

Universalia

17

Appendix II: Summary statistics for all evaluations

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 81

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total | EVALUATION FOR (TYPE) | Number | % of total |
|-------------------------------|--------|------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 13 | 16% | Commission: | 1 | 1% |
| Project: | 31 | 38% | Council: | 1 | 1% |
| Program: | 24 | 30% | Country: | 1 | 1% |
| Other: | 13 | 16% | Donor: | 9 | 11% |
| Total: | 81 | 100% | General assembly: | 1 | 1% |
| | | | GLAND - Headquarters: | 3 | 4% |
| EVALUATION TEAM | Number | % of total | IUCN: | 1 | 1% |
| IUCN members: | 0 | 0% | Mixed: | 11 | 14% |
| IUCN staff: | 8 | 10% | Program: | 5 | 6% |
| Mixed: | 17 | 21% | Region: | 2 | 2% |
| Third party: | 27 | 33% | Other: | 3 | 4% |
| Not clear: | 14 | 17% | Not clear: | 35 | 43% |
| Not specified: | 15 | 19% | Not specified: | 8 | 10% |
| Total: | 81 | 100% | Total: | 81 | 100% |
| IUCN CONTENT AREA | Number | % of total | EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total |
| Biodiversity: | 6 | 7% | Donor driven: | 16 | 20% |
| Conservation strategies: | 14 | 17% | IUCN driven: | 14 | 17% |
| Education and communication: | 4 | 5% | Mixed: | 4 | 5% |
| Forests: | 9 | 11% | Not clear: | 31 | 38% |
| Marine and coastal areas: | 4 | 5% | Not specified: | 16 | 20% |
| Natural resource management: | 12 | 15% | Total: | 81 | 100% |
| EVALUATION TIMING | Number | % of total | | | |
| Organizational: | 22 | 27% | Mid: | 10 | 12% |
| Protected areas: | 2 | 2% | End: | 3 | 4% |
| Social and economic policy: | 2 | 2% | Impact: | 0 | 0% |
| Wetlands and water resources: | 3 | 4% | Not clear: | 42 | 52% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% | Not specified: | 23 | 28% |
| Unclear: | 3 | 4% | Other: | 3 | 4% |
| Total: | 81 | 100% | Total: | 81 | 100% |

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 64 | 79% |

Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale 5 6%

Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: 54 67%

Purpose of the evaluation

Relevance: 10 12%

Effectiveness: 51 63%

Efficiency: 9 11%

| | | | | | |
|--|----|-----|---------------------------------------|----|-------------|
| Evaluation value | | | South America (various): | 3 | 4% |
| Specified: | 1 | 1% | South and East Asia (various): | 1 | 1% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% | Southern Africa (various): | 2 | 2% |
| Not specified: | 80 | 99% | Tanzania: | 1 | 1% |
| Methodology | | | Uganda: | 3 | 4% |
| Questions clearly identified: | 17 | 21% | Vietnam: | 3 | 4% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 58 | 72% | Western Africa (various): | 3 | 4% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 2 | 2% | Zimbabwe: | 1 | 1% |
| Participatory approach used: | 23 | 28% | Total: | 81 | 100% |
| Participatory approach described | | | | | |
| A little: | 14 | 17% | | | |
| Medium: | 5 | 6% | | | |
| A lot: | 2 | 2% | | | |

Appendix III: Summary statistics for West/Central Asia and North Africa

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 16

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|--------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 2 | 13% |
| Project: | 8 | 50% |
| Program: | 3 | 19% |
| Other: | 3 | 19% |

EVALUATION FOCUS

Commissioner:

Council:

Country:

Donor:

IUCN driven: 100%

General association:

GLAND - Headquarters:

| EVALUATION TEAM | Number | % of total | |
|-----------------|--------|------------|----------------|
| IUCN members: | 0 | 0% | IUCN: |
| IUCN staff: | 0 | 0% | Mixed: |
| Mixed: | 1 | 6% | Program: |
| Third party: | 7 | 44% | Region: |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% | Other: |
| Not specified: | 8 | 50% | Not specified: |
| Total: | 16 | 100% | Total: |

IUCN CONTENT AREA Number % of total

Total:

EVALUATION TIME

Mid:

End:

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total | EVALUATION LOCATION: (COUNTRY) | Number | % of total |
|--|---------------|-------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 13 | 81% | Pakistan: | 16 | 100% |
| Context provided | | | Total: | 16 | 100% |
| None: | 3 | 19% | | | |
| Narrow: | 9 | 56% | | | |
| Broad: | 4 | 25% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale | 2 | 13% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: | 9 | 56% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. planned activities: | 13 | 81% | | | |
| Purpose of the evaluation | | | | | |
| Relevance: | 1 | 6% | | | |
| Effectiveness: | 12 | 75% | | | |
| Efficiency: | 2 | 13% | | | |
| Gender equity: | 2 | 13% | | | |
| Other: | 9 | 56% | | | |
| Clear main findings: | | | | | |
| Yes: | 7 | 44% | | | |
| No: | 7 | 44% | | | |
| Somewhat: | 2 | 13% | | | |
| Clear recommendations: | 12 | 75% | | | |
| Clear lessons learned: | 3 | 19% | | | |
| Abstract / Executive summary: | 9 | 56% | | | |
| List of acronyms: | 9 | 56% | | | |
| Project value | | | | | |
| Specified: | 3 | 19% | | | |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Not specified: | 13 | 81% | | | |
| Appendix | | | | | |
| TORs: | 6 | 38% | | | |
| Data collection instruments: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Field visits: | 5 | 31% | | | |
| LFA: | 2 | 13% | | | |
| Action plan: | 1 | 6% | | | |

Methodology

| | |
|--|---|
| Questions clearly identified: | 2 |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 8 |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 |
| Participatory approach used: | 8 |

Evaluation value

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|
| Specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 4 | 100% |

Methodology

| | | |
|--|---|------|
| Questions clearly identified: | 1 | 25% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 4 | 100% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 | 0% |
| Participatory approach used: | 1 | 25% |

Participatory approach described

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| A little: | 1 | 25% |
| Medium: | 0 | 0% |
| A lot: | 0 | 0% |

Appendix V: Summary statistics for Eastern Africa

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 9

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|--------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 0 | 0% |
| Project: | 5 | 56% |
| Program: | 4 | 44% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 9 | 100% |

| EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total | |
|------------------------------|--------|------------|--------------------|
| Donor driven: | 1 | 11% | |
| IUCN driven: | 2 | 22% | EVALUATION DRIVERS |
| Mixed: | 1 | 11% | Commissioned by |
| Not clear: | 2 | 22% | Council of |
| Not specified: | 3 | 33% | Country: |
| Total: | 9 | 100% | Donor: |
| | | | General |
| | | | GLAND - |
| EVALUATION TEAM | Number | % of total | |
| IUCN members: | 0 | 0% | IUCN: |
| | | | Mixed: |
| Mixed: | 4 | 44% | Program: |
| Third party: | 1 | 11% | Region: |
| Not clear: | 3 | 33% | Other: |
| Not specified: | 1 | 11% | Not clear: |
| Total: | 9 | 100% | Not specified: |
| | | | Total: |
| IUCN CONTENT AREA | Number | % of total | |
| Education and communication: | 0 | 0% | |
| Natural resource management: | 3 | 33% | |
| Policy and advocacy: | 3 | 33% | |
| Research: | 3 | 33% | |

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 9 | 100% |

Context provided

| | | |
|--|---|------|
| None: | 1 | 11% |
| Narrow: | 6 | 67% |
| Broad: | 2 | 22% |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale | 0 | 0% |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: | 9 | 100% |

Purpose of the evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|
| Relevance: | 2 | 22% |
| Effectiveness: | 9 | 100% |
| Efficiency: | 1 | 11% |
| Gender equity: | 1 | 11% |
| Other: | 7 | 78% |

Clear recommendations: 8 89%

Clear lessons learned: 078% 11%

78%

Evaluation value

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|
| Specified: | 1 | 11% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 8 | 89% |

Methodology

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| Questions clearly identified: | 4 | 44% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 8 | 89% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 1 | 11% |
| Participatory approach used: | 3 | 33% |

Participatory approach described

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| A little: | 2 | 22% |
| Medium: | 1 | 11% |
| A lot: | 0 | 0% |

Appendix VI: Summary statistics for Western Africa

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 7

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|------------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 0 | 0% |
| Project: | 1 | 14% |
| Program: | 6 | 86% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 7 | |

| EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total |
|-----------------------|--------|------------|
| Donor driven: | 1 | 14% |
| IUCN driven: | 1 | 14% |
| Mixed: | 1 | 14% |
| Not clear: | 1 | 14% |
| Not specified: | 3 | 43% |

Number % of total

Table of contents: 6 86%

Methodology

| | |
|--|---|
| Questions clearly identified: | 2 |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 7 |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 |
| Participatory approach used: | 1 |
| Participatory approach described | |

A little:

Appendix VII: Summary statistics for Southern Africa

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 3

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|--------------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 0 | 100% |
| Project: | 2 | 67% |
| EVALUATION TEAM Program: | Number | % of total |
| IUCN members: | 0 | 33% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% |
| IUCN staff: | 0 | |
| Mixed: | 1 | |
| Third party: | 2 | |
| Not clear: | 0 | |
| Not specified: | 0 | |
| Total: | 3 | |

IUCN driven: Total: 100%

| EVALUATION TIMING | Number | % of total |
|-------------------|--------|------------|
| Mid: | 2 | 67% |
| End: | 0 | 0% |
| Impact: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 1 | 33% |
| Not specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 3 | 100% |

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total | EVALUATION LOCATION: (COUNTRY) | Number | % of total |
|--|---------------|-------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 3 | 100% | Zimbabwe: | 1 | 33% |
| Context provided | | | Other: | 2 | 67% |
| None: | 0 | 0% | Total: | 3 | 100% |
| Narrow: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Broad: | 1 | 33% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale | 1 | 33% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: | 3 | 100% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. planned activities: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Purpose of the evaluation | | | | | |
| Relevance: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Effectiveness: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Efficiency: | 1 | 33% | | | |
| Gender equity: | 1 | 33% | | | |
| Other: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Clear main findings: | | | | | |
| Yes: | 3 | 100% | | | |
| No: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Somewhat: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Clear recommendations: | 3 | 100% | | | |
| Clear lessons learned: | 1 | 33% | | | |
| Abstract / Executive summary: | 1 | 33% | | | |
| List of acronyms: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Project value | | | | | |
| Specified: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Not specified: | 1 | 33% | | | |
| Appendix | | | | | |
| TORs: | 2 | 67% | | | |
| Data collection instruments: | 3 | 100% | | | |
| Field visits: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| LFA: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Action plan: | 0 | 0% | | | |

Methodology

Questions clearly identified: 0 0%

Data sources clearly identified: 2 67%

Data analysis techniques explained: 0 0%

Participatory approach used: 3

Participatory approach described

A little: 1

Medium: 2

A lot: 0

Appendix VIII: Summary statistics for Meso America

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 9

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total | EVALUATION FOR (TYPE) | Number | % of total |
|-------------------------------|--------|------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 1 | 11% | Commission: | 0 | 0% |
| Project: | 3 | 33% | Council: | 0 | 0% |
| Program: | 3 | 33% | Country: | 0 | 0% |
| Other: | 2 | 22% | Donor: | 4 | 44% |
| Total: | 9 | 100% | General assembly: | 0 | 0% |
| | | | GLAND - Headquarters: | 0 | 0% |
| EVALUATION TEAM | Number | % of total | IUCN: | 0 | 0% |
| IUCN members: | 0 | 0% | Mixed: | 0 | 0% |
| IUCN staff: | 0 | 0% | Program: | 1 | 11% |
| Mixed: | 1 | 11% | Region: | 0 | 0% |
| Third party: | 3 | 33% | Other: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 4 | 44% | Not clear: | 4 | 44% |
| Not specified: | 1 | 11% | Not specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 9 | 100% | Total: | 9 | 100% |
| IUCN CONTENT AREA | Number | % of total | EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total |
| Biodiversity: | 0 | 0% | Donor driven: | 4 | 44% |
| Conservation strategies: | 0 | 0% | IUCN driven: | 2 | 22% |
| Education and communication: | 0 | 0% | Mixed: | 0 | 0% |
| Forests: | 2 | 22% | Not clear: | 2 | 22% |
| Marine and coastal areas: | 1 | 11% | Not specified: | 1 | 11% |
| Natural resource management: | 2 | 22% | Total: | 9 | 100% |
| EVALUATION TIMING | Number | % of total | | | |
| Organizational: | 2 | 22% | Mid: | 1 | 11% |
| Protected areas: | 0 | 0% | End: | 0 | 0% |
| Social and economic policy: | 2 | 22% | Impact: | 0 | 0% |
| Wetlands and water resources: | 0 | 0% | Not clear: | 4 | 44% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% | Not specified: | 4 | 44% |
| Unclear: | 0 | 0% | Other: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 9 | 100% | Total: | 9 | 100% |

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 6 | 67% |

Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale 0 0%

Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: 6 67%

Purpose of the evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|
| Relevance: | 0 | 0% |
| Effectiveness: | 6 | 67% |
| Efficiency: | 1 | 11% |
| Gender equity: | 3 | 33% |
| Other: | 5 | 56% |

Evaluation value

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|
| Specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 9 | 100% |

Methodology

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| Questions clearly identified: | 1 | 11% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 7 | 78% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 | 0% |
| Participatory approach used: | 3 | 33% |

Participatory approach described

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| A little: | 3 | 33% |
| Medium: | 0 | 0% |
| A lot: | 0 | 0% |

Appendix X: Summary statistics for Europe

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 3

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|------------------------|----------|------------|
| Organizational: | 0 | 0% |
| Project: | 1 | 33% |
| Program: | 2 | 67% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 3 | |

| EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total |
|-----------------------|--------|------------|
| Donor driven: | 0 | 0% |
| IUCN driven: | 1 | 33% |
| Mixed: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 2 | 67% |

Methodology

**Questions clearly
identified:**

Appendix XI: Summary statistics for North America and the Caribbean

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 1

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|------------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 1 | 100% |
| Project: | 0 | 0% |
| Program: | 0 | 0% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% |

| EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total | EVALUATION TEAM | |
|---------------------|--------|------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | | Number | % |
| | 1 | 100% | | |
| IUCN driven: | 1 | 100% | | |
| | | | IUCN members: | 0 |
| | | | IUCN staff: | 1 |
| | | | Mixed: | 0 |
| | | | Third party: | 0 |
| | | | Not clear: | 0 |
| | | | Not specified: | 0 |
| | | | Total: | 1 |

CONTENT CRITERIA**Table of contents:**

Number

% of total

1

100%

**Clear description of
project/program/etc.
rationale**

0

0%

Clear description of

Evaluation value

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|
| Specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 1 | 100% |

Methodology

| | | |
|--|---|------|
| Questions clearly identified: | 0 | 0% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 1 | 100% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 | 0% |
| Participatory approach used: | 0 | 0% |

Participatory approach described

| | | |
|------------------|---|----|
| A little: | 0 | 0% |
| Medium: | 0 | 0% |
| A lot: | 0 | 0% |

Appendix XII: Summary statistics for South America

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 4

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Organizational: | 2 | 50% |
| Project: | 1 | 25% |
| Program: | 1 | 25% |
| Other: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 4 | 100% |

| EVALUATION TEAM | Number | % of total |
|----------------------|----------|------------|
| IUCN members: | 0 | |
| IUCN staff: | 0 | |
| Third party: | 3 | |

EVALUATION DRIVER

| EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------|
| Donor driven: | 2 | 50% |
| IUCN driven: | 1 | 25% |
| Mixed: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 1 | 25% |
| Not specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Total: | 4 | 100% |

EVALUATION TIMING

| EVALUATION TIMING | Number | % of total |
|-----------------------|--------|------------|
| Mid: | 1 | 25% |
| End: | 2 | 50% |
| Impact: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 0 | 0% |

Total: **4** **100%**

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total | EVALUATION LOCATION: (COUNTRY) | Number | % of total |
|--|---------------|-------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 3 | 75% | | | |
| Context provided | | | Ecuador: | 1 | 25% |
| None: | 0 | 0% | Other: | 3 | 75% |
| Narrow: | 4 | 100% | Total: | 4 | 100% |
| Broad: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: | 4 | 100% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. planned activities: | 4 | 100% | | | |
| Purpose of the evaluation | | | | | |
| Relevance: | 1 | 25% | | | |
| Effectiveness: | 4 | 100% | | | |
| Efficiency: | 2 | 50% | | | |
| Gender equity: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Other: | 4 | 100% | | | |
| Clear main findings: | | | | | |
| Yes: | 3 | 75% | | | |
| No: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Somewhat: | 1 | 25% | | | |
| Clear recommendations: | 4 | 100% | | | |
| Clear lessons learned: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Abstract / Executive summary: | 2 | 50% | | | |
| List of acronyms: | 2 | 50% | | | |
| Project value | | | | | |
| Specified: | 2 | 50% | | | |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Not specified: | 2 | 50% | | | |
| Appendix | | | | | |
| TORs: | 4 | 100% | | | |
| Data collection instruments: | 1 | 25% | | | |
| Field visits: | 2 | 50% | | | |
| LFA: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Action plan: | 0 | 0% | | | |

Methodology

Questions clearly

Appendix XIII: Summary statistics for South and East Asia

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 8

TYPE OF EVALUATION

OrganizasTArT/~~T~~ Twanal1

Project: 6

Program: 1

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total | EVALUATION LOCATION: (COUNTRY) | Number | % of total |
|--|---------------|-------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 7 | 88% | Bangladesh: | 1 | 13% |
| Context provided | | | Laos: | 2 | 25% |
| None: | 2 | 25% | Nepal: | 1 | 13% |
| Narrow: | 3 | 38% | Vietnam: | 3 | 38% |
| Broad: | 3 | 38% | Other: | 1 | 13% |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale | 0 | 0% | Total: | 8 | 100% |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: | 5 | 63% | | | |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. planned activities: | 6 | 75% | | | |
| Purpose of the evaluation | | | | | |
| Relevance: | 1 | 13% | | | |
| Effectiveness: | 5 | 63% | | | |
| Efficiency: | 1 | 13% | | | |
| Gender equity: | 4 | 50% | | | |
| Other: | 5 | 63% | | | |
| Clear main findings: | | | | | |
| Yes: | 4 | 50% | | | |
| No: | 1 | 13% | | | |
| Somewhat: | 3 | 38% | | | |
| Clear recommendations: | 8 | 100% | | | |
| Clear lessons learned: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Abstract / Executive summary: | 4 | 50% | | | |
| List of acronyms: | 6 | 75% | | | |
| Project value | | | | | |
| Specified: | 2 | 25% | | | |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Not specified: | 6 | 75% | | | |
| Appendix | | | | | |
| TORs: | 7 | 88% | | | |
| Data collection instruments: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Field visits: | 5 | 63% | | | |
| LFA: | 0 | 0% | | | |
| Action plan: | 0 | 0% | | | |

Evaluation value

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|
| Specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 8 | 100% |

Methodology

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| Questions clearly identified: | 1 | 13% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 7 | 88% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 | 0% |
| Participatory approach used: | 3 | 38% |

Participatory approach described

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| A little: | 2 | 25% |
| Medium: | 1 | 13% |
| A lot: | 0 | 0% |

Appendix XIV: Summary statistics for Oceania

Currently there are no evaluations in the database for the Oceania region.

Appendix IX: Summary statistics for Global

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS IN THIS SET: 17

| TYPE OF EVALUATION | Number | % of total |
|------------------------|--------|------------|
| Organizational: | 5 | 29% |
| Project: | 1 | 6% |
| Program: | 3 | 18% |
| Other: | 8 | 47% |

| EVALUATION DRIVER | Number | % of total |
|----------------------|--------|------------|
| Donor driven: | 5 | 29% |
| IUCN driven: | 4 | 24% |
| Mixed: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 5 | 29% |

| CONTENT CRITERIA | Number | % of total |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| Table of contents: | 9 | 53% |
| Context provided | | |
| None: | 7 | 41% |
| Narrow: | 7 | 41% |
| Broad: | 2 | 12% |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. rationale | 2 | 12% |
| Clear description of project/program/etc. goals / objectives: | 9 | 53% |

Purpose of the evaluation

| | | |
|-----------------------|----|-----|
| Relevance: | 1 | 6% |
| Effectiveness: | 6 | 35% |
| Efficiency: | 1 | 6% |
| Gender equity: | 1 | 6% |
| Other: | 10 | 59% |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|-----|
| Clear recommendations: | 14 | 82% |
| Clear lessons learned: | 2 | 12% |
| Abstract / Executive summary: | 8 | 47% |

List of acronyms:

Evaluation value

| | | |
|-----------------------|----|------|
| Specified: | 0 | 0% |
| Not clear: | 0 | 0% |
| Not specified: | 17 | 100% |

Methodology

| | | |
|--|---|-----|
| Questions clearly identified: | 5 | 29% |
| Data sources clearly identified: | 8 | 47% |
| Data analysis techniques explained: | 0 | 0% |
| Participatory approach used: | 1 | 6% |

Participatory approach described

| | | |
|------------------|---|----|
| A little: | 0 | 0% |
| Medium: | 0 | 0% |
| A lot: | 0 | 0% |
