

UN Women Global Evaluation Report Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS)



Executive Feedback Template

Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Title of the Evaluation Report	External Evaluation of the Elimination of Violence Against Women (EVAW) Special Fund 2008-14				
Report sequence number	22	Date of Review	2016	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Asia and the Pacific		Country(ies)	Afghanistan	
Executive Summary in Final Report	Good		TORs sent with Report	Yes	
OVERALL RATING			Overall Rating	Good	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	Overall this is a credible report. The findings, conclusions and recommendations appear to be sound and relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives. The report has a significant gap in discussion of progress against indicators e.g. using a results chain/ToC. A gender and human rights 'lens' could have sharpened and deepened the focus in that areas.				
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			PARAMETER 1	Satisfactory	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The context setting around VAW in Afghanistan is clear and provides useful background information. The description of the programme is brief and focuses on its purpose, objective and evolution. The description of the programme is limited to its purpose, objective, alignment with wider policies and initiatives and how it has evolved. No framework or logic model was included. There are omissions around the resources, roles of implementing partners and donors. The contextual description is helpful and relevant.				
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			PARAMETER 2	Good	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The ToRs are followed in terms of the purpose, objectives and scope. The purpose and objectives follow those in the ToRs. The purpose could have gone on to provide clarity around who needs what information. Evaluation criteria are developed into questions (but it is not specified as to whether this was a consultative process or any prioritization of questions). There are no specific GE and HR criteria and questions (beyond those that will be addressed given the nature of the programme).				
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			PARAMETER 3	Good	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	This is good overall. The methodology is clear and appears to be an appropriate design, but there is discussion of the limitations of the methods applied in practice (appears to be design of the methods e.g. interview guiding questions, and survey the results of which could not be used) and further questions should be asked to avoid this happening in the future. Data sources were listed well, and the mix of data sources was appropriate. There is honest discussion of the limitation of the methods applied in practice. The sampling frame was led by security reasons particularly given elections in consultation with UN Women which is understandable. It was not discussed as to how representative the sample was. Attempts to remove the bias were carried out by a survey which included all of those that the field evaluators could not visit.				
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			PARAMETER 4	Good	

Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	This is a sound response to the evaluation criteria and questions, using the methodology set out. It is difficult to fully assess without evaluation indicators/results chain/logic model. The findings respond to the DAC criteria and questions in a clear and coherent way. The evaluator has taken on board the security constraints and the wider context and how they affect the programme's progress.
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	The conclusions represent a brief summary of the findings, and do not provide additional reflection or insights. A reader could not only read this as a 'standalone section', and would have to refer to the findings section as well. This is only considered as satisfactory because although the conclusions are plausible based upon the findings, the conclusions do not provide any further insights, discussion or limited identification of solutions to problems.
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS	
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	The recommendations are relevant to the purpose and objective. They are linked to the findings and conclusions but could have been presented in a way that made those links clearer. They are not prioritized. However, some are very broad, and there is no prioritization of them.
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS	
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	The referencing to gender and human rights in the document shows partial awareness of what is required. The scope of analysis does not discuss a HR and GE lens being used (beyond VAW being the focus of the programme). Indicators are not included therefore it is not possible to state. Evaluation questions do not specify GE and HR issues; there is no specific sub-set of relevant questions. There is reference to integrating Gender, however it could go further for example to include how rights holders were included within the methodology. Some good practice of participatory techniques for example were used. There could have been more substantive discussion of the findings of the outcomes of the programme around gender, and reflections on the programmes systems and resourcing.
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE	
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	This report largely follows the structure shown in the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports. The report is well structured and presented, and the threads of the evaluation criteria run through it. However there is one large omission which effects the report - the logframe/ToC. In addition there could have been further linking of the findings and conclusions.