<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 1**
The report provides a comprehensive review of the context, object, and theory of change behind the strategic note.

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

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 2**
The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clearly spelled out. Evaluation criteria and questions are provided; but the report would have benefited from having the criteria defined.

**PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY**

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 3**
The report explains the overall design and the main methods. However, it could provide more specific details on the sample frame and the representativeness of the final cluster sample. It would also help to more explicitly justify the selection of data sources, and provide concrete examples of how the cited ethics standards were realised during the evaluation process.

**PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS**

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 4**
The findings systematically address the evaluation matrix, and marshall multiple lines and levels of evidence to develop insights.

**PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED**

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 5**
Conclusions are comprehensive and provide an additional level of analysis. They respond systematically to the evaluation criteria. No lessons learned are provided; doing so would enhance the value of the evaluation beyond the level of the country office.

**PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 6**
The recommendations are clearly derived from the findings, and are all marked according to urgency, difficulty, and potential impact.

**PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Executive Feedback on Parameter 7**
This report develops a solid set of findings, conclusions and recommendations that address the purpose of the CPE. It is, however, missing an executive summary, and would also benefit from greater clarity in the explanation of the evaluation tools and methods.
## Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7
GEEW is included in the scope of analysis, and mainstreamed throughout the evaluation criteria; but the evaluation matrix does not include indicators. All evaluation criteria include questions specifically relating to GEEW, in addition to the overall object of the evaluation being focused on gender. The evaluation is based on participatory qualitative methods, including contribution analysis. Data methods included observation and participatory analysis by stakeholders through an extended reference group process. The findings focus extensively on structural causes of marginalisation. While conclusions and recommendations relate to GEEW, they are primarily institutional analysis with less evidence of gender analysis coming through from the findings.

## Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8
The report is logically structured. However, it is missing the executive summary - which is a requirement – and also some tables and figures appear to have been removed from the version uploaded to GATE.