



UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Title of the Evaluation Report	<i>End-of-Programme Evaluation of EC-UN Women's "Supporting Gender Equality in the Context of HIV/AIDS"</i>		
Region/HQ Division	Policy Division , Head Quarters	Country(ies)	Cambodia, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Kenya, Rwanda.
Overall Rating			Very Good
<p>Overall, the report rated as: Very Good. The reviewers made the following specific comments: <i>"This is an excellently written report that is clearly cognisant of UNEG standards. It is not perfect: some additions could include a statement on ethics and greater elaboration of some conclusions. Overall, however, it exceeds many of UN Women's standards for an evaluation report and present insights that are consistent, evidence-based, and useful. The findings and recommendations sections are particularly high quality, and draw the most out of the limitations faced based a primarily qualitative design."</i></p> <p>The reviewers also noted some positive evaluation practices in the report. These included <i>"The report includes the voice of affected populations throughout the report in order to provide concrete examples that support the overall analysis."</i></p>			
Terms of Reference included?	Yes	Executive Summary	Very Good
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			Very Good
<p><i>The evaluation both presents the logical framework and discusses the underlying theories of change (including assumptions). The context provided is an excellent summarisation of the knowledge that is needed by a reader to fully understand the programme and the reasons for its creation. Groups of stakeholders are clearly listed and this is used to guide the design of the report.</i></p>			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			Good
<p><i>The evaluation criteria are described in detail with reference to UNEG guidance. Additional frameworks used by the evaluation (such as ODI's paper on measuring policy change) are also considered good practice. Whilst the discussion of purpose, objectives and scope is fairly concise, all the essential elements are addressed well.</i></p>			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			Good
<p><i>The methodology selected is appropriate to the purpose and object of the evaluation, and is executed with precision. The specification of content, narrative and comparative analysis adds weight to the findings (although, as the report acknowledges, the sample was insufficient to take advantage of the potential for quantitative analysis of this data). The evaluation highlights participatory elements, including direct engagement with women and men affected by HIV and AIDS. The only real missing element is a specific discussion on ethics and how the UN Women guidance was interpreted and applied.</i></p>			

PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS	Very Good
<i>The findings section is detailed and meticulous in responding to the evaluation framework. Evidence from the stated methods is clearly marshalled, and the evaluators specifically use qualifying terms (such as 'majority of') to give an indication of the frequency with which specific points arose. The evaluation does not discuss impact, but replaces this instead with a discussion of key issues and challenges, which is likely to be useful for future programming.</i>	
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	Good
<i>The conclusions section is fairly concise, but responds systematically to the evaluation framework and gives examples of supporting evidence. The conclusions are balanced and present both the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. The lessons learned are clearly identified, appropriate and likely to be useful.</i>	
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS	Very Good
<i>The recommendations are clearly stated and provide excellent practical examples (such as presenting a proposed theory of change in recommendation 1). These are clearly linked to the conclusions and findings, and appear to be both relevant and actionable.</i>	
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS	Meets Requirements SWAP Score: 10/12
<i>The evaluation includes substantial discussion of gender and human rights considerations in both the methods chosen and the analysis undertaken. The absence of quantitative data precludes the use of disaggregated analysis; however, the inclusion of a specific criteria on gender and human rights may have helped strengthen the report further.</i>	
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE	Very Good
<i>The report is excellently structured and clearly written in line with UNEG standards. It makes appropriate use of graphics, tables and boxes; includes important annexes; and begins with a strong executive summary that can stand alone.</i>	

In order to help strengthen future evaluation reports, the reviewers offered the following constructive suggestions:

- Whilst the background section does provide useful financial data, some of the information from the efficiency discussion that was a presentation of data rather than of analysis (for example budgets for each country) might have been brought forward – leaving the findings section to focus on analysis.
- The discussion of the purpose and the scope might also be considered as an opportunity to introduce gender responsive analysis – such as analysing whose questions are being asked, and whose perspectives are being privileged by the evaluation.
- Future reports can be proofread to ensure that evaluators have included specific reference to the ethical standards that were applied and the techniques used to apply these.
- This report serves as a good benchmark for future evaluations of global programmes.
- The conclusions could have been elaborated a little further to give deeper insights into the underlying causal factors and cross-cutting themes.
- It would add additional value if the report were to provide a specific statement on the process by which the recommendations were developed beyond the techniques that were used by the evaluation team (for example, whether there were any participatory processes).
- Future evaluations might consider adding a specific criterion on gender and human rights, in addition to the mainstreaming of GE/HR as implemented in this evaluation.
- It would have been interesting to have an impression of the make-up of the evaluation team from the initial pages of Volume 1, rather than having to search for the team list hidden in Volume 2.