

UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|--|
| | | Response | | |
| Title of the Evaluation Report | | Mid-term Evaluation of UN Women's Anti-human Trafficking Programme | | |
| Report sequence number | o | Date of Review | | Year of the Evaluation Report 2013 |
| Region | Asia and the Pacific | | Country(ies) | India |
| Executive Summary in Final Report | Yes | | TORs sent with Report | No |
| OVERALL RATING | | | Overall Rating | Unsatisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on Overall Rating | <p>Whilst the analysis that is included is strong, and the presentation of data (including stakeholders, participants, and results) is excellent, the report lacks cohesion because of the absence of stated criteria, questions or an evaluation framework. The material that is presented can still be used because it is organised according to the logical framework. However, this only addresses effectiveness, and so decision makers are expected to follow the recommendations without any consideration of relevance, sustainability or efficiency. The absence of all these issues - in addition to a weak executive summary - makes the overall report fall below UN Women standards (despite its excellent writing style and presentation).</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION | | | PARAMETER 1 | Satisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 | <p>Whilst the reader has to flip through the findings and annex to locate some of the information, the programme logic and implementation status is well covered. However, there is very limited contextual information and data on the scale of the project and the budget is entirely missing.</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE | | | PARAMETER 2 | Unsatisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 | <p>The justification of the evaluation is well presented, although the specific objectives are not clear. There are no evaluation criteria presented, nor evaluation questions stated.</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY | | | PARAMETER 3 | Satisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 3 | <p>The methods are very briefly described in terms of design and limitations. These are not the standard required by UN Women. However, the detailed presentation of the evaluation tools and an excellent diagram means that the reader can reassemble what the overall design was and can be confident in the process. There is no discussion of ethics despite the sensitive issues involved.</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS | | | PARAMETER 4 | Good |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 4 | <p>The findings is the strongest section of this report, with systematic assessment of the evaluand according to the programme logframe. Good use is made of triangulation and mixed data types. However, the lack of criteria means that only effectiveness is covered by the findings.</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED | | | PARAMETER 5 | Satisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 5 | <p>Conclusions are structured according to the logframe. Although they only consider effectiveness, they are detailed and provide useful insights. The conclusions, however, do not marshal evidence from the findings as much as might be expected.</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS | | | PARAMETER 6 | Satisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6 | <p>Recommendations very clearly build off of the conclusions, with detailed breakdown of actions. However, these seem to be broadly targeted at UN Women, rather than have well identified stakeholders.</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS | | | PARAMETER 7 | Good |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7 | <p>Gender and human rights are considered well within the scope of the logframe, but this is limited largely to the context of how effective the programme has been. Good gender disaggregation of data is provided in tables</p> | | | |
| PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE | | | PARAMETER 8 | Unsatisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8 | <p>The Executive summary cannot stand alone as a document as it does not include information on the evaluation methods or the recommendations. The Annexes require the inclusion of the TOR as a basic element, and the re is no means of telling which country the report relates to or who undertook the evaluation from the front pages.</p> | | | |