



UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Title of the Evaluation Report	<i>Final Evaluation of the Pro Poor Governance, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment from a HR perspective in Namibia</i>		
Region	East and Southern Africa	Country(ies)	South Africa MCO
Overall Rating			Satisfactory
<p>Overall Feedback: Overall, the report rated as: Satisfactory. The reviewers made the following specific comments: <i>“This report answers to some of the evaluation questions, but it is closer to an implementation monitoring report (reviewing achievement of activities) than to an evaluation report.</i></p> <p><i>The methodology design was not based in sound evaluative reasoning to assess contribution of results to the intervention, but merely some anecdotal research based on key informants' opinions.</i></p> <p><i>The evidence and analysis given by the evaluation is based in a weak and not triangulated data collection that cannot be considered as fully credible.</i></p> <p><i>However, it incorporates some insights and some ideas for improvement that are informative about some aspects of the project.”</i></p> <p>The reviewers also noted some positive evaluation practices in the report. These included <i>“It includes Lessons Learned. It also includes direct quotes from informants. It also mentions success factors of the program.”</i></p>			
Terms of Reference included?	No	Executive Summary	Good
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			Satisfactory
<i>The report could be much richer in terms of technically describing the project, context and parts involved. Also demographics and evolution of target group. And literature justification on how the intervention expects to have an impact in meaning a better life for women and girls and other groups in social exclusion.</i>			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			Unsatisfactory
<i>There is no need to include "Detect good practices and give recommendations" as an evaluation's purpose, as they are usual evaluation outputs. The report leaves all these questions very vaguely defined, so the reader has to do many assumptions.</i>			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			Unsatisfactory
<i>The report misses a lot of information about the decision-making process to choose its methodology and methods. It is not clear that a wide array of potential methods were considered. For the selected ones, desk review and interviews, a complete description of approach, development and findings was not included, to fully assess what it entitled. Interviews questionnaires could have been included as annexe.</i>			
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			Unsatisfactory
<i>Not information about the initial assessments on skills at the beginning of the project (baseline). Maybe an endline using the initial assessment, complemented with other strategies, would have made findings much more representative that only some (6) interviews.</i>			

PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	Unsatisfactory
<i>Conclusions are too brief, not covering the most important issues of the evaluation questions and not a conclusion from the findings.</i>	
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS	Satisfactory
<i>Recommendations section includes some conclusions (Ex. Economic empowerment of women still lags behind in Namibia. Although the project attempted to address this in the Khomas region the support was inadequate to facilitate achievement and sustained results.), that could have enriched the conclusions' section.</i>	
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS	Missing Requirements
<i>There is no much evidence of the evaluation methods fostering GEEW throughout the evaluation process.</i>	SWAP Score: 3/12
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE	Good
<i>Generally speaking the report is well structured.</i>	

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

- There would have been room for perfecting the project matrix, since many indicators don't have a target set, and many are just means of verification, not even metrics. Therefore it could have enhanced the staff and stakeholders capacity assisting them to improve the matrix (also clarifying in order to evaluate it).
- Making a clear difference between evaluation purpose, objectives and criteria helps the evaluation questions easier to answer and clearer. The evaluator is responsible for having a deep understanding of these three topics and to clearly describe them in the report. Enclosing the ToR would have also been very helpful.
- The methodological design does not seem to assure sufficient sources of information, either in variety of methods (only document review and key informant interviews, p.7) or in number (only 12 interviews p.18) to give sound credibility to the findings.
- A richer array of methods (including at least classic participatory methods as field visits, focus groups, interviews to recipients and politicians), giving voice to direct beneficiaries and more stakeholders would have greatly improved the credibility on the research process.
- Being basically a capacity building program, it would have been very interesting to discuss the results of the comprehensive initial assessment of staff capacity (mentioned in p.12) and having repeated it as an endline to assess results in more in-depth manner.
- A rich analysis of data based on the initial and potential final assessment could have brought an interesting set of data to assess profiles and variables vs. gender awareness and responsiveness. This could have shed some light for future interventions/evaluations.
- According to UNEG guidelines (point 3.7) methodology has to be sufficiently rigorous to ensure fair, unbiased assessment. As it was said, having only visited the country for two days and having interviewed only twelve key informants (p.18) does not seem as fundamental enough to reach to relevant conclusions.
- According to UNEG guidelines (4.15) conclusions should be evidence-based and related to important issues.
- In order to improve future reports, conclusion should include a brief review of all relevant issues, and be based on the findings.
- According to UNEG guidelines (point 4.16), Recommendations should be evidence-based, relevant and realistic and include priorities.

- A way to improve future reports would be making Recommendations based on a participatory process with stakeholders, addressing important issues and problems, and being logically constructed based on findings and evidence given by the data collected.
- For improving future evaluation reports and meet UN Women requirements, it is recommended to follow the reference book "Integrating Human Rights and gender in Evaluation".
- Although the report is well structured and logically organised, its content does not meet quality requirements.
- According to UN Women Evaluation policy (point 15) each evaluation should provide evidence on the process and results at impact, outcome, output level.