### Overall Report Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Report Rating</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title of the Evaluation Report

MALAWI GENDER BASED GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME MIDTERM EVALUATION

### Report sequence number

0

### Date of Review
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### Year of the Evaluation Report
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### Region
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### Country(ies)

Malawi

### Executive Summary in Final Report

Fully

### TORs sent with Report

Yes

### OVERALL RATING

Overall Rating: Good

### Executive Feedback on Overall Rating

Overal, this report is fit-for-purpose. There are some opportunities to enhance the transparency of the level and lines of evidence being used to support each finding and recommendation; and it would have benefited from an explanation of the overall design. However, it also maintains a strong focus on the formative purpose, which would appear to support the overall utility of the evaluation.

### PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

**PARAMETER 1**

**Good**

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 1

There are two main introductory sections, both of which speak to the programme itself; including an excellent elaboration and critique of the theory of change. Only limited analysis of the wider context outside of the programme is provided.

### PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

**PARAMETER 2**

**Good**

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 2

The report elaborates the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation (although these are both mislabelled). Although there is a sub-heading for scope, this actually lists objectives.

### PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY

**PARAMETER 3**

**Satisfactory**

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 3

The report lists a series of methods that are suitable for data collection and analysis. However, it does not fully elaborate the overall design logic of the evaluation. Ethics are also not directly mentioned (although data tools are included in the annexes).

### PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS

**PARAMETER 4**

**Good**

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 4

The findings include a scoring rubric, synthesis of the data, and elaboration of key issues. This is a helpful approach in the context of a formative evaluation. While multiple sources of evidence - interviews, survey, visits - are cited, the report might have presented this evidence in more accessible ways (tables, diagrams, etc). As it is, the weight of evidence supporting or contradicting each point is not always immediately evident.

### PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

**PARAMETER 5**

**Good**

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 5

The report integrates lessons into the findings section, which is an interesting and useful approach; however, these lessons are focused on the object itself, and so do not fully meet with the definition of generalised lessons in the standards. Conclusions draw from the findings, and speak to all of the evaluation criteria.

### PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS

**PARAMETER 6**

**Good**

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 6

The recommendations section provides an extensive, but useful divided, list of proposals. This is appropriate to the formative nature of the evaluation. The process for developing and validating the recommendations is not fully elaborated.

### PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS

**PARAMETER 7**

Meets Requirements
### Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7

The scope and objectives of the evaluation cover GEEW because of the object of the evaluation; they do not reference GE/HR as a specific area of coverage. There is not an evaluation matrix, however, the evaluatio draws on the development results framework, which does include gender indicators; and the evaluation tools specifically pick up gender dimensions.

One of the evaluation criteria is specifically defined as addressing GEEW (the others implicitly assess gender because of the evaluation object). Evaluation questions draw on the wider work of UN-Women (such as the meta analysis (based on the Strategic Plan framework) to address issues of wider interest to UN-Women.

The evaluation uses mixed methods to triangulate multiple perspectives, including participatory discussions with rights holders. While there is less evidence of participation in the data analysis phase than in data collection, the use to multiple site visits and FGDs within the limited budget of the evaluation maximised the opportunity for rights holders to influence the outcome of the evaluation.

The findings include a section on gender equality and human rights; and the conclusions and recommendations sections refer to institutional capacity to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment. A deeper gender analysis cutting across all aspects of the evaluation is less evident.

### Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8

The report has a somewhat unusual arrangement of information in the opening sections, but this does not detract from the overall quality — and may be a useful feature given the purpose of the evaluation. The use of opportunities and challenges throughout the report is also of note.