

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



Executive Feedback Template

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------|
| Overall Report Rating | Very Good | Good | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | |
| Title of the Evaluation Report | Final Evaluation of UN Women MCO's Work on Expanding the Scope of Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) in India | | | | |
| Report sequence number | 14 | Date of Review | 2016 | Year of the Evaluation Report | 2015 |
| Region | Asia and the Pacific | | Country(ies) | India | |
| Executive Summary in Final Report | Good | | TORs sent with Report | Yes | |
| OVERALL RATING | | | Overall Rating | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Overall Rating | The quality of this report is considered sufficient to take its conclusions and findings into account, although its level of evaluative thinking and the depth of its insights could be further developed (examples in the Executive summary: "The project has done well", "it is quite relevant") stating ideas in a more sophisticated, analytical manner. | | | | |
| PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION | | | PARAMETER 1 | Good | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 | Evaluation object is clearly described along with the evaluation status and stakeholders. Special mention about how the context is fully described to allow to frame the intervention, along with the attempt of reconstructing the project's theory of change in page 10, the project's strategy and the type of activities conducted. The report does not very clearly describe the scope, including Gender responsive budgeting at policy level in the objectives and context, whereas the project involves merely work in capacity building of CSOs regarding GRB. The theory of change is not complete if it doesn't make explicit assumptions and mechanisms that cause that activities produce the expected changes | | | | |
| PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE | | | PARAMETER 2 | Good | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 2 | The evaluation purpose and objectives are well defined. The report makes a very interesting mention about the use of the evaluation. No clear mention about the Scope (though in point 3.2. it is mentioned that the evaluation will also look into the project management). The report just mentions the evaluation criteria without developing or justifying them. | | | | |
| PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY | | | PARAMETER 3 | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 3 | The evaluation report tries to set out the methodology and approach used, though not very successfully as it doesn't mention any specific standardized approach nor sets the basis for a customised, high-quality one. Methods are described though and a simple evaluation matrix describes methods per stakeholder group and topic. No particular mention of how the sampling was done. No clear detail on the stakeholders consulted and those left aside (apart from officials not being available, page 16). The report acknowledges some limitations but it does not question the quality or potential bias or gaps of the data, as well as the correlation between the project and the results (causal attribution). There is no specific mention of how the project had an impact in different groups (men, women and others). No discussion about ethics was covered by the report. | | | | |
| PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS | | | PARAMETER 4 | Satisfactory | |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 4 | The Findings section is quite complete in terms of covering the 5 main criteria and the way they are addressed. Relevance section (4.1.) reflects a thorough analysis. Table 3 (Logic frame analysis) is also quite clear in terms of summarizing the progress of each of the outputs and outcomes. However, the report does not contain much evidence of a systematic analysis for interpreting the data. Very little reference to the data collected. | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED | | PARAMETER 5 | Good |
| Executive Feedback on Parameter 5 | The evaluation collects in the section 5.1. eleven main conclusions supposedly gathering the evaluation main findings. As mentioned above, no much evidence to making reference to the data collected when explaining and justifying the conclusions. | | |
| PARAMETER 6:RECOMMENDATIONS | | PARAMETER 6 | Satisfactory |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6 | Recommendations are jointly presented in section 5.2 (page 40) but they are only considered satisfactory as they are not consistently based in evidence or in the conclusions, they do not mention a participatory process and some of them are not directly actionable. Most of them seem to be meant for UN Women but not specifically defined. | | |
| PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS | | PARAMETER 7 | Approaches requirement |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7 | Besides the fact that the evaluation object is mainly focus on one gender quality tool (gender-responsive budgeting), the evaluation shows evidence of having incorporated HR&GE issues while conducting it, in its approach, questions, and indicators. Scope and indicators make clear reference to the GEEW perspective driving them to a significant extent. Evaluation questions do not lose focus on the bottom-line goal of promoting equality through the intervention's focus (gender responsive budgeting). The evaluation tools only seem to address GEEW issues in an indirect manner, derived from the evaluation object. The report does not incorporate a clear gender analysis, partially maybe due to the nature of the intervention. | | |
| PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE | | PARAMETER 8 | Good |
| Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8 | The evaluation report appropriately meets most of the requirements UN Women demands for evaluation reports. The title page could include some logo or picture to make it more attractive. Including Biodata of the evaluator could have been interesting. | | |