

UN Women Global Evaluation Report Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS)



Executive Feedback Template

Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Title of the Evaluation Report	EVALUATION OF THE UN JOINT PROGRAMME TO ENHANCE GENDER EQUALITY IN GEORGIA				
Report sequence number	13	Date of Review	2016	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Europe and Central Asia		Country(ies)	Georgia	
Executive Summary in Final Report	Very Good		TORs sent with Report	No	
OVERALL RATING			Overall Rating	Satisfactory	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	<p>This is a report full of promise, with a detailed Inception Report in the annexes and a large set of interviews and documents to draw on. There are two main issues, however. The first is that the analytical precision planned for in the Inception Report is not reflected in the final findings and conclusions, which are broad and aggregated - lacking any significant gender analysis. The second issue - related to the first - is the slightly opaque process by which the data was combined to produce findings. This seemed to rely largely on the expert interpretation of the evaluators, rather than a systematic process of generating and testing logical arguments. Whilst the evaluation object concerns the implementation of policy, the evaluation never really manages to get below the high-level issues and the normative context.</p>				
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION		PARAMETER 1	Good		
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	<p>The object of the evaluation is described in considerable detail, and this is useful. Although the results framework is described, the theories of change underlying the design of the programme are not fully elaborated or critiqued. Furthermore, the context focuses on the policy environment, and does not elaborate on the status of women or the social and cultural context. Nevertheless, there is work in the annexed inception report to map disaggregated stakeholder groups and this is of good quality.</p>				
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE		PARAMETER 2	Good		
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	<p>The rating is based on a complete reading of the report, including the annexed inception report. Within the main report there is considerable potential to provide more information on the evaluation scope, and the definitions of criteria that are applied. The evaluation framework explicitly addresses the adherence to international normative standards on GEWE. The scope is addressed in the Inception report, but not mentioned in the main report at all.</p>				
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY		PARAMETER 3	Satisfactory		
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	<p>The methods section elaborates some data collection methods and data sources. Whilst it does describe that the team got together and triangulated information, it remains unclear the process that was used to do this or to test the findings that emerged. The tone of the report suggests an 'expert-led' approach to developing findings and recommendations, without the clear discounting of alternative explanations. Whilst the Inception report does include a lot more detail, and many important elements are present, the overall approach is essentially a purely qualitative design and is insufficient to fully answer the evaluation questions being posed. The design remains unclear, even after reading the inception report. It appears to be expert-led qualitative triangulation. There is a mapping of the stakeholders, but no clear approach to sampling. The inception report refers to a long list of social groups, but this does not seem to make it through to the analysis of data in any way. Ethics is not addressed in the report.</p>				

PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS		PARAMETER 4	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	Findings are surprisingly brief given the large range of data that was collected. There is also no apparent disaggregation of the analysis based on the social groups identified in the inception report. Considerable focus is applied to relevance and effectiveness, with only very light analysis of efficiency and sustainability. The brief and summative presentation of the analysis leaves little scope to identify the underlying reasons for the findings.		
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED		PARAMETER 5	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	The conclusions section is enormously brief, with only two substantive paragraphs followed by some high-level statements. The material that is present is relevant and useful, however, the report does not sufficiently marshal evidence in support of what is stated. There is little in the conclusions to deepen the analysis or identify justified priority implications for decision makers. Conclusions are largely synthesis of the findings and do not add substantive insights - for example, on the drivers that led to the agencies acting individually rather than jointly.		
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS		PARAMETER 6	Good
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	Recommendations are a manageable number and although not prioritised, they are disaggregated by target institution. Whilst the recommendations are relevant and derived from the findings, they are fairly broad and may be hard to implement. Priorities are not clear. Recommendations are largely sweeping statements and do not elaborate how they should be realised.		
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS		PARAMETER 7	Approaches requirement
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	Given that the nature of the intervention is GE issues, at three different level for the three different components, the report implicitly refers to these issues, but no specific evidence was found of the evaluation taking into consideration the HRGE-based approach elements (such as inclusion principle, customized criteria, or evaluability initial assessment, as reflected in the HR&GE in evaluation Handbook of UNEG).		
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE		PARAMETER 8	Good
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	The report is clearly written and has all of the required elements with the exception of a copy of the Terms of Reference. ToR are not present, but the report includes a +70pages annex (Inception report) where some of the ToR seem to be reflected.		