

UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation of UN Women's Contribution to Gender-Responsive Budgeting in the Europe and Central Asia Region			
Report sequence number	0	Date of Review	February 24th, 2017	Year of the Evaluation Report
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Albania; BiH; FYR Macedonia, Moldova; Georgia; Serbia, Kosovo; Kyrgyzstan; Turkey and Ukraine.	
Executive Summary in Final Report	Fully	TORs sent with Report	No	
OVERALL RATING			Overall Rating	Very Good
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	The evaluation used a strong participatory and gender sensitive evaluation methodology that facilitated the identification of high quality findings and conclusions. Lessons learned could be formulated to better describe their significance to similar initiatives in other contexts, and recommendations could be more actionable.			
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			PARAMETER 1	Very Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The object of evaluation and the context in which it operates are exceptionally well described. The section includes specific information about the initiative's scale, budget, objectives, and theory of change. The context section describes the international and national environments around gender-responsive budgeting, provides detailed information on the socio-economic and political contexts within each primary country, and identifies opportunities and challenges for GRB in ECA. Additionally, stakeholders and their contributions (including rights holders and duty-bearers) are explicitly identified within a dedicated sub-section.			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			PARAMETER 2	Very Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The evaluation purpose is well explained by highlighting which stakeholders will use the information generated by the evaluation and to what ends. The report also provides a good excellent description of the evaluation objectives and scope. It also follows good practice by explaining why the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criterion of "impact" was not appropriate for this evaluation.			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			PARAMETER 3	Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	The evaluation used a participatory theory based evaluation methodology, drawing on Collaborative Outcomes Reporting Technique (CORT). Methodological choices, including the design and data collection methods and sources, are well described and justified. The evaluation was highly participatory and used gender sensitive methodological choices. It ensured that a diverse set of stakeholder views were captured. This being said, the report annexes that are said to contain a list of data sources, additional information on ethics, the evaluation matrix, and copies of the evaluation tools are not retrievable. While the report mentions that case study countries were purposefully sampled, there no justification provided for why these particular countries were selected.			
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			PARAMETER 4	Very Good
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	The findings are based on objective data and are strong at explaining the factors contributing to the accomplishment and non-accomplishment of results.			
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			PARAMETER 5	Very Good

Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	Conclusions are well written and provide analytical insight that goes beyond a summary of the evaluation findings. They are forward-looking and provide important information around challenges and opportunities. Important lessons learned are presented and are correctly identified and presented. However, they could include a more in-depth discussion around how they could be useful or applied to similar initiatives in other contexts.		
PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS		PARAMETER 6	Good
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	Recommendations are supported by the evaluation evidence and reflect a good understanding of the programming context. They were developed in consultation with stakeholders, which reflects good practice. While they are numbered, the order in which they should be implemented or their priority order is not explicitly clear to the reader. Additionally, they could be strengthened by providing more specific details and suggestions on how they could be implemented.		
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS		PARAMETER 7	Exceeds Requirements
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	GEEW is specifically included in the scope and objectives. The evaluation included a specific GE/HR criterion, and also appear to have mainstreamed GE across the evaluation questions. The evaluation applied Collaborative Outcomes Reporting Technique and Outcomes Harvesting, including participatory data analysis and validation processes. The findings, conclusions and recommendations all explicitly include gender analysis at multiple levels (structural and instrumental).		
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE		PARAMETER 8	Very Good
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	The report is logically structured and easy to navigate. The Executive Summary provides an excellent overview of all of the key sections of the report.		