

| UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | Response | | | |
| Title of the Evaluation Report | The Mehwar Centre Final PROJECT Evaluation | | | |
| Report sequence number | 0 Date of Review | Year of the Evaluation Report | 2013 | |
| Region | Arab States | Country(ies) | oPt | |
| Executive Summary in Final Report | Yes | TORs sent with Report | Yes | |
| | OVERALL RATING | Overall Rating | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Overall Rating | There are multiple aspects of this report that are excellent, and good examples of data presentation and use. The information on evaluation participants is particularly good, as is the discussion of evaluation tools. The evaluation used a framework which is good practice, although this and the rest of the evaluation design are not discussed sufficiently. However, the major weakness of the report is the lack of a conclusions section that is a distinct requirement under UN Women standards. | | | |
| PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND C | ONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION | PARAMETER 1 | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 | The report introduces the centre, its history and context, but does not provide a clear picture of the logic of the particular programme interventions or the results framework from the project. However, the stakeholder analysis - which is combined with information on the sampling and respondents - is highly detailed and provides lots of useful information for the reader. | | | |
| PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJ | ECTIVES AND SCOPE | PARAMETER 2 | Satisfactory | |
| xecutive Feedback on are clearly stated. The reader has to derive the scope of the evaluation from looking at the annexes. But, the purpose and objectives are clearly stated. | | | | |
| PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOG | γ | PARAMETER 3 | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 3 | The report provides a detailed discussion of the evaluation tool s that were used, but there is no discussion of the overall design or its limitations. This has to be guessed at by the reader by comparing the tools to the presentation of the findings. Everything indicates that the evaluation process was robust, but the report does need to specify this information more clearly. There is also no discussion of ethics. However, the discussion on sampling and stakeholders is very detailed and of good quality. | | | |
| PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS | | PARAMETER 4 | Good | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 4 | -5 ··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS | AND LESSONS LEARNED | PARAMETER 5 | Unsatisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 5 | The report does not contain conclusions. Conclusions are a core requirement under UN Women quality standards. | | | |
| PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDA | | PARAMETER 6 | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6 | The recommendations are only based on the findings (there ar the recommendations to largely technical change sin the projec to specific stakeholders, there is no indication of how the recor- feasible they are. | ct. Whilst they are logically | structured and linked | |
| PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND I | HUMAN RIGHTS | PARAMETER 7 | Good | |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7 | The report includes good discussion of human rights and gend data where possible. There is a useful discussion of duty-bearing | | regating quantitative | |
| PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT S | | PARAMETER 8 | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8 | The absence of conclusions is a major issue for this report, wit putting this aside, sections such as the Methods need to be exp What material is included in the main report is excellently writ | anded with more informat | | |