

UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Final Project Evaluation: Wanawake-Wanaweza Project on Women Leadership and Political Participation in Tanzania			
Report sequence number	0	Date of Review	February 26th, 2018	Year of the Evaluation Report
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa		Country(ies)	Tanzania
Executive Summary in Final Report	Fully		TORs sent with Report	No
OVERALL RATING			Overall Rating	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	The evaluation is based on a good quality methodology and presents five key recommendations that are based on the information gathered. However, the findings are primarily descriptive and are not presented in a way that easily facilitates answers to the evaluation questions or an assessment of the evaluation criteria. Additionally, the conclusions are lacking a forward-looking focus, and lessons learned are not included in the report.			
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			PARAMETER 1	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The report provides an overall description of the project and an excellent description of the context in which it operates. The primary barriers inhibiting women and people with disabilities from participating in politics are presented within the Desk Review section of the report. This being said, the financial value of the project, its geographic expanse, and the number of rights holders that it affects are not discussed. A Results Framework is presented in the annexes but project stakeholders and their contributions are not identified or discussed.			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			PARAMETER 2	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The evaluation objectives are presented even though they are not clearly labelled as such. However, the report does not discuss the evaluation purpose, including who will use the information generated by the evaluation and to what ends. The evaluation scope is also not defined. While the evaluation criteria is identified, no explanation is provided for why the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of "impact" is not included. The evaluation claims that the evaluation used an equity focus, but the report does not explain how this was executed.			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			PARAMETER 3	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	The methodology is primarily qualitative and draws on a desk review, key informant interviews, case stories, and the use of an Equality and Empowerment Framework and a Project Management Framework. The report provides a good description as to why certain methodological decisions were made, including the selection of data collection methods. The sampling frame is not explicitly outlined, and copies of the evaluation tools are not included within the annexes.			
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			PARAMETER 4	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	The findings are presented in a non-traditional evaluation format where the information is separated per data collection method (i.e. qualitative interviews, project management framework exercise, etc.) rather than in a way that easily facilitates an assessment of the evaluation criteria and that provides clear answers to the evaluation questions. The findings are largely descriptive and lack some analytical value, especially around the reasons for the accomplishment and non-accomplishment of results.			
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			PARAMETER 5	Unsatisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	While the conclusions are based on the evidence presented in the findings and they do reference the project's strengths and areas for improvement, they do not provide any additional analytical value and are simply a summary of the findings. They are not structured around the evaluation criteria or questions and do not make reference to them. They are also not forward-looking and do not identify solutions to important problems. The report includes good practices but does not identify any lessons learned. It is impossible to know whether lessons learned were required in the ToRs, since the ToRs are not included within the annexes.			
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS			PARAMETER 6	Good

Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	<p>The report provides five (5) recommendations and is strong at explaining why each recommendation is warranted. However, the report does not provide an in-depth explanation as to how each recommendation could be implemented. The recommendations are presented in priority order and generally identify the target group for action. The report explains that they were developed in consultation with project stakeholders.</p>		
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS		PARAMETER 7	Meets Requirements
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	<p>The evaluation objectives reference GEEW as an intended outcome for the object of the evaluation. Evaluation indicators do not specifically address gender, but the evaluation also uses the results framework of the intervention, which does include gender responsive indicators. The effectiveness questions disaggregate gender groups, and also refer to power relations. Questions for other criteria do not specifically address gender. The evaluation uses equity focused evaluations as the evaluation method (Bamberger & Segone, 2010). This approach is supported by secondary data synthesis, as a sub-component of equity focused evaluations approach. The evaluation incorporates the Equality and empowerment framework; and the key principles of principles of UN Women Evaluation Policy. However, the evidence of participation is restricted to the data collection stage, and not data analysis nor validation. Findings, conclusions and recommendations all address gender through specific analyses and the disaggregation of evidence.</p>		
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE		PARAMETER 8	Good
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	<p>The report is generally logically structured, although the conclusions are presented after the recommendations, which is unusual. The opening pages contain all of the required information with the exception of the timeframe of the object of evaluation and the names of the evaluators. The annexes include some useful information that adds credibility to the report. However, the ToR and copies of the evaluation tools are not included in the annexes.</p>		