreed upon in the Inception Report or ToR addressed the goals and purpose of the exercise. 2. Questions include cross-cutting issues.		
CQ3. Inclusion of an evaluation matrix	1. Evaluation matrix, including evaluation indicators and benchmarks). 2. Methods and data sources per question are included in the evaluation matrix.		
Section 4.3 (b): EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (Weight 7.5%)			
EM1. Statement of the evaluation design/approach.	1. Approach used (e.g. formative/summative evaluation, utilization-focused evaluation, participatory evaluation, process evaluation, real-time evaluation, theory-based evaluation, synthesis evaluation, etc.) 2. Justification.		
EM2. Type of analysis considered	1. Type of analysis (e.g. qualitative data analysis, quantitative analysis, etc.). 2. Reliability assurance (e.g. triangulation of data collection methods, diverse evaluators, sources of sampling strategies, etc.) and how diverse perspectives are captured to ensure credibility.		
EM3. Description of data collection methods and sources.	1. Data collection methods used (e.g. document review, interviews, observation, surveys), primary and secondary sources, and why they were selected. 2. Primary and secondary data sources.		
EM4. Sampling procedures	1. The sampling procedures are described, including sample sizes and the mechanics for selecting the subjects. 2. Justification for the selection.		
EM5. Inclusion of relevant cross-cutting issues	1. Gender 2. Rights-based approach (RBA) 3. Environmental sustainability		

	4. Disability 5. Protection 6. Accountability for Affected Populations (AAP)		
EM6. Stakeholder participation	1. Description of the stakeholders and rationale for their participation. 2. Stakeholders' participation level during the evaluation (preparation/review of the ToRs, review of the inception and draft evaluation reports, use of the evaluation and follow of the management response).		
EM7. Limitations of the evaluation	1. Explains the limitations of the evaluations due to the context, methodology, data sources, sampling, team and bias (e.g. selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.) 2. Mitigation strategies for the identified limitations.		
EM8. Description of evaluation norms and standards	1. Describe how the UNEG ethical principles of respect and beneficence were applied. 2. Describe how the data protection principles were explicitly addressed, including how informed consent was obtained and how personal identification data was removed.		
Section 5: EVALUATION FINDINGS (Weight 25%)			
F1. Completeness	1. All evaluation criteria and questions are addressed. 2. All findings are included under the relevant criteria. 3. All findings are aligned with purpose, questions and approach 4. The evidence supporting the findings can be traced through the analysis. 5. Findings are backed by robust evidence, which results from systematic and appropriate data analysis, triangulation and interpretation. 6. Presented evidence (including figures) supports a finding or conclusion. 7. Findings are presented as analysed facts, evidence and data, and not based on anecdotes, hearsay, or a compilation of people's opinions.		
F2. Robustness	1. Findings are specific, concise, and justified by evidence and valid analysis and interpretation. 2. All calculations and numbers have been verified. 3. Graph and figures match/represent the evidence/numbers. 4. Data is disaggregated by key variables. 5. Any omission of baselines and targets is justified.		
F3. Identification of causal factors leading to accomplishments and failures	1. The causal factors leading to the achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. 2. Description of unintended effects whenever identified during the evaluation.		
F4. IOM Cross-cutting issues are adequately addressed	1. Reflect how gender, disability, rights-based approach and environmental issues and other relevant cross-cutting dimensions were incorporated in the data collection and analysis.		
Section 6.1: CONCLUSIONS (Weight 25%)			
C1. Value	1. Conclusions are clearly linked to findings 2. Conclusions provide insights and add value to related findings.		
C2. Reasoned	1. Conclusions are grounded in facts and reflect reasonable critical thinking and evaluative judgments to withstand criticism generated by value judgments. 2. Judgments are to the extent possible objective.		
Section 6.2: RECOMMENDATIONS (Weight 25%)			

R1. Clarity	1. Are clear and concise (i.e. one or two sentences followed by explanatory text, if needed). 2. Are based on and directly linked to findings and/or conclusions of the report 3. Are clustered and prioritized.		
R2. Relevance	1. Address key issues and are useful, tied to the subject and purposes of the evaluation. 3. Are fair, unbiased, impartial, practical, will cause no harm, and are not excessively prescriptive. 2. Take into account the context. 3. Address cross-cutting issues.		
R3. Actionability	1. Recommendations are practical, action-oriented, specific, and time-bound.		
Section 6.3 (a): LESSONS LEARNED - (Weight 0% - Optional) Lessons learned are generalizations based on evaluation experiences that abstract from specific circumstances to broader situations.			
LL1. Relevance	1. Lessons learned are derived from findings. 2. Lessons learned represent a relevant (non-trivial)/ new piece of information to be considered in the future.		
LL2. Delimitation	1. The lessons concisely capture the context from which they were derived. 2. lessons learned target specific users.		
LL3. Applicability	1. The lessons suggest what should be repeated or avoided in future contexts to guide action. 2. The lessons learned include causal factors.		
Section 6.3 (b): GOOD PRACTICES (Weight 0% - Optional) A good practice has been proven to work well and produce go+B21od results and is therefore recommended as a model. It is a successful experience which has been tested and validated.			
GP1. Delimitation	1. The good practices concisely capture the contexts from which they were derived. 2. The good practices specify target users.		
GP2. Applicability & replicability	1. The statements describe how the good practices should be implemented and by whom. 2. The good practices explore their applicability in different contexts.		
GP3. Impact	1. The good practice demonstrates a link to specific impacts. 2. The different impacts identified are viable/possible (realistic).		
Annexes (Weight 0%)			
Annexes	Includes the terms of reference and/or inception Report, Theory of Change (if requested), evaluation matrix, list of informants and data collection tools, list of documents reviewed and any other annexes relevant to support the main text.		
Overall rating:			
% of satisfactory or highly satisfactory sections:			
Overall comments:			