UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Title of the Evaluation Report	*Mid-Term Review of the CEDAW South East Asia Programme II*		
Region	Asia and the Pacific	**Country(ies)**	Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, Philippines, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Myanmar

Overall Rating

Overall Feedback: Overall, the report rated as: **Satisfactory**. The reviewers made the following specific comments: *"This report is well structured, and at first glance contains all of the required elements. However, a more careful assessment reveals that a substantial level of detail is missing – including important contextual information, links to the evidence that is being marshalled, and conclusions that give a deeper level of insight. Furthermore, despite having an appropriate team and gender-related evaluation object, the report fails to distinguish itself in terms of a gender-responsive framework, analysis or set of findings. Nevertheless, the report is consistent in applying the stated qualitative methods and developing recommendations linked to the findings and evaluation framework – so it can be used within the boundaries of its constraints."* The reviewers also noted some positive evaluation practices in the report. These included *"The evaluation contains an intriguing discussion on risk in multiple places, and also highlights challenges and potential solutions in the findings."*	**Satisfactory**

Terms of Reference included?	No	Executive Summary	Good

PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION	Unsatisfactory

Whilst the report does include all the required sections, these are all extremely brief - especially given the extensive coverage of the programme. In some cases information could be brought forward from the findings section (for example on implementation status). In other cases there is scope for additional information – such as a stakeholder map, presentation of the logical framework/theory of change, and budget information (allocated/spent). The context of the different countries in which the programme is running might also be expected to be presented, but is almost entirely absent.

PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	Satisfactory

Again, the report includes sections labelled with all the required elements: but these are extremely brief. The purpose, for example, can explain how the evaluation is expected to be used and by who; the criteria can be defined, and the scope can discuss what has been excluded (and to what effect). The evaluation report also mainly covers gender and human rights because of the nature of the object being evaluated, rather than specific criteria, questions and indicators that are gender and human rights responsive.

PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY	Satisfactory

The method and the tools used by the evaluation are described, and links are provided to copies of the data collection tools. The evaluation does attempt to use mixed methods – but ultimately gives up on this due to lack of response to an online survey. Partly due to the lack of a stakeholder map in the initial sections of the report, the sampling remains unclear for the evaluation. Furthermore, although participatory

approaches are used, the people consulted are in power-holding positions (in the context of the programme) and so the method excludes marginalised groups.

PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS	Good

This evaluation covers a very wide range of questions in considerable depth. Challenges are usefully discussed, and there is a specific section on unexpected findings - which is considered a good practice. Whilst findings do appear to have been derived from the stated methods, the addition of frequency information from the coding process would have been interesting and strengthened confidence of the reader. There is scope to move many of the output descriptions to an annex, with the main report focusing on analysis of implications. Nevertheless, the discussion of risks and capacity develop is particularly interesting, and the evaluation references relevant international frameworks and processes.

PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	Satisfactory

Conclusions are extremely brief - painting a broad brush across several criteria at the same time, rather than providing deeper insights into each. There is substantial scope to enhance the conclusions as they are currently stated – both identifying common underlying issues and the implications of these issues to countries within the programme. There is also greater scope for the conclusions to marshal specific evidence to support the statements that are made. Nevertheless, what is written does appear - at first glance - to be balanced and to address both the positives and the challenges of the programme.

PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDATIONS	Good

Recommendations are developed throughout the report in response to specific findings. This ensures that they are relevant. In addition to re-presenting these at the end of the report (as is currently done) the authors might have considered linking the recommendations to the conclusions by using the insights from the conclusions section to suggest an order of priority for the recommendations that are currently stated.

PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS	Approaching Requirements

SWAP Score: 5/12

The evaluation was clearly cognisant of gender in the selection of the evaluation team members, with appropriate balance and experience. However, in this evaluation, gender appears to be treated as a 'subject-matter' rather than in terms of guiding the design, conduct, and analysis of the evaluation itself. This may have started with the absence of specific gender criteria and questions in the Terms of Reference. However, it is manifested in an absence of the voice of marginalised groups or critical analysis of who is benefiting from the programme, who is losing out, and how inequality is being challenged.

PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE	Good

The report is clearly structured and well written. It includes nearly all the required elements (although some of these are overly brief - as discussed above). The executive summary presents all of the key information required of it and is sufficient to stand alone from the report.

In order to help strengthen future evaluation reports, the reviewers offered the following constructive suggestions:

☐ Future reports can use the introduction sections to introduce a reader that is not familiar with the programme to all the essential information that is needed to understand the findings in context. Factual information about the programme - such as the level of spend, the schedule of role-out, and the theory of change can be presented here rather than as findings (even if some of this information has to be investigated). This will leave more room in the findings section for analysis that helps to explain the current status of the programme.

☐ Evaluation frameworks can be assessed at the inceptions stage to ensure that gender and human rights analysis is specifically addressed, rather than just implied. For example, if the UNEG guidance for HR/GE in evaluation is cited, then the report should specify exactly how this is being implemented. One would expect to see at least a main question and one indicator under each criterion that is dedicated to GE/HR

- ☐ More precise details could have been provided on the coding process (inductive or deductive), and the level of participation of stakeholders in interpreting meaning in the findings. Whilst the intention to use mixed methods is admirable and aligned with emerging good practice, low response rates to online surveys can be foreseen and future evaluations should seek to either address this in advance or to include other quantitative data and analysis. An example of research into increasing response rates to electronic surveys has been made available by the Florence Nightingale Foundation: http://bit.ly/GERAAS2

- ☐ Some of the information in the findings section could have been more usefully placed in the introduction section (e.g. on implementation status of the programme and stakeholders) or in the annexes (e.g. examples of outputs achieved). This would leave greater scope for the findings section to present analysis relating to each evaluation question. Future reports can be proof read to ensure that all findings statements clearly cite the evidence on which they are based and the reliability of that evidence. In this instance, the evaluation could have used the coding process to undertake quantitative analysis of findings (in line with the idea of using mixed methods).

- ☐ Where reports are struggling to draw out a comprehensive set of conclusions, it can be useful to attempt to develop a specific numbered conclusion for each of the evaluation criterion. Each of these can then state the findings upon which it draws, add insights about the driving factors behind the conclusion, and elaborate implications for the future of the programme.

- ☐ The link between specific findings and recommendations is a useful part of this report However, it also results in an unprioritised list of recommended actions. An number of approaches are available to address this in addition to the option suggested of using the conclusions section to create a priority order. For example, the report might have organised the recommendations under each country involved in the programme, or the stakeholders who should lead the implementation of recommendations.

- ☐ The evaluation might have considered additional approaches and tools to have enhanced the levels of GE/HR responsiveness; starting with the inclusion of a specific criterion on gender equality. In addition, the evaluation discusses operational issues at length – such as risk and M&E systems – but does not connect these to the issue of gender and power, which it could well do through the use of specific gender questions or indicators. The use of a more gender responsive framework would then imply that the participatory techniques used by the evaluation team could be extended 'downwards' to also include the voice of marginalised groups. The selected team seems to have been well qualified and experienced to have implemented such an approach.

- ☐ The structure of the report clearly reflects an awareness of UNEG standards. In this case, the priority for future reports should be ensuring that there is sufficient detail under each section to meet the more detailed requirements.