

## UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

<b>Overall Report Rating</b>	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
------------------------------	-----------	------	--------------	----------------

	<b>Response</b>				
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Thematic Evaluation on Women's Political Participation</b>				
<b>Report sequence number</b>	0	<b>Date of Review</b>	February 2nd, 2017	<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>Region</b>	Arab States		<b>Country(ies)</b>	Covered 17 Arab countries. Case studies were conducted in Palestine, Morocco, and Libya.	
<b>Executive Summary in Final Report</b>	Satisfactory		<b>TORs sent with Report</b>	No	
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b>	<p>This is a mostly credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence and can be used with confidence. However, there are some areas for improvement. These include: justifying the selected evaluation criteria; providing greater detail around why certain data collection methods were selected; and using a more robust methodological design to collect quantitative data; and better justifying the evaluation scope and selected case study countries. Additionally, the evaluation should provide more information around how stakeholders were included in the evaluation process (not only as information-sources but also to generate findings and recommendations); should identify unexpected findings; and should better synthesize conclusions so that they can be more easily used by decision-makers. Lessons learned need to be more generalizable and the process followed in developing the recommendations needs to be explained, particularly concerning the involvement of stakeholders.</p>				
<b>PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION</b>			<b>PARAMETER 1</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	<p>The report is very strong at describing the object of evaluation and provides excellent detail on the regional approach as well as the specific programmes under evaluation. The report is also strong at presenting both a written and pictorial theory of change for both the global and lower levels.</p>				
<b>PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>			<b>PARAMETER 2</b>	<b>Good</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	<p>The report's objectives and scope are sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation. While evaluation criteria are presented, there is no explanation as to why the criteria of "sustainability" and "impact" were not included. While all of the information is not directly stated in the purpose section, the report does identify key info in the introductory section.</p>				
<b>PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>			<b>PARAMETER 3</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	

Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	Although the report states that the evaluation used a mixed methods approach, it did not collect any first-hand quantitative data (i.e. through a survey or through other means), making the evaluation light on quantitative data. Additionally, there is not much of a discussion around why certain data collection methods and sources were selected and what limitations they may have. As well, there is no justification for why certain countries were selected as case studies. While the report mentions that stakeholders were consulted, there is not much information provided on the kinds of consultation that took place and there is no discussion around whether this was an appropriate level of involvement.
<b>PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS</b>	<b>PARAMETER 4</b> <b>Good</b>
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	The findings are clearly presented around evaluation criteria and questions; are relevant; and are based on evidence and sound analysis. However, unexpected findings are not clearly identified.
<b>PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>PARAMETER 5</b> <b>Good</b>
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	Conclusions are strong overall and are based on the findings and substantiated by evidence. However, a total of 25 conclusions are presented, which is quite a few for decision-makers to take into consideration. Conclusions would likely be more beneficial if they were synthesized to highlight the most important strengths and areas for improvement. Additionally, some of the lessons learned are overly specific to the object of evaluation and cannot be easily applied to other contexts and scenarios.
<b>PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>PARAMETER 6</b> <b>Good</b>
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6	The recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation and do a good job at identifying the target group for action. However, the process followed in developing the recommendations is not explained, including any consultation with stakeholders. As well, even though the recommendations are numbered, the report does not explicitly state that they are presented in priority order.
<b>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</b>	<b>PARAMETER 7</b> <b>Meets Requirements</b>
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7	The evaluation did a good job, overall, at integrating gender and human rights perspectives. However, the evaluation did not provide gender-sensitive targets (since no targets were provided in the Evaluation Matrix) and the methodology did not explicitly discuss how traditional data collection methods were adapted to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups feel comfortable and are able to fully participate in the evaluation.
<b>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</b>	<b>PARAMETER 8</b> <b>Good</b>
Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8	The report is well structured and includes numerous annexes that provide the report with additional credibility. While the Executive Summary is strong overall, it is too long and needs to be shortened to somewhere around 5 pages.