

## UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

<b>Overall Report Rating</b>	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
	<b>Response</b>			
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Strengthening women's capacity in disaster risk reduction to cope with climate change in Viet Nam</b>			
<b>Report sequence number</b>	0	<b>Date of Review</b>	February 26th, 2018	<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>
<b>Region</b>	Asia and the Pacific		<b>Country(ies)</b>	Viet Nam
<b>Executive Summary in Final Report</b>	Fully		<b>TORs sent with Report</b>	No
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b>	Overall, this is a good quality evaluation report that can be used with confidence. It is based on a strong methodology, provides analytical findings, and forward-looking conclusions. This being said, the conclusions could present a more balanced view of the project by discussing weaknesses and offering some insights into potential solutions. Additionally, the actionability of the recommendations could be strengthened by discussing how recommendations could potentially be implemented.			
<b>PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION</b>			<b>PARAMETER 1</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	The object of evaluation and its evolution are very well outlined. The project's planned outputs and outcomes are identified within the report but the full Theory of Change model is presented in the annexes, which are not attached to the report. While the report provides some useful information on the context in which the project operated, including the key national frameworks relating to climate change and disaster reduction, more statistical information on the actual situation and how it affects women would be useful. Key project partners and their contributions are well identified but the report does not clearly outline different groups of rights holders.			
<b>PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>			<b>PARAMETER 2</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	The evaluation purpose, objectives, and scope are clearly outlined. The report is particularly strong at identifying both primary and secondary evaluation users. The evaluation uses standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and lists the evaluation questions within the body of the report. The report also explains how it used a participatory and gender sensitive approach.			
<b>PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>			<b>PARAMETER 3</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 3</b>	The evaluation used a strong mixed methods methodology that gathered primary quantitative and qualitative data. The methodology was participatory and was sensitive to GEEW and human rights. While the report explains that the evaluation used a purposeful sampling approach, the criteria used to select evaluation participants is not outlined. The approach was highly participatory and included stakeholder engagement at multiple stages of the evaluation process. Unfortunately, the lists of persons interviewed, documents consulted, and copies of the evaluation tools are found within the annexes, which are not attached to the report. While the report references the UNEG Ethical Guidelines, a more thorough discussion within the report as to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and the ethical safeguards used to protect evaluation participants is warranted.			
<b>PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS</b>			<b>PARAMETER 4</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 4</b>	Findings present an analytical assessment of the information obtained through the mixed methods methodology, reflecting the voices of diverse stakeholders. They are presented per evaluation criterion and are structured around the evaluation questions, thus easily facilitating answers to the criteria and questions. They are strong at discussing the causal factors for the accomplishment and non-accomplishment of results, and they discuss unexpected results within the impact section.			
<b>PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>			<b>PARAMETER 5</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 5</b>	Conclusions are forward-looking and provide analytical value beyond a summary of the findings. They do not, however, present a balanced view of the object of evaluation, as they are primarily focused on the positive elements of the project. The report presents 12 lessons learned. However, they consist of very general statements that do not provide enough substance or detail to be very useful to evaluation users.			

<b>PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 6</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6</b>	The recommendations are supported by the evidence presented in the evaluation findings and conclusions, and they are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation. They are clearly prioritized and identify a target group for action. However, they do not include a detailed explanation as to how they could be implemented. The report explains that they were developed in consultation with project stakeholders.		
<b>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 7</b>	<b>Meets Requirements</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7</b>	GEEW is included in the scope and objectives of the evaluation; no evaluation indicators are provided in the report. The evaluation questions address GEEW both as an intened outcome of the intervention, and in a few cases directly. Gender is explicitly mainstreamed in two criteria. The evaluation is a qualitative design based on a 'concentric circle methodology' that triangulated multiple lines and levels of evdience from purposively sampled groups, including women and men not involved in the project. The report also cites that opportunities for participation were extended to the validation phase. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations explicitly address Gender Equality and human rights through both standalone sub-sections, and mainstreamed into the wider analysis.		
<b>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</b>		<b>PARAMETER 8</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8</b>	While it can be assumed that the report annexes were included under separate cover, this is not mentioned anywhere in the document and the annexes are not listed within the opening pages.		