

**UN Women Global Evaluation Report Assessment
Analysis System (GERAAS) Constructive Feedback Template**



Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation Report “Innovative Action for Gender Equality in Georgia” (IAGE) Project			
Report sequence number	24	Date of Review	2016	Year of the Evaluation Report 2015
Region	Europe and Central Asia		Country(ies)	Georgia
Executive Summary in Final Report	Unsatisfactory		TORs sent with Report	Yes
OVERALL RATING			Overall Rating	Good
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	This reports follows the evaluation methodology and questions set out in the ToRs, and appears to use sound data collection and analysis (as demonstrated in ToRs) methods and standards. There are various gaps that would have helped the reader - logframe, more description of the project, executive summary. There is one area of concern that should be flagged which is that the ToRs include analysis of the progress that has been made (relationships developed) and these are then included in the findings (some verbatim).			
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			PARAMETER 1	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The project description sets out the overall objective and outputs, but does not discuss the activities of what the projects interventions are. A ToC was developed as per the ToRs, and that sheds more light on the intended results and paths for change. The stakeholders are only mentioned in terms of the reference group but are not listed or mapped. Further background description would have been useful regarding geographical boundaries, budget, management, human resource and also stakeholders involved. The contextual analysis is relevant and good.			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			PARAMETER 2	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	Section 1 of the report presents the evaluation objectives and purpose, and it develops the evaluation criteria and their meaning regarding this evaluation down to the detail. The scope addresses what it does cover well but does not specify (and possibly have need to) what it does not cover. A gender and human rights 'lens' for the evaluation is not discussed within evaluation objectives, scope or background.			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			PARAMETER 3	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	Some parts of the methodology are good - the discussion around the data collection tools and selection, data sources, and data quality. It appears that there is no description of geographical boundaries, location of interventions, overall 'population' and sample selected. There is some mention of what different methods were used but it does not go beyond this to discuss in a comprehensive way the stakeholders involved, and the rationale for degree of involvement in the evaluation. No specific mention of gender considerations in evaluation design. It is recommended that UNEG's Integrating Human Rights and Gender in Evaluations is consulted in future.			
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			PARAMETER 4	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	Overall this section is good with clear systematic analysis covering all of the evaluation criteria and questions. It was clearly challenging given the weak logframe (that should have been included) and indicators that are not SMART which is discussed. Some concern that a finding is included, that was written in the ToR (re relationship between stakeholders) but it was also justified.			

PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED		PARAMETER 5	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	The conclusions provide a useful summary of the findings based on evidence, and add to it with some insights about the enabling and hindering factors.		
PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDATIONS		PARAMETER 6	Good
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	The recommendations are based upon the findings and conclusions. As it is an end of project evaluation, they are based upon potential areas of work in the future. The target group was not specified and the numbering in the recommendations did not imply or give information about their priority order.		
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS		PARAMETER 7	Approaches requirement
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	The focus of the project is GEEW and the evaluation report has carried out a useful assessment of the progress of the project by both duty bearers and for rights holders. The weak indicators has made this challenging for the evaluators. The scope is very brief and does not include any reference to GEEW (although the project is focused on GEEW so implicitly included). The focus of project indicators is GEEW related but they are loosely written (as mentioned in the evaluation) and could benefit from being more specific and measurable. The evaluation criteria and questions were set out within the ToRs and include some gender questions. A reconstructed ToC has GEEW at its core including the roles (in other words) of rights holders and duty bearers. Data collection used mixed methods, qualitative and quantitative, and good practice standards for data analysis. The findings, conclusions and recommendations have a strong focus on GEEW, identifying enabling and constraining factors. More contextual analysis / insights of the effects of gender relations would have improved the report. Within the next stage/ Strategic Note it is recommended that new 'SMART' GEEW related indicators would be developed so that, in particular more outcome related gender analysis could be included.		
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE		PARAMETER 8	Satisfactory
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	The report is structured and logical although it presents some important gaps that are required by UNEG guidelines such as including an executive summary, a logframe or results chain, etc.		