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

6.2 Recommendations are well formulated and are directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation criteria.

6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up), and actionable. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of the evaluation questions and criteria.

4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities).

3.3 Portfolio of stakeholders. Mostly evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias. Fully relevant ethical standards including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and protection of privacy and confidentiality. Suggest to add more details about the ethical standards for the evaluation, especially for participants, and when sensitive information is involved.

5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.

5.2 Conclusions are clear, and follow-up suggestions are presented in a prioritized order.

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

4.2 Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate sampling strategy is provided. Suggest to add more details about the findings generation process and any impact analysis. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

3.2 Are relevant, valid, and authentic? (e.g. reflective of the mixed methods used to describe the project context and identify key issues and factors involved). Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

3.1 Are the evaluation objectives and scope clearly stated? Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

2.1 Purpose, objectives and scope of evaluation. The evaluation report provides a clear explanation of the purpose for the evaluation, including the intended audience and aim(s) of the evaluation, and the information that is to be collected and how it will be used. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

2.2 Evaluation design. The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the evaluation context, purpose and design, as well as the reasons for the scope of the evaluation (e.g. limitations). Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

2.3 Stakeholders and Consultations. The evaluation report provides a clear description of the stakeholders consulted in the evaluation process, including the stakeholders consulted and their role in providing feedback and their level of confidence and is properly included with a good overview of the overall project, goals and objectives, the key activities and stakeholders/partners (and their role) as well as resources and geographical locations. Suggest to include information about the project implementation status. Also, include more information about the context and the methodology for the evaluation along with the role of the stakeholders involved in the evaluation. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

2.4 Evaluation questions and criteria. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

1.1 Methodology: The report specifies and provides a complete description of the relevant design and sets of parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. Recommendations are derived from the findings and conclusion and are geared to specific agencies, but need to be prioritized. They are also presented with relevance to the overall objectives, related to the stakeholders involved (e.g. ministries, their related goals and objectives) in order to inform decision-making processes and support stakeholders in making informed decisions.

1.2 Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate sampling strategy is provided. Suggest to add more details about the findings generation process and any impact analysis. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

1.3 Stakeholders and Consultations. The evaluation report provides a clear description of the stakeholders consulted in the evaluation process, including the stakeholders consulted and their role in providing feedback and their level of confidence and is properly included with a good overview of the overall project, goals and objectives, the key activities and stakeholders/partners (and their role) as well as resources and geographical locations. Suggest to include information about the project implementation status. Also, include more information about the context and the methodology for the evaluation along with the role of the stakeholders involved in the evaluation. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

1.4 Evaluation questions and criteria. Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.

1.5 Evaluation methodology. The evaluation report provides a clear description of the evaluation context, purpose and design, as well as the reasons for the scope of the evaluation (e.g. limitations). Mostly limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.
1.0 Gender responsiveness and equity

The evaluation was designed to be gender-responsive and equitable. The evaluation questions and criteria were designed in a way that would ensure gender-related data will be collected.

2.0 Methodology

The methodology was fully gender-responsive. The evaluation was based on gender and human rights principles, as defined in the UN Women Evaluation Policy and adhered to the UN Women Evaluation Standards and Norms (UNEG). A gender-responsive methodology, methods, and tools, and data analysis techniques were selected.

3.0 Reporting

The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

4.0 Executive summary

The Executive summary is concise but should also have contained information about the project to help situate the reader.

5.0 Findings

The findings address the evaluation questions and criteria, and are well substantiated, even if more explanations are needed on the complex situations found in the PT.

6.0 Recommendations

There is a good set of conclusions and the recommendations are appropriate, but need more details to enable full implementation.

7.0 Implementation

The implementation of the recommendations and the evaluation standards is satisfactory. GEEW aspects also included in conclusions and recommendations, even though recommendations are very generalized.

8.0 Annexes

The annexes are reasonably clear and well-organized. Annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information on questionnaires, list of documentary evidence.

9.0 Project description

The project description is well-written and presented. The structure is appropriate but the report is only 30 pages long. Page numbers are not numbered. The executive summary is concise but should also have contained information about the project to help situate the reader. The project description includes a gender problematique that the project attempted to address (focusing mostly on the project description). Findings contain gender analysis, and cover co-construction of knowledge. The report refers to the adoption of gender-specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct, and specifically references to respect to people's right to provide information in confidence during interviews and focus group meetings are included. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to gather data that promotes inclusivity, respects understanding of equality and rights of beneficiaries and supports the development of co-learning and the co-construction of knowledge, according to the report. The evaluation shows sensitivity to gender analysis. The background sections could provide better explanations on the complexities of the situation described and more properly state the results obtained by the intervention. Unidentified efforts were not identified.

10.0 Overall assessment

The overall assessment is good. The findings address the evaluation questions and criteria, and are well substantiated, even if more explanations are needed on the complex situations found in the PT. The recommendations are appropriate, but need more details to enable full implementation.