

## UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

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

	<b>Response</b>				
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Mid-Term Evaluation of the Pacific Regional Ending Violence Against Women (EVAW) Facility Fund</b>				
<b>Report sequence number</b>	0	<b>Date of Review</b>	06 February 2017	<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Region</b>	Asia and the Pacific		<b>Country(ies)</b>	Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, and Vanuatu	
<b>Executive Summary in Final Report</b>	Satisfactory		<b>TORs sent with Report</b>	No	
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>			<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b>	<p>This evaluation report presents several areas for improvement. Namely, a thorough discussion of the Theory of Change must be provided along with a pictorial graph that provides a clear image of the logic model behind the intervention. Also, the evaluation should include quantitative methods such as surveys so as to compare it against the data collected through qualitative methods. The methodology should also discuss the ethical safeguards implemented to ensure that the evaluation processes observed relevant ethical standards. A complete section of the gaps, limitations and unexpected findings must be provided along with the analysis of these. Furthermore, the conclusion should underline the project's areas of improvement and not only focus on its strengths. In addition, lessons learned need to be correctly identified as a contribution from the evaluation to general knowledge. The development of the recommendations and the consultation with stakeholders during this process should be explained in detail. The ToR must be systematically included among the annexes since it is essential to an accurate assessment. Finally, the executive summary should not be more than 5 pages long.</p>				
<b>PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION</b>			<b>PARAMETER 1</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 2</b>	<p>The context in which the Fund operates is well described and enough background information is provided. The report presents some complete information on the object of evaluation such as the key stakeholders involved and the overall scale of the intervention is well documented. On the other hand, the ToC is only discussed on the surface and no logic model or results chain is presented.</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 evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are clear and can guide the evaluation. The evaluation criteria and questions are explicitly presented and the rationale for their choice is discussed. Gender and human rights concepts are duly addressed in the scope and integrated in the evaluation questions.</p>				

<b>PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY</b>		<b>PARAMETER 3</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 3</b>	The methodology used for the evaluation is clearly described and data collection methods are discussed. However, there is no reference to any quantitative method used, i.e. survey or other. On the other hand, data sources, the sampling frame and the rationale for selecting them are adequately addressed. Also, the stakeholders consulted are specified and the interview protocols are presented in the annexes. Furthermore, the evaluation underlines that the methods employed integrated gender and human rights approaches. Finally, the evaluation does not discuss the evaluation design's ethical safeguards and mechanisms implemented throughout the evaluation process.		
<b>PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 4</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 4</b>	The findings are clearly presented and structured around the evaluation criteria, which contributes to clarity. They are relevant and based on the objective use of sufficient evidence. All findings reflect systematic analysis and interpretation of the presented data. Also, the reasons for accomplishments and failures are correctly identified. On the other hand, gaps and limitations as well as unexpected findings are not fully addressed in the report.		
<b>PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b>		<b>PARAMETER 5</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on Parameter 5</b>	The conclusions provide pertinent insights to the evaluation object and added value to the findings. Also, the conclusions are formulated so as to provide solutions to issues that may be encountered. The recommendations do a good job at underlining the strengths of the project but very little is mentioned regarding the areas of improvement. Finally, the report does not present a formal section or subsection on Lessons Learned and these are not correctly identified elsewhere in the report.		
<b>PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 6</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 6</b>	The recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation and are very clearly presented. They are supported by evidence; identify the target group for each recommendation; and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints. The report does not describe the process followed in developing the recommendations.		
<b>PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS</b>		<b>PARAMETER 7</b>	<b>Meets Requirements</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 7</b>	Gender and Human-Rights perspectives are well integrated throughout the evaluation process and sufficiently discussed in the report. A gender analysis can be found throughout the whole report.		
<b>PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE</b>		<b>PARAMETER 8</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<b>Executive Feedback on PARAMETER 8</b>	The report is logically structured and easy to follow. The title page and opening pages contain all necessary elements. The annexes contain most of the necessary elements, however, the ToR is not included. Also, although the executive summary can stand alone and inform decision-making, it is slightly too long (9 pages).		