

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6	Organizational unit:	UNFPA Philippines										Year of report:	2023					
7																		
8	Title of evaluation report:	Philippines 8th Country Programme Evaluation 2019-2023																
9																		
10	Overall quality of report:	Very Good										Date of assessment:	25 November 2023					
11																		
12	Overall comments:	This report provides a comprehensive picture of the performance of the 8th country programme, sufficiently addressing the evaluation purpose with good analysis of evidence. It uses a logical structure based on the evaluation criteria, presenting findings by evaluation questions for easy navigation by the intended audience. Strengths and weaknesses are well-evidenced and balanced, offering a clear picture of the country programme's performance. Inclusion of a section on lessons learned with clear articulation of facilitating and hindering factors is the strength of the report. The evaluation also demonstrates good practices in its thorough and solid integration of gender, human rights, disability and LNOB principles across the findings, conclusions and recommendations. By reframing the conclusions as judgments rather than actions, the conclusion section could have maintained the analytical objectivity and avoid pre-empting the recommendations section. This allows the recommendations to stand out as distinct actionable steps derived from the conclusions. While recommendations are logical and stemmed from conclusions, the number of specific action points within each one could be streamlined. A more concise set of well-synthesized and manageable action points would support clearer management response and implementation. Nonetheless, the report is clear about the process followed in developing the recommendations including validation with UNFPA staff and Evaluation Reference Group members.																
13																		
14	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													
15																		
16																		
17	Quality Assessment Criteria										<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>							
18	I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting										Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:		Good				
19	<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>																	
20	I. 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)?										Yes	The report reads well with a few grammatical errors and at times long sentences esp in the recommendation section. It has distinct sections on findings, conclusions and recommendations. The CPE team made good efforts to specify lessons learned.						

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	
21	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)								Partial	The report is 73 pages long, exclusive of the executive summary, which is above the recommended page limit.								
22	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)?								Yes	The report contains all required annexes								
23	<i>Executive summary</i>																	
24	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?								Yes	The executive summary is reasonably concise (presenting summary of findings and conclusions). It includes all required components plus a lessons learned section.								
25	5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?								Yes	The executive summary has a length of 5 pages								
26																		
27																		
28	2. Design and Methodology								Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:				Fair				
29	<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>																	
30	1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?								Yes	The context section clearly describes the institutional and development situation. The report also provided an additional comprehensive contextual analysis across the country programme priority areas in Annex 13.								
31	2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?								Partial	The evaluation employs a theory-based approach, combining mixed methods and triangulation to ensure data quality. However, the extent to which the evaluation team validated, expanded, or retrofitted the TOC is unclear. This would have provided a clearer indication of whether the programme contributed to improvements at outcome level indicators.								

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
32	<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>																
33	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?								Yes	The evaluation matrix is described in the text and also included as an annex (9). It includes evaluation questions by criterion, assumptions, line of inquiry and appropriate data sources, and methods for data collection. The matrix guided data gathering, analysis and reporting in the various phases of the evaluation process.							
34	4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?								Yes	The methods/tools for data collection are described and the rationale for their choice explained with detail information provided in the annex. The evaluation methodology covered qualitative and quantitative methods and tools, including desk review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and field observations.							
35	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)?								Yes	A stakeholder map is provided in Annex 12, which lists implementing partners and other stakeholders by CP outcome, including information on the role in UNFPA programme. Recommendations were validated with the ERG.							
36	6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?								Yes	The evaluation report notes that qualitative content analysis, context analysis, analysis of the TOC and results chain of the programme, SWOT analysis, timeline and policy analysis were used. The definition of these and how they were applied is briefly explained in the Annex.							
37	7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?								Yes	The methodological limitations, the risks (esp in related to COVID-19) and the methods that were taken to mitigate the limitations are described in the annexes.							
38	8. Is the sampling strategy described?								Yes	The evaluators incorporated a purposive sampling strategy for the selection of sample of stakeholders at national and sub-national levels with consideration to represent all aspects of UNFPA's development and humanitarian programming, including offering a balanced sampling covering successful and less successful programmes. In the selection of stakeholders to be interviewed, those working with and representing vulnerable and marginalized groups were included.							
39	9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?								Yes	Where relevant disaggregation of data was used, particularly relating to gender and the analysis demonstrated analysis by various vulnerability variables. The list of respondents provided disaggregated data by sex.							
40	10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?								Yes	Cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment, vulnerability and disability inclusion are mainstreamed across evaluation questions. There is also a dedicated section presenting a thorough analysis of these dimensions and the findings present a good analysis of the extent to which the CP addressed key population groups.							
41																	

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	
42																		
43	3. Reliability of Data								Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:				Very good				
44	<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>																	
45	1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?								Yes	The evaluation findings triangulate data across sources/ methods and the annexes provide a strong evidence base in terms of analysis of findings.								
46	2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?								Yes	The evaluation methodology covered qualitative and quantitative methods and tools, including desk review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and field observations. Where available, use was made of disaggregated data along gender, disability and other vulnerability criteria. This approach was further augmented through a validation meeting with UNFPA staff and Evaluation Reference Group members.								
47	3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?								Yes	There is a subsection on Ethical Considerations which discusses the UNFPA and UNEG guidance that was followed, including the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct gamut from obtaining consent from evaluation participants to maintaining confidentiality.								
48																		
49																		
50	4. Analysis and Findings								Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:				Very good				
51	<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>																	
52	1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?								Yes	The findings are objectively reported based on solid evidence and provide a reasonable analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the country programme performance. Details on the data sources are provided in the annex.								
53	2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?								Yes	The presented analysis and the subsequent interpretations are carefully described, including clear articulation of the factors that have contributed towards or hindered success.								
54	3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?								Yes	The findings are structured along the evaluation criteria and questions, making it easy for the reader to understand how these have been answered.								

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
55	4. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?								Yes	While the evaluation utilizes contribution analysis and assesses achievements in line with the Theories of Change (TOC) of the programme components, an evidence-based narrative demonstrating the cause-and-effect links or the relative contribution of UNFPA interventions to improvements at outcome level indicators is not always evident. However, the report is transparent in terms of outlining the limitations and made suggestions to redress this in the new country programme.							
56	5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?								Yes	The findings present a good analysis of cross-cutting issues, including analysis of the different outcomes for different target groups in line with a rights-based and gender responsive approach. This is evidenced across all evaluation criteria and different sections of the report. There is also a solid analysis of the extent to which the CP addressed persons with disabilities (PWD) with intersectionality lens and addressing various gender identities. For example, evaluators note that there has been some attention to people with disabilities (PWD) in selected programmatic interventions. This has not yet resulted in attention to PWD mainstreamed throughout the programme, including in the four strategic focus areas of the related corporate strategy, i.e. strategic planning and management, inclusiveness, programming and organizational culture.							
57	6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?								Yes	The findings are strong at discussing factors that have contributed towards or hindered success.							
58	7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?								Yes	Cross-cutting issues of human rights, LNOB, vulnerability and gender equality as well as disability inclusion are incorporated systematically across all evaluation questions and well addressed in the analysis of findings, conclusions and recommendations. This is in addition a dedicated evaluation question on mainstreaming gender equality, human rights & disability.							
59																	

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	
60																		
61	5. Conclusions								Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair							
62	<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>																	
63	1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?								Partial	The conclusions logically build on and flow from the findings. However, conclusions should present the final interpretation and judgment derived from the findings, without venturing into action steps or recommendations. There are more apparent in conclusions 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 etc)). By reframing the conclusions as judgments rather than actions, this section could have maintained the analytical objectivity and avoid pre-empting the recommendations section. This allows the recommendations to stand out as distinct actionable steps derived from the conclusions.								
64	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?								Partial	The conclusions are analytical, go beyond the findings and demonstrate a good understanding of the key issues underlying the country programme. In addition, they adequately integrate cross-cutting issues, including those 'those furthest behind' such as inclusion of indigenous peoples, PWD and gender minorities. However, the judgments are often mixed with actions. By reframing the conclusions as judgments rather than actions, this section could have maintained the analytical objectivity and avoid pre-empting the recommendations section.								
65	3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?								Yes	The conclusions convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment by presenting a balanced assessment of the country program's strengths and weaknesses, including highlight areas that worked and didn't work.								
66																		
67																		
68	6. Recommendations								Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good							
69	<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>																	
70	1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?								Yes	Each recommendation is linked explicitly to its corresponding conclusion.								
71	2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?								Yes	The recommendations are presented both at strategic and programmatic levels. The recommendations also propose a suite of actions but didn't discuss the financial and other implications for their implementation. There are few shortcomings. One is that the plethora of key actions could have been synthesized and rationalized focusing on the most pressing issues that needs to be tackled in the formulation and implementation of the next country programme.								
72	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	Recommendations address key cross-cutting issues that address vulnerable and marginalized groups with a focus on LNOB and addressing the social and gender norms including addressing barriers from a rights-based perspective, including PWD, LGBTQI etc								
73	4. Are the recommendations prioritized?								Partial	The level of priority is identified for each recommendation (high or intermediate).								
74																		

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	
75																		
76	7. Gender								0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:				Very good				
77	<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>																	
78	1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?												<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)</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)</p> <p>3 c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</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)</p>					
79	2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?												<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)</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)</p> <p>3 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</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)</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)</p>					

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R		
80	3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?									<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)</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)</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</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)</p>									
81																			
82	(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 =																		
83	(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).																		
84																			
85	Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment																		
86											Assessment Levels (*)								
87	Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)										Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory					
88																			
89	1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)											7							
90	2. Design and methodology (13)													13					
91	3. Reliability of data (11)										11								
92	4. Analysis and findings (40)										40								
93	5. Conclusions (11)													11					
94	6. Recommendations (11)											11							
95	7. Integration of gender (7)										7								
96	Total scoring points										58	18	24						
97	Overall assessment level of evaluation report										Very Good								
98											Very good	Good	Fair	Good					
99	(*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column).																		
100																			
101																			
102	If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain																		
103																			
104	• How it can be used?																		
105																			
106																			
107																			
108																			
109																			
110	• What aspects to be cautious about?																		

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
111																	
112																	
113																	
114																	
115																	
116	Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment of Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory																
117																	
118																	
119																	
120																	
121																	
122	Consideration of significant constraints																
123																	
124	The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																
125																	
126	If yes, please explain:																
127																	
128																	
129																	
130																	