## Executive Feedback Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Report Rating</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Title of the Evaluation Report
Evaluation finale du projet « Accès aux services judiciaires pour des femmes et des enfants victimes de la traite humaine au Maroc »

### Report sequence number
7

### Date of Review
2016

### Year of the Evaluation Report
2015

### Region
Arab States

### Country(ies)
Morocco

### Executive Summary in Final Report
Good

### TORs sent with Report
Yes

### OVERALL RATING
Overall Rating | Good

### Executive Feedback on Overall Rating
This is an overall sound, good-quality report which addresses the evaluation question in a very credible way supported by a robust methodological design. A remark to the whole process would be addressed to the commissioners regarding the evaluability of the intervention as the lack of legal framework for trafficking in Morocco makes the evaluation very challenging (no legal text on how trafficking victims are defined).

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

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 2
The report clearly presents a clear and full description of the object of the evaluation, providing detail of the intervention, its context, its status, etc. It stands out the way the object is described (table in page 17) as well as the explicit mention of the stakeholders involved. Stakeholders are well explained in table in page 20, although further information about their roles could have been useful regarding the project management done by UNW and the Ministry.

### PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 2
The evaluation purpose, objective and scope are sufficiently clear in sections II.1,2,3. It proves an utilization-focus approach as it also specifies how each of the partners will use the evaluation. However, the report do not provide with a clear definition on how the evaluators understand and will apply the criteria, nor how these incorporate gender and HR issues within their definitions.

### PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 3
The report includes a very comprehensive description of the rational processes that gave shape to the methodology. Choices done to select methods, to do the sampling and overall the evaluation design appear to have a logical, evaluative-thinking approach trying to maximize the representability of the information capture. Constant mention to gender and human rights issues show how this approach was present and integrated along all the relevant phases of the evaluation. Interesting comparison of recipients’ opinions and level of sensitivity with a comparison group included in the design.

### PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 4
The findings section present relevant, clear data about the performance of the intervention. It is considered a very good practice to have included a synthesis of the informants opinions (as in page 34). Efficiency criteria is only assessed at a financial monitoring level. Findings section in general includes little evidence on performance of results beyond performance of activities.

### PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

### Executive Feedback on Parameter 5

The report presents the conclusions and lessons learned in clear comprehensive manner and even a SWAT analysis is included where strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are identified for the intervention. However, they are merely a summary of the findings section, similar to the one found in the executive summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Feedback on Parameter 5</th>
<th>PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>PARAMETER 6</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very relevant and targeted recommendations are provided in the last section of the report, where the main issues for making next potential phase perform better have been pointed out. However they provide with little evidence about the priority order of the list of ideas provided as recommendations for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6</th>
<th>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</th>
<th>PARAMETER 7</th>
<th>Approaches requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The report incorporates a clear predisposition to take the gender-responsive approach into account, and it makes constant reference to it. There is clear reference to the GEEW issues in the scope. Description of evaluation criteria in page 19 could have been done integrating GEEW in their customization. Methodology reflects somehow the GEEW perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7</th>
<th>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</th>
<th>PARAMETER 8</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The report’s structure is clear, logical and covers the main requirements preconized by UNEG Evaluation reporting standards. Information about most of the main evaluation elements can be found, exception made on information about the evaluators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>