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



Executive Feedback Template

Overall Report	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Rating				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation finale externe du programme «Observatoire genre et gouvernance démocratique» (WEW)			
Report sequence number	13	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
Very sound report, filled with high-quality elements that allow the evaluation users to trust its results. In order to improve its quality further, a deeper understanding of the evaluation tools and concepts used could be useful (such as a better understanding of what a Theory of Change needs to reflect, the concept of unexpected outcomes - confused with implementation difficulties in the report, etc.)				
PARAMETER 1: OBJ	ECT AND CONTEXT O			Very Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The report very thoroughly describes the program's objective, partners, strategy, expected results and monitoring indicators. It includes the list of interventions brought together by the program. The context could have gone deeper into the present situation of Gender and democratic governance in Morocco, giving specific data about the situation that motivated such a program.			
PARAMETER 2: PUR	POSE, OBJECTIVES A	AND SCOPE	PARAMETER 2	Good
	the explustion was not included. The object and seems of the explustion were not too detailed in			
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	section III.5 discusses the evaluation was not their description. Evalu	riteria of the evaluation ne evaluation main users included. The object and	have been covered by the a. However, information a d scope of the evaluation	e report. Interesting that bout who commissioned were not too detailed in
	section III.5 discusses the evaluation was not their description. Evalu specifically defined.	riteria of the evaluation ne evaluation main users included. The object and	have been covered by the a. However, information a d scope of the evaluation	e report. Interesting that bout who commissioned were not too detailed in
on Parameter 2	the evaluation was not their description. Evaluation was not their description. Evaluation was not their description. Evaluation with their description. Evaluation was not their description. Evaluation was not their description. The methodology used the Theory of Change and the level, it describes the methodology was not their describes the methodology.	titeria of the evaluation ne evaluation main users included. The object and ation criteria definition by the evaluators is descrites to rebuild it, a gendenethods used, with a vetool (Observation check	have been covered by the s. However, information a d scope of the evaluation in the light of this particular parameters aribed at the approach lever-sensitive and HR-focusery clear explanation of the dist), along with the Life	e report. Interesting that about who commissioned were not too detailed in alar project were neither Good el where it mentions the
on Parameter 2 PARAMETER 3: MET Executive Feedback	section III.5 discusses the evaluation was not their description. Evaluation by their description. Evaluation by their description. Evaluation by their description. Evaluation by the methodology used and the their describes the management of the control of their describes the management of the control of their describes the management of the control of their describes the management of their description.	titeria of the evaluation me evaluation main users included. The object and ation criteria definition by the evaluators is descrites to rebuild it, a gendenethods used, with a vetool (Observation check the evaluation most com	PARAMETER 3 ribed at the approach lever-sensitive and HR-focusery clear explanation of this particular. PARAMETER 3 ribed at the approach lever-sensitive and HR-focusery clear explanation of this particular. PARAMETER 4	e report. Interesting that about who commissioned were not too detailed in alar project were neither Good el where it mentions the ed approach. At methods the sampling process. It e-story tool, that are not Good
on Parameter 2 PARAMETER 3: MET Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	the evaluation was not their description. Evaluation was not their description. Evaluation was not their description. Evaluation which is pecifically defined. THODOLOGY The methodology used to the methodology used to the level, it describes the mincludes an interesting usually utilized among to the evaluation (Pertinence, Efficacy, I approach coherent with the analysis of some of	by the evaluators is describes to rebuild it, a gender thools used, with a vertical (Observation cheek the evaluation most compact, Sustantial Contents and the criteria such as Efficiency, Impact, Sustantial Contents and the criteria such as Efficiency the causal links be such as Efficiency to the causal links be such as E	PARAMETER 3 ribed at the approach lever-sensitive and HR-focusery clear explanation of the dist), along with the Lifemon methods. PARAMETER 4 vered in a comprehensianability) has been dist are covered so are unexplanation of the covered so are unexplanation.	Good The description of the state of the sampling process. It estory tool, that are not soussed using a specific pected results. However, it include deep analytical

Executive Feedback on Parameter 5

Conclusions gather the main messages of the findings sections along the five criteria. Lessons learned have also been included with interesting observations collected along the evaluation. This section is not very extensive though, resulting rather too brief.

PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDATIONS

PARAMETER 6 Good

Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6

The report delivers multiple recommendations for future phases of the program, classified by operational (9) and strategic levels (8). Some of the recommendations are described in a very generic way, such as involving stakeholders, involving the population, etc. which do not provide with concrete elements to build on.

PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS

PARAMETER 7

Approaches requirement

Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7 This evaluation fairly integrates the Gender and HR perspectives within its report. Successfully integrated along the scope, evaluation criteria and questions, methods and tools developed. The methodology and indicators in the evaluation matrix clearly set Gender and HR as priorities within the focus of the evaluation. The evaluation questions make often direct or indirect reference to the GEEW aspects. The methods and tools used in the evaluation have been carefully designed and incorporate a constant focus to GE issues. Only limited evidence of gender analysis could be found in the findings and conclusions sections.

PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE

PARAMETER 8

Good

Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8

The report is structured correctly, providing readers and users a good basis for understanding its content. The executive summary, though a bit too extensive contains all relevant information and can stand-alone. Interesting annexes have been included, such as the evaluation matrix and a mapping of stakeholders.