

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



## Executive Feedback Template

Overall Report Rating	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
	Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	ANÁLISIS METODOLÓGICO, CUALITATIVO, CUANTITATIVO Y POTENCIAL DEL CLASIFICADOR DE ORIENTACIÓN DEL GASTO EN POLÍTICAS DE IGUALDAD DE GÉNERO				
Report sequence number	4	Date of Review	2016	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Latin Americas and Caribbean		Country(ies)	Ecuador	
Executive Summary in Final Report	Good		TORs sent with Report	No	
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating	Very technical, analytical, well-written report that provides insights regarding the implementation and performance of the COG in Ecuador. Some of the evaluation objectives were not directly addressed but the DAC criteria and some additional ones were comprehensively covered.				
<b>PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION</b>			<b>PARAMETER 1</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	This report documents a special assessment that falls into the category of an evaluation, but is a specific type. It is called "Methodological analysis (qualitative, quantitative and potential) of an indicator of public expending in Equity policies". Therefore the object is not an intervention but an indicator or tool which will make the evaluation peculiar. The report could have provided a wider information about the context to frame the evaluation. Notably, the report should have discussed the social, economic, demographic factors that justify the intervention, in particular about the gender equality issues and other inequalities. However, the report meets requirements in terms of describing the Object and Context. Further information about Ecuador's context that justifies the COG would have been appreciated.				
<b>PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>			<b>PARAMETER 2</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 2	The evaluation purpose and objectives are more or less defined in page 11, section 2, though the scope has not been discussed. Some evaluation criteria such as Replicability were added to the usual five DAC criteria commonly used. The scope is not explicitly discussed. Gender and HR perspective were not explicit either in this section of the report.				
<b>PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>			<b>PARAMETER 3</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 3	The evaluation methodology in the report jumps into the evaluation criteria and questions to later develop the methods without having discussed an overall evaluation design or approach. Ethical issues were not acknowledged.				
<b>PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS</b>			<b>PARAMETER 4</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 4	The findings of the report are well documented and analysed and provide with much information and data. Nevertheless there is evidence of an incoherence between the objectives of the evaluation (page 10 - assessment of feasibility, coherence, complementarity, etc.) and the way findings are presented (following DAC criteria).				
<b>PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>			<b>PARAMETER 5</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Executive Feedback on Parameter 5	The conclusions are well substantiated and provide with key messages regarding the main findings. The conclusions are structured according to the DAC criteria instead of the evaluation objectives and criteria mentioned in section 2 (page 10), which would have been more coherent.				

<b>PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 6</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6</b>	Recommendations are grouped by criteria, and provide with focused indications to improve the quality and impact of the indicator in the future. The process for developing the evaluation that now appear in this section was not described.		
<b>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 7</b>	<b>Approaching requirement</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7</b>	This report reflects a bottom-line conscience and consideration of the GEEW issues, even though the evaluation object is placed at a policy-level (not in direct relationship with rights-holders). Along with the evaluation questions, indicators have not been specifically defined. The evaluation questions show a sensitivity regarding gender and empowerment of women (page 12). The evaluation methods (Annex 5) reflect an appropriate level of gender and human rights and a good evaluative tone along the questions. Segregated data was provided when relevant and one of the annexes presents a Stakeholders' mapping.		
<b>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</b>		<b>PARAMETER 8</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8</b>	The report overall meets UN Women's evaluation reports standards. It is logically structured with clarity and coherence. The executive summary provides all the relevant elements of the report. The annexes increase the credibility of the document by adding relevant secondary information.		