



Organizational unit: ASRO

Year of report: 2020

Title of evaluation report: Regional Program Evaluation (RPE) 2018-2021 Regional Interventions Action Plan (RIAP)

Overall quality of report: Very good

Date of assessment: 24 July 2021

Overall comments: This is a very good report prepared under difficult conditions thanks to COVID-19. It had a very thorough evaluation matrix and collected data systematically, including particularly a large number of interviews that provided a wide set of findings. Issues of gender and disability, as well as of youth, were well discussed in the evaluation which had a good human rights focus. In addition to KIs, the methodology included a survey and country case studies that helped to provide triangulated information for recommendations. The evaluation's main weaknesses were that the consultation process was not well-described, there was little discussion of unintended results, and the set of recommendations was more extensive than what is generally considered manageable. The evaluation focused well on how to respond to the new challenges and evolving environment of the COVID-19 pandemic. It was also disability inclusive in that it looked at consideration of PWD within the CP in several places in the findings, and these issues were carried through to the conclusions and recommendations.

Assessment Levels: Very Good (strong, above average, best practice), Good (satisfactory, respectable), Fair (with some weaknesses, still acceptable), Unsatisfactory (weak, does not meet minimal quality standards)

Quality Assessment Criteria: Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)

Table with 2 columns: Criterion (1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting) and Assessment Level (Good)

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

Table with 3 columns: Criterion (1-3), Assessment Level (Partial/Yes), and Comments

Executive summary

Table with 3 columns: Criterion (4-5), Assessment Level (Partial/Yes), and Comments

Table with 2 columns: Criterion (2. Design and Methodology) and Assessment Level (Very good)

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context

Table with 3 columns: Criterion (1-2), Assessment Level (Yes/Partial), and Comments

To ensure a rigorous design and methodology

Table with 3 columns: Criterion (3-10), Assessment Level (Yes/Partial), and Comments

Table with 2 columns: Criterion (3. Reliability of Data) and Assessment Level (Very good)

To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes

Table with 3 columns: Criterion (1-3), Assessment Level (Yes), and Comments

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	There were many findings, organized by evaluation question and by subject area. In each case, the finding was based on evidence that was presented.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis was described in each case, including where there were issues with the evidence.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The main structure was the four types of programmes (SRH, Youth, Gender and Population Data) and within each of these, the evaluation questions.	
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	In terms of effectiveness, cause-effect is shown. There were no instances described of unintended outcomes, even though unintended rightsholders were noted in the stakeholder map.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The focus particularly on vulnerable groups was clear.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors were always invoked in explaining results.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	There is a section on cross-cutting issues, but many, including disability and gender, are found throughout the analysis as relevant.	
5. Conclusions			
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The evaluators make a clear link between findings and conclusions.	
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The conclusions build on the findings but are wider, in part because they draw on different findings.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias.	
6. Recommendations			
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	They follow the conclusions and are linked.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The intended users are clear and each has operational aspects.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	They address the cross-cutting issues, including disability.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritize?	Partial	There are 18 recommendations and all are given high priority although different timeframes are given (short, medium and longterm). To help ensure they are manageable to address, it is good practice to have fewer overall recommendations, and to have different levels of priority. The three timeframes also adds a level of complexity to management processes.	
7. Gender			
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>			
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
	2	<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) GEEW was not specifically highlighted in scope or objectives. Score=0</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3) There was a standalone criterion. Score=3</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) There were evaluations questions on gender. Score=3</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation assessed the amount of information on gender available and had specific indicators. Score=3</p>	
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	3	<p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) Gender was discussed in the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evaluation processes were gender-responsive. Score=2</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3) There was a mixed-method approach. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) There was document analysis and many interviews. Score=3</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3) the range of stakeholders, including rights holders, were engaged. (Score=3)</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) Ethical considerations were adequately explained. Score=3</p>	

<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3) The background for gender, which is complex given differences in countries, includes the analysis. Score=3</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3) The issues of differences by vulnerability that were not taken into account in policies and programmes is noted. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) There is only a very limited discussion of unanticipated effects. Score=1</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3) There are a solid number of recommendations on gender. Score=3</p>
--	--

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.
 (***) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment				
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels (**)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)		7		
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			
3. Reliability of data (11)	11			
4. Analysis and findings (40)		40		
5. Conclusions (11)	11			
6. Recommendations (11)	11			
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	53	47		
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very good			