PART I: REPORT DETAILS
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Evaluators: 3  
Year: 2016  
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Country(ies): Global  
Type of intervention evaluated: Corporate  
Portfolio Budget (USD): 64,000,000.00  
Evaluation Budget (USD): 148,700.00  
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply): Women's access to, Women's leadership and Global norms,  
Reviewer: Alaina Vehu  
Review Date: 06 February 2019

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)  
RATING  
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?  
92%  
Executive Feedback on Section 1

1.1 The report clearly specify the object of the evaluation, and provides clear and complete description of the intervention’s logic or theory of change, intended beneficiaries by type and by geographic location(s) as well as resources from all sources including humans and budgets, and modalities.  
Fully  
Executive Feedback on Section 1

1.2 The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional. This also includes explanation of the contextual gender equality and human rights issues, roles, attitudes and relations.  
Fully  
Executive Feedback on Section 1

1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.  
Mostly  
Executive Feedback on Section 1

1.4 The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.  
Fully  
Executive Feedback on Section 1

SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)  
RATING  
Are the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?  
100%  
Executive Feedback on Section 2

Are weights equal to 100%?  
OK  
Executive Feedback on Section 2
### 2.1 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation: The evaluation report provides clear explanation of the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation including the intended use and users of the evaluation and how the information will be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.1 The evaluation was guided by six objectives which were aimed at assessing: the relevance of FGE and the grantees’ approach and contributions, added value of the FGE’s contribution to the UN women’s mandate, FGE’s organizational efficiency, how the FGE informed and influenced UN women; good practices and lessons learned; and actionable recommendations. The primary users are FGE staff and grantees, UN Women Senior Management Team, FGE and UN Women, women-led organizations, development actors, and gender advocates to support learning and their guidance for decision-making and accountability.

### 2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including justification of what the evaluation covers and did not cover (thematically, geographically etc) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToR, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.2 The evaluation scope was fully covered and highlighted the need to respond to UN Women Senior Management’s question regarding the FGE’s future scale and ambitions. The evaluation scope covered the years from 2009-2017, and assessed the FGE fund, the 121 grants it made, and intersections with UN Women’s strategies, operations, and programmes.

### SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE FEEDBACK ON SECTION 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Methodology: The report specifies and provides complete description of a relevant design and sets of methods including the chosen evaluation criteria, questions, and performance standards. The methods employed are appropriate for analyzing gender and rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.</td>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>3.1 The OECD DAC evaluation criteria was used for this study: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, potential for sustainability and potential for impact. The evaluation team streamlined the 42 questions from the ToR based on stakeholders consultation identified 15 final questions that aligned with the evaluation objectives and criteria. The evaluation also employed a “hypothesis-based evaluation framework”. The evaluation used a feminist evaluation approach, focused on empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Mostly | 3.2 The evaluation used a mixed method approach, gathering qualitative and quantitative data, including Country Case Studies, Social Learning, Grantee Guided Self Reviews, and Portfolio analysis (cross-case analysis). Specific focus was dedicated to Democratic evaluation practices and outcome harvesting as methodologies. Outcomes were analyzed at three levels: systemic, indirect and outcomes. Data were triangulated. The methodology was well-described with justification of why each method was used. The sampling methodology for case studies, utilized the Collaborative Outcomes Reporting Technique to craft a narrative about how the outcomes were achieved, however the sampling choice to select Bolivia and India as country case studies was not clear. |

| | Not at all | 3.3 A stakeholders’ consultation was done but was discussion was limited. |

| | Fully | 3.4 There was no discussion of limitations and how these data issues could be mitigated. |

| | Mostly | 3.5 The section on ethical considerations was strong and clear. |

### SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE FEEDBACK ON SECTION 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 High-quality evidence supported the findings in diverse forms, e.g. data tables, charts, case studies, quotes and stories. The presentation of data enabled a clear visualization of what the FGE achieved per evaluation criteria. The findings were clear on the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability etc. of the FGE, noting challenges encountered and weaknesses of the FGE, producing an overall comprehensive evaluation report.</td>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>4.1 The findings were clearly supported by the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgements made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Fully | 4.2 The analysis and findings were backed up by evidence and did not appear subjective. With their presentation of evidence based results, this evaluation did well in clearly presenting output, outcome and impact level information despite the volume of data and scope (80 countries) reviewed. |

| | Fully | 4.3 The achievement or non-achievement of outcomes was linked to the activities/stories which illustrated the contributing factors for outcomes. |

| | Fully | 4.4 With strong data presentation, the findings were always clear and coherent. The findings section was also divided into 3 parts: 1.) Did the Fund do things right?; 2.) Did the Fund do the right things?; and 3.) Evaluation Case Studies and in each part, specific evaluation criteria aligned with the part was discussed (i.e. effectiveness and efficiency criteria was discussed under the Did the Fund do the right things part). This allowed for a very clear and systematic and contextualized discussion of the findings. |

### SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE FEEDBACK ON SECTION 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</td>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>5.1. Aside from having the conclusions arranged per evaluation criteria, each conclusion also noted which finding it is derived from providing a well-substantiated conclusion. This has likewise made the conclusions contextualized making it easy to understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. The evaluators synthesized high-level findings in the conclusion, adding deeper insights on the progress made based on the objectives. For example, its conclusion number 1: "The Fund for Gender Equality implemented everything it set out in Programme Documents covering 2009-2017" addresses the evaluations findings #1-3.

5.3 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the project (policy, programmes, project’s or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.

5.4 Lessons Learned: When presented, the lessons learned section stems logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

5.5 The evaluators synthesized high-level findings in the conclusion, adding deeper insights on the progress made based on the objectives. For example, 2017 addresses the evaluations findings #1-3.

5.6 The conclusions highlighted both the strengths and weakness of FGE and frame areas of focus for the future. It highlighted limitations in the initial Fund’s attention to funding sustainability, identified the business case for the FGE and the future of the Fund.

5.7 The conclusions highlighted both the strengths and weaknesses of FGE and frame areas of focus for the future. It highlighted limitations in the initial Fund’s attention to funding sustainability, identified the business case for the FGE and the future of the Fund.

SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.

5.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.

5.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject’s potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.

5.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.

SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)

5.1 GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.

5.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.

5.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.

SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 Report is logically structured, well written and presented with clarity and coherence (e.g., the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles; context, purpose and methodology would normally proceed findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations) and written in an accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.

5.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluator, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.

5.3 The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that includes an overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive summary should be reasonably concise.

5.4 Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s).

Additional Information
Identify aspects of **good practice** of the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Guiding Question</th>
<th>Total weighted score %</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Overall Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?</td>
<td>96.32</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>This was a strong analysis and evaluation, with diverse and creative feminist methodology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodology and the feminist and participatory analytical lens of results and recommendations were particularly strong in this evaluation and could be read as inspiration for other evaluations.