

UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Country Portfolio Evaluation of Moldova Strategic Note 2014 - 2017			
Report sequence number	0	Date of Review	January 23rd, 2017	Year of the Evaluation Report
Region	Europe and Central Asia		Country(ies)	Moldova
Executive Summary in Final Report	Fully		TORs sent with Report	No
OVERALL RATING			Overall Rating	Good
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	The report is based on a solid methodology and presents good quality findings, analytical and forward-looking conclusions, and grounded and actionable recommendations. Further improvements could be made to the report by further explaining methodological choices; presenting the evaluation questions within the body of the report; including lessons learned to inform the next programming cycle; describing how stakeholders were involved in the development and/or validation of recommendations; and ensuring that the report annexes are attached to the report to facilitate access for evaluation users.			
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			PARAMETER 1	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The report provides a good description of the context in which Country Programme operates. However, the background section does not discuss contextual factors that challenge or facilitate the achievement of results. The report specifies that a stakeholder analysis was conducted, which can be found within the annexes. Overall, the description of the object of evaluation (the Country Programme) is quite light and could benefit from more detail concerning the problems that the programme is trying to address and the strategies being implemented. The report presents a results framework but does not identify outputs or discuss how outputs are expected to achieve outcome and impact-level results.			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			PARAMETER 2	Very Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The report provides a good description of the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope. It also follows good practice by explaining why the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criterion of "impact" was not appropriate for this evaluation. Additionally, the report clearly outlines UN Women's definition of a gender responsive evaluation.			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			PARAMETER 3	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	The evaluation used a theory-based cluster design that was based primarily on a qualitative methodology. While the data collection techniques are identified, the rationale for their selection is not well outlined or justified. A summary table of people interviewed is included in the body of the report but a full list of people interviewed is not accessible within the annexes. Copies of the data collection tools are also likely present within the annexes, which were not included with the report. The report does not identify any evaluation questions, which are likely included in the annexes. While the report mentions that stakeholders were consulted as part of the evaluation process, their level of engagement is not well outlined. The report does not at all describe the evaluation sampling.			
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			PARAMETER 4	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	The findings are based on objective data and are strong at explaining the factors contributing to the accomplishment and non-accomplishment of results. However, the evaluation questions are not presented within the main evaluation report.			
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			PARAMETER 5	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	Conclusions are well written and provide analytical insight that goes beyond a summary of the evaluation findings. They are forward-looking and provide important information around challenges and opportunities. It is impossible to know whether or not they address the evaluation questions, since they are not included as an annex. Lessons learned are not included in the evaluation report.			
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS			PARAMETER 6	Good

Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	Recommendations are supported by the evaluation evidence and reflect a good understanding of the programming context. They are actionable, as they clearly identify the target group for action and are prioritized using a five-star rating system. The report, however, does not clearly describe the process followed in developing the recommendations. It appears as though the report suggests that stakeholders be consulted upon completion of the final report rather than explaining how stakeholders were involved in the development of the recommendations.
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS	
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	GEEW is fully integrated into the objectives and scope of the evaluation. However, evaluation questions are not included in the report and the annexes are not retrievable. The evaluation has both a standalone GE/HR criterion and also appears to mainstreams GEEW into selected questions under other criteria. The reports provides a limited overview of the methods – which include participatory processes to include the voice of different stakeholders. Contribution analysis is relevant to identify gender dimensions; but there is limited evidence of participation in the analysis of data. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations address both the contributions of the CO the GEEW and include gender-analysis of the design-led approach used by the office.
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE	
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	The report is logically structured and easy to navigate.