UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY		
Overall Rating	89%	Highly Satisfactory
● ● ● ● ● Excellent	5	
● ● ● ● Highly Satisfactory	4	The report fully meets all UNFPA/UNEG standards for evaluation reports, with minor shortcomings in certain indicators. Decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence.
● ● ● – Satisfactory	**3**	
● ● – – Fair	2	
● – – – Unsatisfactory	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	Formative evaluation of the UNFPA Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Programme 2022-2025
Region	EECA
Country	Multi-country
Year of report	2024
Business Unit/programme country *(managing evaluation)*	EECA Regional Office
Date of assessment review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	October 10, 2024
Name of assessment review firm	IOD PARC
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Primary SDG(s) covered *(list provided below)*	3, 5
UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered *(lists provided below)*	
Three transformative results	1, 2, 3
Six outputs	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Six accelerators	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	Yes
Humanitarian evaluation	No
Evaluation evaluand *(e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)*	Regional Programme
Evaluation type *(e.g. formative, summative, developmental)*	Formative
Geographic scope *(e.g. global, regional, national)*	Regional

EQA Summary: *The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (strengths and weaknesses), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight good practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation. The rater should also highlight how cross-cutting issues were addressed in the report. Considerations of significant constraints (e.g. humanitarian crisis or political turmoil) should also be highlighted here.*

This is a highly satisfactory formative evaluation of the UNFPA Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Programme 2022-2025. The key strengths and weaknesses of the Evaluation Report are as follows:

Key areas of strength

• **Section A: Executive Summary** – The Executive Summary is a clear standalone document that will be useful for informing decision-making. It meets the page requirements set out in the ToR and includes the necessary components.

• **Section B: Background** – Overall, there is a clear description of the regional programme. There is a clear and relevant description of the context for the EECA regional programmes, which includes broader economic, social, political context as well as the demographic change.

• **Section C: Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope** – The purpose of the evaluation is clearly outlined in Section 1.1 (p.11). It also mentions that the RPE is one of six that are being conducted in coordination with a Strategic Plan Evaluation. The primary and secondary audiences are identified in para 5. In addition, there is a clear and relevant description of the scope in Section 1.2.

• **Section E: Evaluation Findings** – The findings are clearly presented and organised by the evaluation questions and sub-questions. This section is very well written, showing clear analysis and its presentation makes it easy to digest the information. For example, each question is introduced with a summary of the key findings, which helps orient the audience to the upcoming information and provides a concise overview for those with limited time. The findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented. Triangulation is evident through the use of both primary and secondary sources, and references are provided in the footnotes of nearly all pages of the findings section.

• **Section F: Evaluation Conclusions** – The conclusions are clearly formulated. They are well substantiated and are derived from findings. They are not summaries to each evaluation questions, as these are provided in summary boxes in the findings section. Instead, the conclusions offer deeper insight analysis that go beyond the findings.

• **Section G: Evaluation Recommendations** – They are clearly described and they include supporting actions and are targeted to UNFPA personnel.

• **Section I: Cross-cutting issues** – The evaluation addressed cross-cutting issues. An intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis and this is most evident in areas related to Leave No One Behind (LNOB) and 'reaching the furthest behind'. The findings, conclusions and recommendations address cross-cutting issues including equality, vulnerability, disability inclusion, LNOB and reaching the furthest behind.

Key areas for improvement

• **Section B: Background** – One of the key areas that can be strengthened in this report is a clear identification of key stakeholders, particularly regarding the specific partners involved. While paragraph 13 mentions a stakeholder map provided by EECARO, it is not provided in the Report or its Annexes. While it is evident from the methodology section that evaluators interviewed UNFPA staff, UN agencies, donors and partners, and there is a list of key informants in Annex 5, it is unclear who were left out from this list. It is also unclear what their roles and responsibilities and interlinkages are.

• **Section D: Evaluation Design and Methodology:** The sampling strategy can be elaborated on as it is unclear how informants and the two country missions were selected. Please see the recommendations below for suggested improvements. In terms of analysis, the evaluation report provided a clear description of the coding process but less on the analysis such as how the evaluation framework was used. There is also limited information provided on ethical issues and considerations.

Suggestions for future evaluators: *The rater will identify key suggestions to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, examples will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.*

Recommendations for improvement
• **Section B: Background** – In relation to identifying stakeholders, evaluators are encouraged to incorporate a stakeholder map or table in the background section of the Report alongside their roles and responsibilities and to highlight interlinkages. This will not only allow the audience to better understand the evaluand but will also enhance clarity and transparency, particularly in understanding the sampling strategy for the evaluation.
• **Section D: Evaluation Design and Methodology:** Evaluators are encouraged to elaborate on their sampling strategy for the evaluation. One suggestion is to start by clearly identifying key stakeholders, either through the use of a map or a table. Evaluators are also encouraged to describe the criteria used for selection. In terms of analysis, evaluators can consider elaborating on how the analysis was conducted such as the use of the evaluation matrix and indicators as well as the strengths of evidence rubrics in identifying key findings. In terms of ethical considerations, it would be beneficial to have a separate section that contextualises the UNEG standards so it is clear how the evaluation was conducted.

SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i	Is a clear, standalone document useful for informing decision making, (a minimum of 5 pages, up to a maximum of 7 pages). *Note: YES - the executive summary is within the indicated maximum page limit. PARTIAL - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by 1 to 2 pages. NO - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by more than 2 pages.*	Yes	The Executive Summary is a clear, standalone document that will be useful for informing decision making. It is just slightly over 4 pages long and does not meet the minimum requirement of 5 pages. However, as the ToR specifies that the Executive Summary should be 3-5 pages (see Annex 5 of the ToRs), this criterion is rated as meeting the requirement (i.e. 'yes').
ii	Includes all necessary components of the evaluation report, including: (1) overview of the context and intervention, (2) evaluation purpose, objectives and intended users, 3) scope and evaluation methodology, (4) summary of most significant findings, (5) main conclusions and (6) key recommendations	Yes	The Executive Summary includes all the necessary components of the evaluation report. This includes a brief overview of the context and intervention (see 'background' on p.6); Evaluation purpose, objectives and primary audience (p.6); Scope and evaluation methodology (p.6); Summary of findings (p.6-7); Main conclusions (p.7-8); and Key recommendations (p.9=10).
iii	Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Yes	Overall, the Executive Summary (ES) includes the necessary information from the main report, which is conveyed in a concise manner.

SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	60%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	Is the evaluand (i.e. intervention/policy/thematic area etc. that is to be evaluated) and context of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Clear description of the evaluand (e.g. intervention), including: geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Partially	Overall, there is a clear description of the regional programme (section 2.2.2 - 2.2.3). This includes the geographical coverage (i.e. Eastern Europe and Central Asia), with the list of the 17 countries provided in section 2.1.1. The current programme covers 2022-2025 (p.20). The budget details are outlined in para 31, which includes the overall financial envelope, specifying the percentage and amount allocated for 'non-core resources to be mobilised to achieve the programme objectives.' What is missing is a description of the partners involved, although it is clear that evaluators interviewed partners during data collection. Evaluators are encouraged to include a section identifying the key stakeholders, including partners, as this helps establish a foundation for sampling. The evaluation would also benefit from a clearer explanation of the six accelerators and 12 strategic shifts, which is central to this evaluation and are reflected in the three main evaluation questions. For example, paragraph 26 says that the Strategic Plan Evaluation (SPE) 'inception report discusses these in some detail' (p.19). However, the SPE evaluation report and related documents are not made available to the reviewer of this RPE and are also not currently available online (as noted in para 2, the RPE is one of six conducted together with the SPE).
ii	Clear description of the context of the evaluand (e.g. economic, social and political context, relevant aspects of UNFPA's institutional, normative and strategic framework, cross cutting issues such as gender equality and human rights, disability and LNOB dimensions) and how the context relates to the evaluand (e.g. key drivers and challenges that affect the implementation of the intervention/policy/thematic area	Yes	The Evaluation Report provides a clear and relevant description of the context for the EECA regional programme. This includes a broader economic, social and political context in section 2.1.1, outlining key implications for the current relational programme (2022-2025) such as demographic change in the region, increase in political turbulence where 7 out of 17 countries are considered medium or high-risk in the 2024 INFORM Risk Index, lagging population data systems and more. It also provides the status of UNFPA's Transformative Results across the 17 countries in section 2.1.2.
iii	Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	SDGs are mentioned in the context of EECARO's intention to support the achievement of universal access to SRH and realisation of RR. Similarly, reference is made to the Programme of Action (PoA) of the ICPD. However, targets and indicators are not provided but the evaluators explains that as the '*focus of UNFPA regional programmes is on the output level. Hence, the IRRF does not list any indicators for EECARO to track its performance against these three strategic plan outcomes, and no targets have been set*' (para 32). For this reason, this criteria is rated as being met.
Question 3.	Are key stakeholders clearly identified and analysed?		

	i	Clear identification of key stakeholders which should include implementing partner(s), development partners, rights holders, and duty bearers among others; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map).	Partially	The Evaluation Report lacks a clear identification of key stakeholders, particularly regarding the specific partners involved. While para 13 mentions a stakeholder map provided by EECARO, it is not provided in the Report or its Annexes, nor the Inception Report. However, it is evident from the methodology section that evaluators interviewed UNFPA staff, UN agencies, donors and partners. In addition, a list of key informants is provided in Annex 5. Due to the partial information, it is rated accordingly. To enhance clarity and transparency, it is strongly recommended that evaluators incorporate a stakeholder map or table in the background section or an annex of the Report. This would not only aid the audience in understanding the key players involved but also provide a clearer rationale for the sampling strategy for the evaluation.
	ii	Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	No	This is not available. Evaluators are encouraged to include some information that identifies the key stakeholders and identify what their interest are, their needs, contributions, roles and responsibilities. This information is also not provided in the Inception Report.
SECTION C:		**EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)**	100%	**Comments on Rating**
Question 4.		**Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?**		
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the Regional Programme Evaluation (RPE) is clearly outlined in Section 1.1 (p.11). It describes the evaluation as being a formative one of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2022-2025, which will feed into internal consultations on the UNFPA strategic plan 2026-29 design. It also mentions that this RPE is one of six that are being conducted 'in a coordinated manner with the' Strategic Plan Evaluation. It also adds that the SPE is being conducted in parallel with a mid-term evaluation (MTR). It elaborates on the triple purpose of the RPE (para 3) i.e. to inform the remainder of the regional plan, inform the next strategic plan (2026-2029) and to make inputs ready for the SPE.

The primary and secondary audience are defined in para 5, which include EECARO management and staff (primary) and to whom the recommendations are addressed. The secondary audiences identified are EECARO partners, UNFPA HQ, UNFPA Country Offices in the region. |
Question 5.		**Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?**		
	i	Clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, including reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	The objective of the evaluation is described in para 4 as being in '*line with the SPE, its objective is to assess UNFPA's organizational readiness and strategic positioning to accelerate progress towards achieving the transformative results in the EECA region....*' The evaluation report refers to a triple purpose, while the ToR notes three objectives, which can be confusing. However, the three purposes listed are aligned with the three objectives outlined in the ToR.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope (e.g. thematic, geographic, and temporal) of the evaluation, covering what will and will not be covered, as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political, humanitarian or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the scope in Section 1.2. This includes all 'accelerators' and selected 'strategic shifts' included in the UNFPA strategic plan 2022-2025 across all regional programme outputs. The Report also describes the temporal scope (i.e. start of 2022 to end of data collection in May 2024). The geographical scope includes 12 of the 17 countries supported by UNFPA EECARO using a criteria described in para 7.
SECTION D:		**EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)**	61%	**Comments on Rating**
Question 6.		**Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use?**

Note: UNFPA evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria such as: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (not necessarily applicable to all evaluations) and, for country programmes that include circumscribed and limited humanitarian and/or emergency interventions, the criteria of coverage and connectedness. | | |
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Partially	The evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation, as described in the Final Report (Section 1, p.11). OECD DAC criteria are not used as the questions were refined/restructured during Inception. While no explanation is provided in the Evaluation Report, the Inception Report notes that '*references to the evaluation criteria have been dropped, analogue to the SPE evaluation matrix*' (p.22 of IR). While it does not say, some of the questions cut across different OECD-DAC criteria. It will be beneficial for evaluators to explain their rationale for 'dropping' the evaluation criteria. Another option is for evaluators to note the main corresponding criteria, alongside each question or sub-question.
	ii	Evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, indicators, lines of inquiry, benchmarks, assumptions, source of data, methods for data collection and analysis, and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.	Yes	As mentioned in 6i above, the evaluation report does not present the evaluation criteria. However, each sub-EQ includes corresponding indicators as a basis from which analysis can be made and conclusions drawn. In addition, the source of data and methods for data collection are also included for each sub-EQ. The Evaluation Matrix is provided in Annex 1.
Question 7.		**Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?**		

	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Not Rated	As this is a formative evaluation, it looks specifically at the use of new elements introduced in the current Strategic Plan (i.e. the six accelerators and strategic shifts) to assess *'organizational readiness and strategic position to accelerate progress towards achieving the transformative results in the EECA region....'* (para 4 on objective of the RPE, p.11)
	ii	Causal relationships between the various elements (e.g. outcomes, including the three or relevant Transformative Results, outputs) of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework are presented in narrative and/or graphic form).	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
	iii	Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework, and if requested in the ToR, it is retrofitted/reconstructed by the evaluators.	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
Question 8.		**Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?**		
	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are clearly described, and are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, including the use of AI in the evaluation process if applicable.	Partially	Overall, the evaluation design and methods are clearly described. Where additional description could be provided is in relation to the 'guiding framework' depicted in a text box in figure 2, which has guided the development of the Evaluation Matrix (p.13). The guiding framework is elaborated on in the Inception Report, which includes a conceptual framework for the SPE that is adapted for the RPE. Evaluators are encouraged to include this figure and description in the main report or the Annex as it provides a clear framing for the evaluation design, including the deep dives. The evaluation employs a mixed-methods approach involving key informant interviews and document review at different levels. This included regional level, two countries explored in greater depth through a country visit, document review and interviews, and ten additional countries that involved document review and a few interviews (i.e. 'wide but shallow). These methods are relevant for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope and sufficiently robust in design. There is no mention of the use of AI in the evaluation process.
	ii	Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR).	Yes	Data sources are clearly described in section 1.3.2. It includes key informants from across UNFPA, other UN agencies, donors, and partners at regional and country levels ((list of participants are provided in Annex 5). It also includes a review of 100 documents that include regional and global-level documents and country-level documents, (list of documents are provided in Annex 6). A scan through the list of document indicates that some of the sources should provide quantitative data such as the UNAIDS. Global AIDS Monitoring 2023 or United Nations. 2023. The Sustainable Development Goals Report. Special Edition. 2023.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The sampling strategy is insufficient as it is not clear how informants and the two country missions were selected. Although the report states that the evaluation team 'contacted' EECARO senior management and advisors; UNFPA representatives and heads of office in 12 countries; and key regional and country-level programme staff as well as other UN agencies, donors and partners, it is unclear who all the stakeholders are, why these were selected and who were left out. The report mentions that the informants were selected based on a *'stakeholder map by EECARO'* (p.14) but this is not included in the report. Evaluators are encouraged to clearly identify key stakeholders, either through a map or a table, and provide the criteria used for selection, even if the process was purposive, to explain how these stakeholders were selected. Similarly, evaluators can consider providing the criteria for the selection of the two country missions.
	iv	Methods allow for rigorous testing of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework (e.g. methods help to understand the causal connections, if any, between outputs and expected outcomes (3TRs).	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
	v	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including explainability and full disclosure of the use of AI in the evaluation process, if applicable.	Yes	There is a section on coding and analysis (1.3.3, p.14). This is mainly a summary of the coding with a very brief description of how anomalies and contradictions were investigated. It says *'findings were then tested against the evidence and confirmed'*. There is mention of a strength of evidence in the coding process for findings, which is good practice. The key component that is missing in this section is the use of the Evaluation Framework, in particular, the assessment indicators. It would be helpful if the evaluators elaborated on this process so that it is clear how the analysis was conducted and how findings and conclusions were drawn. However, this is elaborated on in the Inception Report.
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation in its data collection and analysis, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Partially	There is a section titled 'Challenges' (1.3.4, p.14), which describes the limitations and mitigating steps. In some cases, the mitigating steps were sufficient. However, some are said to have remained an issue throughout despite mitigating steps (e.g. country office staff not making linkages to EECARO support). This is important to be mindful of when reviewing the report and the evaluators are transparent about it. While gaps in information are noted, evaluators did not include mitigation of bias which would have been helpful.
Question 9.		**Are ethical issues and considerations described?** **The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:**		

	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Partially	The evaluation is said to conform to UNEG standards. However, it is a very brief reference and does not provide any description for how the UNEG obligations are contextualised to this evaluation and/or UNEG ethical principles. In order to meet this criterium, evaluators could have included a separate section on ethical considerations that provide a brief summary for how the evaluation meets UNEG obligations of evaluators or steps taken in areas such as independence, impartiality, credibility and so on.
	ii	Clear description of ethical issues and considerations (e.g. respect for dignity and diversity, fair representation, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm) that may arise in the evaluation, safeguard mechanisms for respondents (e.g. parental consent forms for adolescents, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups; WHO standards of safe data collection on GBV) and ethical considerations in the use of AI as applicable (e.g., transparency of use, explainability, privacy, data protection, accuracy, human rights). If AI is used in the evaluation, there should be transparency and disclosure on the ethical and responsible use of AI in the report.	No	The evaluation report does not provide a description of ethical issues or considerations. This is an area that evaluators could have elaborated on so it is clear how interviews were conducted, what protocols were used, how consent was obtained, how data is protected and more. Furthermore, while Annex 2 is titled 'interview protocols', they are primarily interview guides with questions for different stakeholder types and not protocols for conducting the interviews.
Question 10.		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could include efforts to optimize the evaluation process (e.g., use of AI or new technology for data gathering, content analysis, outcome harvesting among others), or components introduced to enhance inclusion and participation in the evaluation processes (e.g. a youth steering committee), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Not Rated	There are no specific innovative practices used in this evaluation.
SECTION E:		EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 11.		Do the findings clearly and adequately address all evaluation questions and sub-questions?		
	i	Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions	Yes	The findings are presented clearly and are organised by the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Each question is introduced with a summary of the key findings, which helps to orient the audience to the upcoming information and provides a concise overview for those with limited time. The findings are highlighted in bold, directly answering the question or sub-question posed, followed by supporting evidence. The section is well written, showing clear analysis and its presentation makes it easy to digest the information.
	ii	Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
Question 12.		Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?		
	i	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible forms of both qualitative and quantitative data, with a greater emphasis on qualitative data, which is appropriate for this evaluation. It looks at the key areas outlined in the conceptual framework i.e. the extent to which the accelerators and strategic shifts have supported enhanced programming. It presents key areas identified in the conceptual framework, specifically the extent to which the accelerators and strategic shifts have contributed to enhanced programming. Triangulation is evident through the use of both primary and secondary sources, and references are provided in the footnotes on nearly all pages of the findings section. Evaluators may wish to consider including the strength of evidence used during analysis, as was mentioned. However, since this is not required by the evaluation criteria, it does not impact the scoring. This is simply a suggestion, particularly if a strength of evidence rubric was used, as it could enhance the transparency and credibility of the evidence presented.
	ii	Findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented, both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	Findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented. This includes both positive and negative and this is evident in a number of findings statements (e.g. finding 1, 2, 5, 7, and more). There is evidence that some of the indicators from the evaluation framework have been applied.
	iii	Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from outputs to high level results).	Yes	Although this is not an output/outcome/impact evaluation, the report examines the extent to which 'enablers' facilitated the implementation of the accelerators and strategic. This is covered under EQ3 (p.42-48).
Question 13.		Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i	Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's planning, monitoring, and reporting system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Not Rated	The inception report did not make reference to a specific assessment of RBM and M&E components of the regional programme as the evaluation is focused primarily on accelerators and shifts. However, the extent to which the RO utilises, supported and has capacity for data and evidence (one of the six accelerators) is assessed and presented under finding 4 (p.28).
SECTION F:		EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 14.		Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluand?		

	i	Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	The conclusions are clearly formulated. The summative statements are presented in greater detail in the 'summary boxes' at the start of each question in the findings section. Nevertheless, the conclusions also provide summative statements. In addition, while the conclusions are not structured according to the evaluation questions, it is evident that they respond to the three main questions. They also include a conclusion on each of the deep dives conducted i.e. one on demographic resilience and one on humanitarian preparedness and response.
	ii	Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The conclusions are well substantiated and are derived from findings. However, evaluators can make the findings origin more transparent by mentioning or signposting to the evaluation questions/findings they are based on. As mentioned above, in 14i, they are not summaries as these are presented in the findings section itself in summary boxes. Instead, the conclusions add deeper insight and analysis that go beyond the findings.
Question 15.		**Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]**		
	i	Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	Not Rated	There is no separate section on lessons provided in this evaluation report. It is not stated as a requirement in the ToRs (see Annex 5 of the ToR under 'Outline of Final Report')
	ii	Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluand as well as any areas of improvement.	Not Rated	There is no separate section on lessons provided in this evaluation report. It is not stated as a requirement in the ToRs (see Annex 5 of the ToR under 'Outline of Final Report')
SECTION G:		**EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)**	100%	**Comments on Rating**
Question 16.		**Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?**		
	i	Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations are clearly formulated and are structured by strategic recommendations (1-3), programmatic recommendations (4-7) and operational recommendations (8-9). They are logically derived from the findings and, to and extent, the conclusions. Evaluators could have considered making these linkages more explicit by adding sign-posts to relevant sections or paragraphs from the findings and/or conclusion. However, this was not essential.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users. Specific guidance is provided for its implementation (e.g. actions, deadlines, responsible actors), as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are clearly described and are useful for the primary intended users. For example, each recommendation is provided with guidance or supporting actions for their implementation. They are targeted at specific EECARO teams or staff e.g. EECARO Gender Advisor or ECCARO human resources staff and also include who they should work alongside such as 'collaboration with humanitarian staff' or 'in consultation with 'EECARO Senior Management'. While deadlines are not provided, they are each given a priority rating. The recommendations also provide links to specific sub-sections in the findings and conclusions sections.
	iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of key stakeholders (e.g. evaluation reference group members), including those who will be affected by the recommendations.	Yes	The process for finalising recommendations is provided at the start of the Recommendations section (p.51). This involved presenting the recommendations to regional office staff, who are charged with implementing them, as well as ERG members for discussion and validation over two meetings.
	iv	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	The recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritisation is provided.
SECTION H:		**REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)**	92%	**Comments on Rating**
Question 17.		**Does the evaluation report include all required information?**		
	i	Opening pages include: Name of evaluation and/title of evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluand, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes)-; list of acronyms/abbreviations.	Yes	The opening pages includes the name of the evaluation, timeframe of the evaluand, date of the report, location of the evaluand, names of the evaluators and the commissioning organisation. It also includes the table of contents (including tables, figures, boxes and Annexes) and a list of acronyms/abbreviations. Evaluators can also consider including the names of Evaluation Reference Group members as requested in the UNFPA handbook.
	ii	Annexes include, if not in body of report: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology (e.g. inception report), case study reports.	Partially	The Annexes include the evaluation matrix, interview guides, list of respondents, list of consulted documents, additional analysis and the two deep dives. The list of site visits is included in the main body of the report. The ToC/logical framework is not required for this evaluation. What is missing is the terms of reference. Evaluators can also consider including the guiding/conceptual framework in the Annex (it is available in the Inception Report).
Question 18.		**Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?**		
	i	The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report is well-structured, making it easy to navigate. It features clear section titles, numbered sections, and paragraphs for easy reference. The formatting is clean and organized, enhancing readability.
	ii	Structure and length accords to UNFPA guidelines for evaluation reports; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR. _Note: Maximum pages for the main report, excluding executive summary and annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations and 50 for other types of evaluations_	Yes	The evaluation report is 46 pages, excluding the executive summary, annexes and opening pages. It, therefore, meets this criterion.
Question 19.		**Is the report well presented?**		
	i	Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for the intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is easy to understand and is written in an accessible way. It is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.

	ii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The Evaluation Reports uses a number of tables and figures to convey key information and help break down the text. These are clearly labelled and referenced in the text.
SECTION I:		**CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)**	92%	**Comments on Rating**
Question 20.		**Are cross cutting issues - in particular, human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB - integrated in the core elements of the evaluation (e.g. evaluation design, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations)?**		
	i	Evaluation's data collection methods designed to capture the voices/perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders including right holders, marginalized and vulnerable persons, young people, people with disabilities, migrants or refugee populations, indigenous communities, and other persons that are often left behind.	Yes	Evaluators spoke to a wide range of UNFPA EECA stakeholders, with the list of participants provided in Annex 5.
	ii	Evaluation questions address cross cutting issues, such as human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB, social and environmental standards as appropriate.	Yes	The evaluation questions addressed cross cutting issues, especially as they sought to understand the extent to which accelerators were used in the context, and this involved looking at human-rights based and gender-transformative approaches, leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first and so on.
	iii	Data is disaggregated by population groups (e.g. persons with disability, age, gender, etc.) where there are implications related to UNFPA's portfolio/interventions for these population groups; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	The list of key informants is disaggregated by gender. In addition, the findings section presents evidence related to disaggregation either as an area identified for capacity strengthening or gaps in data. These are also reflected in the recommendations.
	iv	Intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis, looking at various and multiple forms of exclusion and discrimination (and how they overlap with each other) and how this may impact the performance or results of the evaluand.	Yes	An intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis and this is most evident in areas related to Leave No One Behind (LNOB) and 'reaching the furthest behind' where multiple forms of exclusion and/or discrimination overlap. It draws on these findings to highlight a need for offering more support to target intersectional vulnerabilities such as through better data as well as better informing the design of inclusive programmes. For example, see finding 5.
	v	Findings, conclusions and recommendations, address cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no-one behind, social and environmental as relevant.	Yes	Findings, conclusions and recommendations address cross-cutting issues such as equality, vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no-one behind and reaching the furthest behind.
	vi	Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Not Rated	The inclusion of young people in the evaluation team is not mentioned in the Report. However, this is not requested in the ToRs.
Question 21.		**Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?** *Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below*	7	**Comments on Rating**
	i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Fully integrated	The evaluation assesses rights and gender-based approaches. While it is not explicitly mentioned in the objective, it is a standalone criterion in the evaluation criteria of the questions.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	A gender-responsive methodology is not outlined in the evaluation data collection methods. However, it is the list of participants is disaggregated by gender. It uses a range of data sources with a triangulation process to enhance accuracy and credibility. The sampling frame could be better described, as mentioned in 8iii. In addition, no ethical considerations are described aside from a general statement on adherence to UNEG standards.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. Gender transformative approaches, particularly in areas such as gender-based violence (GBV) and social norms are a significant part of the report.

SWAP Rating Guidance

---

i GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.

a. 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?

b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?

c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?

d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

---

ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.

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?

b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?

c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?

d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?

e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

---

iii The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

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?

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?

c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?

d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?

List of SDGs
1. No Poverty
2. Zero Hunger
3. Good Health and Well-being
4. Quality Education
5. Gender Equality
6. Clean Water and Sanitation
7. Affordable and Clean Energy
8. Decent Work and Economic Growth
9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
10. Reduced Inequality
11. Sustainable Cities and Communities
12. Responsible Consumption and Production
13. Climate Action
14. Life Below Water
15. Life on Land
16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
17. Partnerships for the Goals

Three transformative results
1. Ending unmet need for family planning
2. Ending preventable maternal deaths
3. Ending gender-based violence and harmful practices

Six outputs
1. Policy and accountability
2. Quality of care and services
3. Gender and social norms
4. Population change and data
5. Humanitarian action
6. Adolescents and youth

Six accelerators
1. Human rights-based and gender-transformative approaches
2. Innovation and digitalization
3. Partnerships, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing
4. Data and evidence
5. Leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first
6 .Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and peace-responsive efforts