

| UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template |
|---|
|---|

| Overall Report Rating | Very Good | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | Response | | | | | |
| Title of the Evaluation Report | Report of Final Evaluation | Report of Final Evaluation Integrating Gender in Peace Support Operations | | | | |
| Report sequence number | 0 | Date of Review 01 February 20 | 2018 Year of the Evaluation Report | 2017 | | |
| Region | Eastern and Southern Africa | | Country(ies) | Kenya | | |
| Executive Summary in Final Report | Partly | | TORs sent with Report | Yes | | |
| | OVERALL RATING | | Overall Rating | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on Overall Rating This is a robust evaluation report that draws on both qualitative and quantitative analysis to produce recommendations that are relevant to the purpose. It would benefit in some places with more extensive analysis, and a stronger executive summary would help to make it even more usable. | | | | | | |
| PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND C | CONTEXT OF THE EVALUA | TION | PARAMETER 1 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 | The report describes the broad theory of change alongside the key expected results; and demonstrates the potential for adding even greater value if this analysis had been extended into a more nuanced analysis of each stage of the theory of change. The presentation of key stakeholders and implementation status is very comprehensive. | | | | | |
| PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJ | JECTIVES AND SCOPE | | PARAMETER 2 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 The purpose and scope of the evaluation are acurately portrayed; but the report unfortunately mixes th eevaluation objectives with the project objectives, and this would benefit from clarification. | | | | | | |
| PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOG | GY | | PARAMETER 3 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 3 | | | uld only benefit from some more tee and an explanation of how the sing | | | |
| PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS | | | PARAMETER 4 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 4 | The findings are based on object and non-accomplishment of res | | explaining the factors contributing | to the accomplishment | | |
| PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS | S AND LESSONS LEARNED | | PARAMETER 5 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 5 | The conclusions are brief, but s referencing to specific pieces of | | assessment of strengths and weakne | ess, and useful cross | | |
| PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDA | ATIONS | | PARAMETER 6 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6 | The recommendations are shor | rt, but relevant to the purpos | se. They are small in number and li | | | |
| PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND | HUMAN RIGHTS | | PARAMETER 7 | Meets Requirements | | |

| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7 | The evaluation scope and objectives explicitly addressed gender equality and human rights. Indicators refer to the consideration of gender, although they are generally institutional rather than gender-specific. The evaluation included standalone criterion on gender equality and human rights; but ensured that it was not siloed by havingquestions that cut across multiple criteria. The evaluation applied a participatory qualitative approach to data collection; and this ensured that issues of gender equality were captured. However, the methods for data analysis did not include clear mechanisms for ensuring participatory interpretation of the evidence. The findings address gender equality specifically in a standalone section based on the evaluation matrix. However, this is very short and not a full analysis. Conclusions and recommendations are clearly derived from the findings. | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|------|--|--|
| PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE | | PARAMETER 8 | Good | | |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8 The report is logically structured and easy to navigate. It communicates key messages clearly. The exceutive summary, however, is very concise and misses several key pieces of information. | | | | | |