



<b>Organizational unit:</b>	Malawi CO	<b>Year of report:</b>	2022
<b>Title of evaluation report:</b>	UNFPA Malawi CPE Evaluation Report		
<b>Overall quality of report:</b>	Very good	<b>Date of assessment:</b>	10 May 2023
<b>Overall comments:</b>	<p>This evaluation report is rated as very good. The report is highly commendable and useful for decision-makers, offering strong sections on design and methodology, analysis and findings, conclusions, recommendations, and integration of gender. The evaluation design was rooted in the Theory of Change and the results framework, providing a description of data collection activities along with reported limitations. The mixed methods approach allowed for triangulation of evaluative data and validation through stakeholder consultations. The evaluation findings demonstrated a balanced and rigorous response to all evaluation questions, heavily relying on qualitative data. The report effectively showcased the linkages between outputs and outcomes, although weak linkages between output and outcome indicators were acknowledged. A notable strength is the comprehensive reporting of program effectiveness, including achieved results, challenges, facilitating and hindering factors, unintended consequences, and summary of performance achievement. These were presented on a scale of 'achieved' to 'unlikely to be achieved', accompanied by corresponding colors. Moreover, the report successfully integrated human rights, gender equality, women's empowerment, and disability throughout the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The recommendations are targeted, actionable, and prioritized clearly.</p>		
<b>Assessment Levels</b>	<b>Very Good</b> strong, above average, best practice	<b>Good</b> satisfactory, respectable	<b>Fair</b> with some weaknesses, still acceptable
			<b>Unsatisfactory</b> weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria	Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)		
<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
<b>1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?</b>	Partial	The report has a well-structured and easily navigable format, with clearly labeled sections and numbered paragraphs. It effectively utilizes tables and graphs. However, the use of colored text-boxes and bolded texts for recommendations is unusual and is somewhat distracting.	
<b>2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)</b>	Yes	The report, excluding the executive summary, meets the maximum page limit requirement for CPEs at 70 pages.	
<b>3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?</b>	Yes	The annexes contain the required elements - the TOR, evaluation matrix, reconstructed theory of change, data collection tools, stakeholder map, list of consulted stakeholders, data collection tools, and references for consulted documents - as well as additional materials .	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
<b>4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?</b>	Partial	The executive summary contains all the required sub-sections and can be read as a standalone document. However, it does not specify the number of stakeholders involved in the evaluation, which limits the readers' understanding of its scope and robustness, despite the inclusion of a description of the methodological approach and emphasis on its inclusiveness.	
<b>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</b>	Yes	The executive summary is reasonably concise at 5 pages in length.	
<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>			
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
<b>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	The second chapter presents a solid overview of the development context related to GEWE including disability. This chapter outlines the country context, development challenges, national strategies, and the role of external assistance such as overseas development aid and the United Nations Sustainable Development Framework for Malawi. The third chapter covers the UN and UNFPA strategic response, including the UNFPA response through the current CP8 country programme.	
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>	Yes	There is discussion on how the ToC was used as a theory-based approach in chapter 1, with detailed analyses and criticism in chapter 3. Evaluators observed that the ToC played a central role in the entire evaluation process, from design through to conclusions and recommendations. Annex A includes a graphic depiction of the ToC. The results framework and narrative were presented in chapter 1 and in chapter 3 in relation to the UNFPA intervention.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			

<p><b>3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?</b></p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The evaluation matrix in Annex 4 clearly outlines the evaluation criteria and questions. It organizes information such as indicators, assumptions, methods for data collection, and sources of information. The matrix is referenced in the main report. However, the UNFPA requirement for key findings to be included in the matrix is not met.</p>
<p>4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluators discuss and justify the chosen evaluation design. They employ tools such as a literature review, individual and group interview instruments, a FGD instrument, and an observation checklist. These tools are briefly described in the methods section, with the evaluators justifying their selection to gather comprehensive information from diverse stakeholders. Annex 7 contains the detailed data collection tools.</p>
<p>5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Annex 6 includes a comprehensive stakeholders map that organizes stakeholders and rights holders according to strategic plan outcomes and outputs. The evaluators observed that it was challenging to identify the direct beneficiaries of the interventions since most of the UNFPA interventions were implemented at national and sub-national levels, however they were still able to conduct FGDs with rightsholders in the sampled districts. The sample is noted as including persons with disabilities. The evaluation reference group was consulted at each stage of the evaluation, including on the draft report which would have included recommendations.</p>
<p>6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluators provided a clear description of the data analysis methods, which included qualitative content analysis, quantitative analysis, and contribution analysis. These methods aimed to triangulate data and enable the team to draw conclusions. The contribution analysis specifically assessed the extent to which the CP contributed to the expected results. The evaluators also highlighted that the data analyses were conducted in a way that allowed for gender and age disaggregation.</p>
<p>7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Table 5 provides a summary of the methodological limitations, risks, and mitigation measures. In anticipation of COVID-related mobility concerns, the evaluation team made prior arrangements to utilize virtual online methods like Zoom/Microsoft Teams for data collection.</p>
<p>8. Is the sampling strategy described?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The sampling criteria for the selection of districts is provided in 1.4.5. The sampling process for the selection of individuals is described in very generally in section 1.4.2., stating that it was purposive. Tables 4 and Figure 3 breakdown the final sample by stakeholder group and gender. However, it appears that the evaluators did not fully adhere to the provision in the Terms of Reference (ToR), which required them to explicitly state which groups of stakeholders were not included and provide reasons for their exclusion.</p>
<p>9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>While TOR specified that the evaluation should disaggregate data by sex, age, location, and other relevant dimensions, such as disability status, the report only mentions disaggregating data by gender and age. The other vulnerability criteria mentioned in the TOR were not provided. Additionally, regarding qualitative data collection, the report could have included a summary of the evaluation participants in Annex 2 to show the proportion of males and females in the final sample of 112 participants.</p>
<p>10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluation matrix includes questions and indicators specifically designed to collect disaggregated data, primarily focusing on gender, related to gender equality, the empowerment of women and girls, and reproductive rights outputs contributing to outcome-level change. Perspectives of beneficiaries, including from those with disabilities, were obtained, through primary data collection.</p>
<p><b>3. Reliability of Data</b></p>		<p>Yes No Partial</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b></p>
<p><i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i></p>		
<p><b>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluators mention the triangulation of data from various sources and methods to identify consistent topics, themes, and patterns. The evaluation findings do include qualitative quotes from Key Informant Interviews (KII) and focus groups, as well as references to secondary data in footnotes which provide some evidence of data source triangulation.</p>
<p><b>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The sources utilized in the evaluation report appear to be appropriate and reliable, including an extensive list of documents. The primary sources heavily relied on qualitative data, while quantitative data was predominantly drawn from secondary sources. The reliability of the data sources is raised to some extent in the limitations section. The methodology section also mentions that the evaluation team held regular debriefing meetings to compare and validate data from interviews and conducted preliminary analysis of emerging topics and themes.</p>
<p>3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The methodology section acknowledges adherence to UNEG Ethical Guidelines, and the report demonstrates ethical considerations throughout the data collection protocols. This includes aspects such as informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and following COVID-19 protocols. The evaluators explicitly mentioned obtaining separate consent for the participation of minors in the evaluation, ensuring their ethical inclusion and protection.</p>

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings in the report are strongly supported by a variety of sources, including document sources, project monitoring data, references to interviews, and direct quotes from respondents. This comprehensive approach enhances the credibility and robustness of the findings, as they are grounded in multiple forms of evidence.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The evaluation report demonstrates clear evidence of utilizing various frameworks for the interpretation of evaluation findings. These frameworks include the results framework of the 8th Country Programme (CP), the Theory of Change (ToC) presented in Annex 5, and the UNFPA global results framework. The use of these frameworks strengthens the analysis and interpretation of the evaluation findings, providing a structured approach to understanding the outcomes and impact of the program.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The report's findings are organized systematically based on the evaluation questions, providing a clear structure that facilitates understanding of how each question has been addressed. For each evaluation question, a concise summary of the findings is provided, making it easier for readers to grasp the answers and conclusions pertaining to each specific question. This approach enhances the report's readability and comprehension.	
<b>4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Yes	The findings of the evaluation are based on the results framework and ToC to assess the causal linkages between output and outcome level changes respectively. Additionally, the report discusses unintended results that have emerged from the intervention. This comprehensive analysis provides insights into both the expected and unexpected outcomes of the program, contributing to a holistic understanding of its effectiveness.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The analysis in the report includes references to performance levels in the Effectiveness discussion, allowing for an assessment of how well the intervention has performed. Additionally, the Effectiveness findings also encompass an examination of unexpected results, providing a comprehensive analysis of the program's outcomes for rightsholders including persons with disabilities.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The report consistently provides contextual information, ensuring a thorough understanding of the program's operating environment. The discussion of challenges for achieving results includes a clear presentation of factors that hinder and enable the achievement of program results. The report specifically highlights traditional and harmful cultural practices deeply ingrained in the lifestyles of boys and girls as a systemic challenge. This emphasis on cultural practices helps shed light on significant obstacles to progress and underscores the need for targeted interventions to address these issues.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report demonstrates effective mainstreaming of disability and women's empowerment in the analysis. Additionally, evaluators discuss the engagement of men in gender-based violence (GBV) prevention activities related to sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), as well as addressing SGBV and harmful practices. This emphasis on male engagement highlights the significance of creating safe spaces for mentorship and promoting positive masculinities, contributing to a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to gender equality and addressing GBV.	
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The report effectively establishes a logical flow between the findings presented in Chapter 4 and the evaluation criteria, leading to clear and well-supported conclusions. The conclusions are presented at both strategic and program levels, ensuring a comprehensive overview of the evaluation's outcomes. Importantly, each conclusion is explicitly linked to the corresponding evaluation questions and criteria in the findings. Conclusions are further connected to the relevant recommendation.	
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 report effectively addresses underlying issues related to the country context, UNFPA strategic directions, and cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, equity and vulnerability, human rights, and disability inclusion in the conclusions. This ensures that the conclusions provide a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the program's performance and impact, taking into account the specific challenges and opportunities related to the country context and the cross-cutting issues relevant to UNFPA's mandate.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The report demonstrates a lack of indication of bias, maintaining an objective stance throughout the evaluation. The conclusions present a balanced view by acknowledging both the strengths and weaknesses of the UNFPA intervention. This balanced approach ensures that the evaluation's findings and conclusions accurately reflect the program's achievements as well as areas for improvement.	
<b>6. Recommendations</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The report establishes clear and explicit links between the recommendations and their corresponding findings as well as the relevant evaluation conclusions. Each recommendation is categorized as either strategic or programmatic, ensuring a systematic approach to addressing the identified areas for improvement. This linkage between findings, conclusions, and recommendations enhances the report's clarity and facilitates the implementation of the recommended actions.	

2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	All the recommendations put forward in the report are deemed actionable and useful. Each recommendation explicitly identifies the responsible users or stakeholders who are accountable for its implementation. Furthermore, the recommendations provide clear operational implications, outlining the practical steps required for their successful implementation.
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	The recommendations presented in the report reflect impartiality and are based on the strengths and weaknesses identified through the evaluation process. They take into account cross-cutting themes such as gender equality, equity, vulnerability, and disability.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The report identifies the level of priority for each recommendation, categorizing them as ranging from low to high. By specifying the priority level, the report provides guidance on which actions should be given higher importance and immediate attention in order to address the identified issues and improve the program's effectiveness.
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)		
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	2	<p><b>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)</b> The evaluation does not include an objective specific to assessing gender and human rights, nor is this reflected in the scope. = 0</p> <p><b>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)</b> HRGE issues are mainstreamed into the criteria = 3</p> <p><b>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</b> EQ4 and subquestion EQ1 (i) are dedicated question to GEEW. = 3</p> <p><b>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)</b> The use of the results framework and indicators provided a framework for assessing whether or not sufficient information was collected human rights and gender equality results. Data was disaggregated by gender, when possible. (3)</p>
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	3	<p><b>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)</b> Evaluators note using the UNEG guidance on HRGE in evaluations. They explain steps taken to ensure gender and socio-economic status in the selection of FGD participants, and the need to ensure the comfort of participants, including by have separate discussions for males and females. = 3</p> <p><b>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)</b> The mixed methods and participatory approach is appropriate for assessing GEEW. = 3</p> <p><b>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</b> Although sampling of participants could have been more well defined, evaluators state that the participatory approach ensured inclusion. Both triangulation and validation were evident. = 2</p> <p><b>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)</b> The list of evaluation respondents includes their organizational affiliation and location, but it doesn't provide a cumulative count of participants or separate them by stakeholder group, gender, or location. However, it does show representation from organizations dedicated to women, human rights, and persons with disabilities. =3</p> <p><b>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</b> Ethical considerations are apparent and evaluators specifically stated getting consent from parents and guardians for participation of minors = 3</p>
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3	<p><b>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)</b> The context section provides an appropriate analysis, including on GBV. = 3</p> <p><b>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)</b> The findings provide a solid analysis of gender equality (GE), but there is room to make the voices of disability inclusion actors and women more prominent. =2</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation does include the unanticipated effects of the intervention on HRGE where applicable. =3</p> <p><b>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)</b> Both the strategic and programmatic recommendations specifically address GEWE issues. = 3</p>
<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).</p>		
<b>Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment</b>		

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			
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>20</b>		
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Very good</b>			
The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.				
<b>Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)</b>				
The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
If yes, please explain:				