A robust evaluation report that excels in institutional analysis; including benefiting from applying a clear rubric to assess performance. Some strengthening of gender analysis, and some polishing of the opening sections would strengthen an excellent report even further.

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

Executive Feedback on Parameter 2: The logic of the programme is well articulated, as is the rest of the information about the programme itself (key stakeholders and their roles are described in the methods section). The report is very light on wider social, political and institutional context, but this information is found later in the findings sections.

**PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE**

Executive Feedback on Parameter 2: Purpose, objectives and scope are clear. The report, however, would benefit from explicitly stating and defining the evaluation criteria.

**PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY**

Executive Feedback on Parameter 3: The methods are appropriate and well justified. The use of rubric and human rights analysis of the stakeholders is particularly notable. However, while ethics standards are referenced, it is not explained how they were applied. Similarly, the full sampling frame is not explained (even though the evaluation is non-experimental it still made sampling decisions), and the methods for capturing and processing data would also have benefited from elaboration.

**PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS**

Executive Feedback on Parameter 4: The evaluation provides a strong set of well evidenced findings that respond systematically to the evaluation questions.

**PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

Executive Feedback on Parameter 5: The report provides a strong and comprehensive set of conclusions; and a generalised set of lessons.

**PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS**

Executive Feedback on Parameter 6: The recommendations are clearly linked to the supporting evidence, and address the purpose of the evaluation. While the methods explains that the IRG was involved, the recommendations section itself would also benefit from some more explanation of who was involved in the development and validation process.

**PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

Executive Feedback on Parameter 2: The logic of the programme is well articulated, as is the rest of the information about the programme itself (key stakeholders and their roles are described in the methods section). The report is very light on wider social, political and institutional context, but this information is found later in the findings sections.
### Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7

GEEW is clearly included in the scope of the evaluation - both implicitly and explicitly through the objectives. No evaluation matrix is presented with indicators, and so there is not evidence available to support these being gender responsive.

The evaluation framework included a specific criterion on gender equality and human rights, and the questions cited in the main body of the report illustrate that gender equality was included both in the assessment of standard criteria and as a standalone issue.

The evaluation applied a qualitative design that included participatory data collection methods. There is less evidence available to indicate the participation of rights holders in data analysis.

The evaluation findings address gender through the sections on relevance, effectiveness and as a standalone section. However, the conclusions and recommendations are largely institutional and do not interrogate structural inequality or root causes of marginalisation.

### PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE

A comprehensive and logically structured report with all the required elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8</th>
<th>PARAMETER 8</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive and logically structured report with all the required elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>