

**UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template**

<b>Overall Report Rating</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	
<b>Response</b>					
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>MTE of Securing Rights and Improving Livelihoods of Women (SRILW) Programme</b>				
<b>Report sequence number</b>	0	<b>Date of Review</b>	01 February 2018	<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2017
<b>Region</b>	Arab States		<b>Country(ies)</b>	Egypt	
<b>Executive Summary in Final Report</b>	Fully		<b>TORs sent with Report</b>	Yes	
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b>	This is a comprehensive, clear and systematic evaluation. Further strengthening the presentation of the overall evaluation design would have added additional benefit; but it already stands out in terms of the specific reference to how human rights based approaches were integrated into the process.				
<b>PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION</b>			<b>PARAMETER 1</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	The context section is comprehensive and makes a significant contribution to understanding the later analysis of the evaluation.				
<b>PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>			<b>PARAMETER 2</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	The purpose states what the evaluation has been tasked to do; it could be further strengthened by stating why this is important at this time. Gender is mainstreamed into the Effectiveness criterion. The scope and the objectives are all clear.				
<b>PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>			<b>PARAMETER 3</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 3</b>	The methods section does not describe the overall design and approach taken by the evaluation, but does list and justify the various methods and tools to be used; including their limitations. The sampling strategy is described; although more explanation could have been provided about the sample frame to which this was applied. Ethics lists the appropriate standards; the report would be even stronger if it was explained how these were applied in this particular case.				
<b>PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS</b>			<b>PARAMETER 4</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 4</b>	The findings systematically respond to the evaluation questions. The most robust set of findings relate to effectiveness; however, the findings on relevance, efficiency, and sustainability are much more limited in the level of evidence that is marshalled. In a few cases findings stray into very broad statements that talk about 'evidence' without naming what it is.				
<b>PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>			<b>PARAMETER 5</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 5</b>	Conclusions are substantive and provide useful additional insight into each of the criteria. Lessons learned are identified that helpfully talk about some of the insights coming out of different CSO models.				
<b>PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			<b>PARAMETER 6</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6</b>	The recommendations are firmly grounded in the findings and conclusions, and provide a good range of changes to be considered. The report is not fully clear on who was involved in validating these; and it begins with a clear statement of prioritisation, but this is not repeated for later recommendations. Overall the recommendations appear to be useful and relevant.				
<b>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</b>			<b>PARAMETER 7</b>	<b>Meets Requirements</b>	

<p><b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7</b></p>	<p>GEEW is clearly included in the scope and objectives, but there are no evaluation indicators. Evaluation questions on effectiveness specifically address gender power relations; for other criteria the integration of gender is dependent on the object of the evaluation.</p> <p>The Mid-Term Evaluation process investigated which groups benefitted from the programme and targeted them during the assessment process. The evaluation process adopted and followed a participatory approach, applying methodologies and data collection tools engaging the programme stakeholders in a consultative manner, including in the development of recommendations. The MTE measured the level of their participation and involvement in the project design, planning, and monitoring activities. However, there was some limited inclusion of some groups. The designed of the Mid-Term Evaluation focused specifically on assessing the degree to which power relations among the different project stakeholders and implementers supported or undermined project results.</p> <p>Findings analyse gender more extensively than conclusions and recommendations do - which are primarily concerned with institutional aspects. However, conclusions do examine the differentiated effects of the intervention at different levels.</p>		
<p><b>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</b></p>		<p><b>PARAMETER 8</b></p>	<p><b>Very Good</b></p>
<p><b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8</b></p>	<p>The report is well written and clearly presented.</p>		