**PART I: REPORT OBJECTIVES**

**SECTION 3: OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE**

- **Objectives:**
  - Partly
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Fully

- **Scope:**
  - Partly
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Fully

**PART II: METHODOLOGY**

**SECTION 1: METHODOLOGY**

- **Methodology:**
  - Methodology is not generally explained, with information about the basis of evidence, data analysis and translation and limitations or a list of limitations.
  - The state provides the basis (or initial) statements, inputs, criteria, etc. to provide the reader with assurance that the methods were appropriate for the translation, analysis and assessment of all specific findings. These methods are not clearly explained and are not adequate for the scope of the evaluation.

**PART III: EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES METRIC**

**SECTION 1: EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES METRIC**

- **Evaluation of objectives:**
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Fully

**PART IV: EVALUATION OF FINDINGS**

**SECTION 1: EVALUATION OF FINDINGS**

- **Findings:**
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Fully

**PART V: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

**SECTION 1: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

- **Conclusions:**
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Fully

**PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS**

**SECTION 1: RECOMMENDATIONS**

- **Recommendations:**
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Mostly
  - Fully
8.1 The purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. Is this report well-structured, written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Fully

8.2 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. Partially integrated (1) Is the report logically structured, and evidence presented with clarity and relevance (e.g., for structure and presentation scores to identify and analyze treatment options, data tables and figures, method and methodology would normally provide findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, recommendation and recommendations) and is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Fully

8.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. Partially integrated (1) The evaluation scope fully included gender as appropriate for assessment related to VAW. Even if no references are made to assessment of existence of data on gender-related results, GEEW is included in the evaluation scope and evaluation questions related to gender (all are included). The methodology is partially gender-responsive. Methodology is too generally explained. There are no references to gender in the methodology and/or to the task of indicators to measure gender progress. The methodology was based on data collection methods, but more information was needed on the sampling strategy to demonstrate that the methodology was developed to address gender. Suggest providing information about the sampling frame, with references to data collection related to gender (all are included). Is the report logically structured, and evidence presented with clarity and relevance (e.g., for structure and presentation scores to identify and analyze treatment options, data tables and figures, method and methodology would normally provide findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, recommendation and recommendations) and is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Fully

7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. Partially integrated (1) The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. Partially integrated (1) Is this report well-structured, written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Fully

7.1 GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected. Fully designated (1)

8.4 Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information on survey and interview questionnaires, list of documentary evidence. ToR, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires). Suggest providing information about the sampling frame, with references to data collection related to gender (all are included). Is this report well-structured, written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Fully

PART V: THE FINDINGS
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PART VI: THE EVALUATION

Executive Feedback on Section I1

Overall Rating

Weighted score

85.00

Part I: The findings

Executive Feedback on Section 8

Overall Rating

Weighted score

85.00

Part II: The evaluation

Other reviewer's comments

The evaluation scope fully included gender as appropriate for assessment related to VAW. Even if no references are made to assessment of existence of data on gender-related results, GEEW is included in the evaluation scope and evaluation questions related to gender (all are included). The methodology is partially gender-responsive. Methodology is too generally explained. There are no references to gender in the methodology and/or to the task of indicators to measure gender progress. The methodology was based on data collection methods, but more information was needed on the sampling strategy to demonstrate that the methodology was developed to address gender. Suggest providing information about the sampling frame, with references to data collection related to gender (all are included).