



## UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<i>Formative Evaluation of the Pacific Regional Ending Violence Against Women (EVAW) Facility Fund</i>		
<b>Region</b>	Asia and the Pacific	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu
<b>Overall Rating</b>			
<p><b>Overall Feedback:</b> Overall, the report rated as: <b>Very Good</b>. The reviewers made the following specific comments: <i>“Within the boundaries of a purely qualitative design, this report contains many strong elements. It demonstrates a clear understanding of the context, references appropriate human rights frameworks and statistics, applies a highly participatory process, and develops a set of recommendations that are demonstrably owned by primary intended users. Particularly interesting aspects of the report are the use of an evaluation criterion on Inclusion and the participatory workshop used to develop conclusions. Whilst a number of elements could still be strengthened, the it largely meets or exceeds all UNEG standards.”</i></p> <p>The reviewers also noted some positive evaluation practices in the report. These included <i>“The evaluation process - including participatory workshop on conclusions and recommendations, and the use of an “Inclusion Criteria”.”</i></p>		<b>Good</b>	
<b>Terms of Reference included?</b>	Yes	<b>Executive Summary</b>	Very Good
<b>PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION</b>			<b>Good</b>
<p><i>The evaluation report strikes a useful balance between contextual and programmatic background information - cross-referencing important gender equality and human rights issues. Good reference is made to CEDAW and statistical data, as well as a gender responsive discussion on the experience and implications of VAW. Whilst the budget of the fund is explicitly referenced, and various stakeholders are discussed throughout the report, it would have been informative to have included an explicit stakeholder map - including (where possible) estimated sizes of stakeholding groups. This could even be included as an annex in the same way the results framework is presented.</i></p>			
<b>PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>			<b>Good</b>
<p><i>The purpose of the evaluation discussion is excellent - explaining why the evaluation is needed and how it will be used. All of the criteria are described (although a table summarising this would also have been useful) and human rights and gender are explicitly mainstreamed as well as being highlighted under 'inclusiveness'. If the report were to include a detailed discussion on scope - including the boundaries of the evaluation and the reasons for excluding certain issues/sources - then the report could be rated as excellent.</i></p>			
<b>PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>			<b>Good</b>
<p><i>The method chosen is primarily qualitative and is thus subject to the limitations and advantages of this design. However, it remains a justifiable choice for a formative evaluation. The methods are strengthened significantly by the detail provided on the evaluation process (which emphasised participation) and the presentation of data collection tools. Some more methodological discussion on</i></p>			

<i>sampling and the applications of ethics standards would have been welcome, but the method is robust given the context and purpose.</i>	
<b>PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<i>Findings are systematic and respond to all of the evaluation criteria and questions. The discussion on human rights is mainstreamed throughout the document, and the use of boxes to highlight issues from CEDAW is also excellent. The evidence marshalled is almost exclusively qualitative; however the report is mostly very disciplined in stating the source of different findings. Discussions on the underlying causes of challenges to the programme as part of the 'key issues' section is of great relevance to policy makers.</i>	
<b>PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Good</b>
<i>Conclusions are taken from across the range of criteria covered by the evaluation, and include organisational, programmatic and human rights issues appropriately. There is some scope to elaborate the conclusions further in order to give greater insight and also to marshal the evidence behind each conclusion more explicitly. Nevertheless, for the reader who has been through all of the findings, it is clear that the conclusions do represent the most important issues identified by the evaluation.</i>	
<b>PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<i>The process of developing the recommendations is excellent – showing a high level of participation that is likely to have resulted in strong actionability and ownership of the recommendations. The combination of a short summary and a more detailed explanation also works well.</i>	
<b>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>Meets Requirements</b> <b>SWAP Score: 10/12</b>
<i>The evaluation is limited by the monitoring systems of the object in present disaggregated data - but greater use of quantitative data could still have been considered in terms of identifying the groups most included/excluded from the fund. Nevertheless, the discussion makes strong references to human rights principles and CEDAW throughout, and discusses the implications of findings for different groups (including men). The findings might have discussed power, and the evaluation is missing a discussion of scope (and thus gender issues within this). However, the use of an 'Inclusiveness' criteria makes a strong contribution to the gender responsiveness of the evaluation.</i>	
<b>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<i>The evaluation is very clearly structured and includes all the required information. It is logical and uses highlighting within the text to ensure that the reader can quickly identify central issues.</i>	

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

- Including a specific table or annex on the stakeholding groups, their roles and the size of the sample frame would provide an important framing element of a future evaluation. Better Evaluation has identified several useful guidelines on approaches to stakeholder mapping:  
[http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/mapping\\_stakeholders/guidelines](http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/mapping_stakeholders/guidelines)
- Future reports should ensure that an explicit discussion of the evaluation scope is included.
- Including a specific section on the interpretation and realisation of ethics standards would further strengthen this report. The process chosen by the evaluation has elements of Collaborative Outcomes reporting Technique, which might help inform future formative evaluations of this nature:  
<http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/cort>
- Whilst this is a formative evaluation and uses a qualitative design, it could have been interesting to apply some quantitative analysis to the evidence in order to triangulate findings (or at least to have included some frequency data for often issues came up).
- It may be useful to restructure the conclusions in the same way that the recommendations are presented - with the brief statement in bold and additional accompanying text that explains the evidence, reliability,

applicability and implications of each conclusion for the primary intended users.

- It could be interesting to note the particular conclusions that each recommendation pertains to as either a subtitle or footnote to each recommendation.
- The evaluation might have considered undertaking Critical Systems Heuristics or another participatory approach to map the roles of different stakeholders and explore the power dynamics behind the fund (see [http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/critical\\_system\\_heuristics](http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/critical_system_heuristics)).
- This is an excellent report that is clearly structured and develops a convincing set of recommendations based on the stated methods and evidence. It can be shared with other evaluators to support their work.