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

The evaluation report is clear, well structured and uses a gender-responsive methodology, and presents findings according to evaluation questions that are under-pinned by good human rights and gender analysis.

The executive summary is of a good standard and contains the key elements and findings of the evaluation report.

The one section of the evaluation which is weaker and would need amending for this evaluation report to be rated as ‘good’ is the conclusion section, which would benefit from further depth of analysis, clearer linkages to evaluation criteria/questions, restructuring and to be separated from the lessons learned section.

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

The contextual gender issues relevant to the programme and the evaluation, and the context in which the evaluation and programme took place in are clearly described.

The expected results chain of the programme is clearly described, as is the budget, background and implementation status of the programme.

The key stakeholders and their roles in the programme and the evaluation are clearly detailed.

**PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY**

The Design of the Evaluation section clearly details how the methodology was designed to address the evaluation criteria, and how the methodology was adapted during the inception phase to accommodate the requirements of stakeholders.

**PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS**

The conclusions and lessons learned are combined into one section in the evaluation report and this section is quite brief, and for some of the points, lacks depth and full explanation and evidence.

The conclusion section does not address all of the key evaluation questions and is not logically connected to the

**PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

The recommendations made in the evaluation report are relevant to the object and purposes of the evaluation and clearly identify each target group, but the report does not describe the process in developing the recommendations and how/whether stakeholders were consulted in this process. There is no sense of prioritisation or timescale within the recommendations.

**PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

The sampling strategy for beneficiary interviews meant that only beneficiaries present during the time of the evaluation at the IOSC or a certain number recommended by IOSC were interviewed and there is no detail in the report of whether this sample included diverse age ranges, genders, or whether the violence was domestic etc. and so it is not possible to ascertain how representative the findings from the beneficiaries interviewed are.

**PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE**

The report is well structured, logical and clear, although is missing key annexes such as the TOR, against which the reviewer could analyse the success of the evaluation in responding to the TOR, and the methodological approach to ascertain whether the method used was in fact gender responsive.