

# UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		94%	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	Country Programme Evaluation of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Indonesia Tenth Country Programme, 2021 - 2025
Region	AP
Country	Indonesia
Year of report	2024
Business Unit/programme country (managing evaluation)	UNFPA Indonesia CO
Date of assessment review (dd/mm/yyyy)	December 19, 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	(a) an end to preventable maternal deaths; (b) an end to the unmet need for family planning; and (c) an end to gender-based violence and all harmful practices, including female genital mutilation and child, early and forced marriage
Six outputs	Policy and accountability Quality of care and services Gender and social norms Population change and data Humanitarian action Adolescents and youth
Six accelerators	(a) Human rights-based and gender transformative approaches (b) Innovation and digitalization (c) Partnership, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing; (d) Data and evidence; (e) "Leaving no one behind" and "reaching the furthest left behind first"; (f) Resilience and adaptation,
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	Yes
Humanitarian evaluation	Yes
Evaluation evaluated (e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)	Country Programme
Evaluation type (e.g. formative, summative, developmental)	Formative
Geographic scope (e.g. global, regional, national)	National
<b>EQA Summary:</b> 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 excellent Country Programme Evaluation of the UNFPA Indonesia Tenth Country Programme, 2021 - 2025. It is thorough and detailed, and follows the structure expected of a UNFPA evaluation. Key points to note in this evaluation are outlined below.

- The purpose and objectives of this CPE evaluation are set out clearly and concisely.
- The evaluation questions are clear and appropriate and aligned to OECD DAC criteria, however eleven individual questions is more than is outlined in the UNFPA evaluation handbook which notes that evaluation question should be 6-8 in number.
- The results chain and relevant theories of change for the different programmes are discussed and assessed in section 1, and also mentioned in the findings section, as relevant.
- There is a clear identification of key stakeholders which includes implementing partners (and description of them), government partners at national and sub national level, donors, other UN agencies and academia. Stakeholder mapping is provide in Annex 6. While stakeholders are well described, more detail on each situated perspective, particularly in terms of rights and duties would be welcomed.
- The design and methodology is rigorous and thorough, with clear description of methods of data analysis, and appropriate sampling strategies. There is an excellent description of the methods of analysis, as well as limitations and mitigation of risk which includes detailed description of high level limitations, and appropriate mitigation measures, or clear acknowledgement of where mitigation is challenging and bias may exist.
- The approach of a theory based evaluation, but also participatory based, and using appreciative inquiry is an excellent approach to take for a CPE in that it should allow for strong participation of a range of stakeholders, as well as identify positive learning outcomes.
- The country context, and UNFPA operating context is well described, outlining the complex humanitarian and development context in Indonesia.
- Findings are detailed and thorough, and present analysis of findings against output and outcomes, as well as discussing results across different groups of people (young people, women who have experienced GBV, people with disabilities etc). However, due to the large number of questions the findings are overlong with some duplication.
- Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation findings, and add deeper insight and analysis.
- Recommendations are clear and prioritised and broken down by strategic and programmatic recommendations. Crucially they include a discussion of how recommendations were developed in consultation with partners and UNFPA - this is an example of good practice in developing and presenting recommendations.
- Although not required of a UNFPA evaluation, lessons learned have been included and add insight and value to the report.
- GEEW is very well attended to at all stages of the evaluation from design, methodology, data collection, findings, conclusions and recommendations, and includes consideration of intersectionality.

**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.*

While overall this is an excellent evaluation there are some minor issues which could be improved upon. These are outlined below.

- The structure accords with the UNFPA evaluation guidance, however the length of the report exceeds the number of pages specified at 80 pages in length, instead of 70.
- While there is mention of ethical issues and data collection, there is not explicit reference to how these were addressed, and how for example safeguarding was ensured for vulnerable people. The WHO guidelines are mentioned in regard to data collection on GBV, but this section could be improved if ethical approaches and practices were described and contextualised to enable an understanding (and assessment) of what this meant in practice for the FGDs and interviews conducted in this evaluation.
- While stakeholders are well described, more detail on each situated perspective, particularly in terms of rights and duties would be welcomed.
- The evaluation matrix should include detail of indicators, against which assumptions can be tested and verified.
- While evaluation findings are detailed and thorough, it should be noted that eleven evaluation questions is more than is expected of a UNFPA evaluation.

## 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).	Yes	The executive summary is a clear and standalone document, useful for informing decision making, and is 6 pages in length.
	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	All necessary components of the evaluation report are included in the executive summary.
	iii Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Yes	All significant information is presented in a concise and clear manner to enable a sound understanding of the CP, and its programmatic interventions, and the evaluation of it.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	90%	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.	Yes	There is a clear description of the evaluand, including geographic coverage at national and sub national levels and implementation period. Main partners are clearly outlined and broken down by type of partner, the cost / budget is discussed narratively, and outlined in detail at Annex 7.
	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	There is an excellent and clear description of the evaluand taking into account social and political contexts. There is explicit reference to UNFPAs strategic framework, and cross cutting issues are well described with a LNOB approach to equality, human rights, gender and disability. Key drivers and changes that affect implementation in the complex humanitarian and development context of Indonesia are well described.
	iii Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	Linkages are drawn between the evaluand and ICPD benchmarks, as well as relevant SDG targets and indicators.
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).	Yes	There is a clear identification of key stakeholders which includes implementing partners (and description of them), government partners at national and sub national level, donors, other UN agencies and academia. Stakeholder mapping is provided in Annex 6.
	ii Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Partially	Stakeholders are well described, although more detail on each situated perspective, particularly in terms of rights and duties would be welcomed.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>		
	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 evaluation is clearly described, it is needed at the end of the 10th CP to combine accountability of performance and learning objectives, for the UNFPA Indonesia CO. It aimed to support learning through broadening the evidence-base of achievements within the programme and the organization and to inform the design of the next eleventh CP cycle. The evaluation results also feed into the evaluation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), which was being conducted at the same time.
<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>		
	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	There is a clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, as outlined in the ToR, these are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to provide the UNFPA Indonesia CO, national stakeholders and rights-holders, the UNFPA APRO, the UNFPA Headquarters as well as a wider audience with an independent assessment of the UNFPA Indonesia 10th CP (2021-2025)</li> <li>• to broaden the evidence base to inform the design of the next country programme cycle</li> </ul>
	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:  Thematically all four outcome areas of the programme are included these are: (i) Sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights (SRH&RR); (ii) Adolescent and youth (AY) (iii) Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) (iv) Population dynamics and data (PD)  Temporally the scope is outlined as being from 2021 to 2023, while the geographical area is described narrative as including national and subnational activities in all parts of the country, and a map is provided at the start of the report.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use?</b>  <i>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>		
	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	Evaluation questions and sub questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives, and align with the eleven evaluation questions in the inception report. Six criteria are identified, they are clearly specified and aligned with the questions. It is well noted the questions cover development and humanitarian issues, in line with the CP.  However, it should be noted that eleven evaluation questions is more than would be expected, and ideally they should have been condensed and broken down into key areas of inquiry with sub questions form them. This would have been more manageable in terms of designing the evaluation matrix, and in addressing each question in the findings section. The UNFPA evaluation handbook notes that evaluation questions should be between 6-8 in number.

	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.	Partially	<p>The evaluation matrix clearly presents each question, broken down by criteria, as well as outlining assumptions, data sources, methods for data collection and initial fieldwork findings/ substantiating evidence. The processes and information contained in the matrix should enable a robust analysis upon which conclusions can be drawn.</p> <p>However, the evaluation matrix does not include indicators that can be used to verify assumptions, which are expected and outlined in the UNFPA evaluation handbook in expectations for an evaluation matrix.</p>
<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?</b>		
	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.	Yes	There is a clear description of the interventions intended results, and the results chain and ToC is described and assessed in section 1 of the evaluation report. While section 3 narratively discusses UNFPA interventions in Indonesia, with a clear results framework set out at Table 7, and in more detail at Annex 5, while the ToC is set out at Annex 9.
	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).	Yes	<p>The evaluation applied a theory-based approach, making use of the UNFPA Strategic Plan results framework as well as the results framework of the CPD and theories of change (ToCs) of the Country Programme outputs in order to assess the causal linkages amongst the inputs and activities implemented and the resulting output and outcome level changes. Narrative description of the results framework and the ToC is provided, noting the lack of alignment between the country ToC and updated strategic plan at output level. The limitations of the ToC were therefore noted, along with the partial mitigation through the adapted results framework.</p> <p>There is a figure of the ToC provided at Annex 9, and a minor point of improvement would relate to its formatting: at the moment not all aspects can be read on the page.</p>
	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.	Yes	The results chain and relevant theories of change for the different programmes are discussed and assessed in section 1, and also mentioned in the findings section, as relevant. The ToC has not been reconstructed by the evaluator's, but lessons learned from the assessment of the results framework and ToC will inform the design of the 11th CP ToC and results framework. Indicators, baseline data and target data is also usefully provided.
<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>		
	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.	Yes	<p>The evaluation applied a theory based approach, as well as being participatory in nature, and including appreciate inquiry - which is a relevant and interesting approach to take and should help to both include a wide range of stakeholders, and focus on solutions rather than problems. Contribution analysis using theory of change was also applied, and is appropriate for an evaluation of this nature.</p> <p>Methods are clearly described and robust to meet the evaluations purpose and objectives, they included desk review, semi structured KIIs (in person and online with key stakeholders) and FGDs with beneficiaries. Observations at selected health facilities also occurred and email communication with some stakeholders was used to fill some evidence gaps.</p>
	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 all clearly described, relevant and robust. They include an appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative sources, including KIIs, FGDs, and desk review of programme data, including M&E reporting.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	<p>Sampling strategy is clear and outlined for each element of the data collection process.</p> <p>Key stakeholders for KIIs were selected purposefully to ensure that all relevant stakeholders were included and that there was a range of different types of stakeholders. Site visits for FGDs and observation were also selected purposefully to ensure that areas visited had a range of UNFPA interventions that would enable exploration of all evaluation questions.</p>
	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).	Yes	Methods allow for rigorous testing of the TOCs and wider results and logical framework, with a focus on outputs and outcomes, along with the three transformative results.

	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	<p>There is an excellent description of the methods of analysis, which are rigorous and thorough, they include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative content analysis.</li> <li>• Context analysis was used in order to assess the contextual enablers and constraints in programme implementation.</li> <li>• Analysis of the TOC and the Results Chain of the programme.</li> <li>• Policy analysis: With inclusion of policy engagement and advocacy in the country programme, the analysis made use of a number of tools to assess and analyse policy engagement initiatives and their results, including the policy cycle, type of policy engagement, theory of change and partnership analysis.</li> <li>• SWOT analysis: which looked at strengths and weaknesses in terms of internal capabilities of UNFPA's programme interventions, and at opportunities and threats to highlight external factors. Internal strengths and external opportunities were used to assess aspects to be further developed and reinforced, while internal weaknesses and external threats were used to identify those issues that needed to be addressed and mitigated against.</li> </ul> <p>AI was not used in the conduct of the evaluation except for language translation purposes.</p>
	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).	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of the limitations and constraints as they relate to the design, process, and outcomes of the CPE. Bias is acknowledged, for example in outlining the challenges of results based management, and addressed by exploration of the capacity of UNFPA and partners to help inform the design of future CPs.
<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>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:</b>		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Partially	There is explicit reference to the UNEG Ethical principles, as well as WHO principles. However, the UNEG guidelines have not been sufficiently contextualised for this evaluation, and greater clarity could be provided on how this occurred in practice.
	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.	Partially	There is mention of ethical issues, and of conduct of interviews and focus groups in term of respect, confidentiality etc. However, there is not explicit reference to how these were addressed, and how for example safeguarding was ensured for vulnerable people. The WHO guidelines are mentioned in regard to data collection on GBV, but this is not described or contextualised to enable readers to understand what this meant in practice for the FGDs and interviews conducted in this evaluation.
<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?</b>		
	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	Not rated, innovation was not present or expected.
<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>		100%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Do the findings clearly and adequately address all evaluation questions and sub-questions?</b>		
	i Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions	Yes	Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient level of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions. However, as noted above with eleven evaluation questions there is a significant difference in the level of detail presented (and required) to address each question. As such the evaluation findings are overlong, and there is duplication across questions.
	ii Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The results framework is explicitly addressed in the formulation of the findings.
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?</b>		
	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 qualitative and quantitative evidence, and presents both output and outcome level data. Triangulation is evident through reference to multiple forms of data including programme data, site observations KIIs and FGDs.

	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 evidence and both positive and negative findings are presented, for example the lack of safe and accessible services for women who experience GBV. However the positive aspects of a gender transformative approach that involved deliberate and close engagement with community leaders and with IPs who can work in settings to address harmful aspects of masculinity, for example religious groups, was a successful element of the programme.  Findings are based on clear performance indicators and benchmarks, and for each relevant question there is a useful narrative and figurative analysis of output and outcome indicators, for example Figure 4: spiderweb of GEWE achievements in relation to GEWE indicators.
	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	Factors impacting on achievement of results are clearly outlined for relevant questions, for example contributory factors include strong partnerships with CSOs, and selection of the right IP for each intervention. Constraining factors include the piloting of initiatives, which limits the scope for exploring a broader range of issues, as well as budget constraints and country-specific challenges, such as insufficient resources at the sub-national level to support UNFPA outcomes.  The findings analyse the logical chain from outputs to high level results.
<b>Question 13.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?</b>		
	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.	Yes	There is assessment of results based management in addressing EQ 8 where it is noted that there has been limited use of results-based management and monitoring and reporting have focused on activities and milestones, not taking higher level outputs and outcomes into account. Programmatic ToCs are at the output level and not well linked the three transformative results. Overall the evaluation does a good job of assessing vertical and horizontal M&E processes.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)</b>	100%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluand?</b>		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond the evaluation findings. They address key points of learning, and present each clearly and concisely.
	ii Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	Conclusions are well substantiated and clearly derived from findings - each of the eight conclusions have short sentence after each which clearly indicates which evaluation questions, and which recommendations relate to each individual conclusion. The conclusions add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.
<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]</b>		
	i Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	Not Rated	Not rated as not a requirement of a UNFPA evaluation and ToR, but lessons learned have been included. They are clearly derived from findings and with strong practical examples.
	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	Not rated as not a requirement of a UNFPA evaluation and ToR, but lessons learned are clearly presented and present actionable insights based on positive aspects, and areas of improvement.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	88%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?</b>		
	i Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from findings and conclusions, with direct links to indicate which conclusions they relate to.
	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.	Partially	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary users, a rationale is provide for each recommendation, along with operational implications. However, this section could have been improved if there had been greater specificity on responsible actors, i.e. units in CO and specific partners, instead of organisation level actors, and generic partners.
	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 developing the recommendations is clearly outlined at the start of the recommendations section and includes the involvement of key stakeholders and those who will be affected by the recommendations. This is an example of good practice in addressing recommendation development.
	iv Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritised based on their urgency.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	83%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation report include all required information?</b>		

	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 contain all relevant and expected information of a UNFPA evaluation. They also provide an overview of the evaluation reference group membership.
	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.	Yes	Annexes include all relevant information including ToRs, Results framework, evaluation matrix, list of documents reviewed, data collection instruments and list of respondents, list of site visits and sampling strategy as well as budgetary information.
<b>Question 18.</b>	<b>Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?</b>		
	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 has a logical structure that is easy to navigate with clear numbered section and titles. It is well formatted and easy to read.
	ii Structure and length accords to UNFPA guidelines for evaluation reports; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.  <i>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)</i>	Partially	The structure accords with the UNFPA evaluation guidance, however the length of the report exceeds the number of pages specified at 80 pages in length, instead of 70.
<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Is the report well presented?</b>		
	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 written in an accessible way. It is 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, labelled, and referenced in text.	Partially	There is frequent use of visual aids, infographics, tables and figures, they are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)</b>	100%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>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)?</b>		
	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	The evaluation's data collection methods are designed to capture the views of a range of stakeholders at national and subnational level, including rights holders, marginalised people and young people in particular.
	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	Evaluation questions have cross cutting equality and inclusions issues integrated within them to ensure each criteria, and question addresses issues of equality as relevant, there is explicit reference to LNOB.
	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	Data is analysed by population groups (not always disaggregated), however there is good attention to the needs of different groups, for example of people with disabilities and the barriers to them accessing UNFPA services. Analysis by age and gender are both well addressed.
	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 a key finding is that intersectionality should be given more attention in future CPs. The evaluation outlines various and multiple forms of exclusions and discrimination.
	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 well, they are integrated across all relevant evaluation questions and equality, vulnerability disability and LNOB issues are discussed as relevant.
	vi Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Not Rated	This is not applicable, as not requested in the ToR.
<b>Question 21.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?</b>  <i>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below</i>	9	<b>Comments on Rating</b>

	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	GEEW is fully integrated into the scope of analysis and evaluation criteria, with gender related issues integrated across all relevant evaluation questions to ensure that GEEW data can be collected.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The methodology is gender responsive and methods tools and data analysis reflect a gendered lens that should ensure the voices of women are well represented. One area for improvement would be to include more detailed data collection tools to enable a fuller assessment of them.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	Findings do an excellent job of analysing GEEW data and findings, and presenting analysis of gender transformative approaches to harmful practices such as child marriage, as well as detailed responses to GEEW-related output and outcome indicators. Conclusions and recommendations also take excellent account of GEEW considerations, and there is evidence of an intersectional lens applied to the analysis of data.



## 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.

- 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?
- Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
- Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
- 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.

- 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?
- Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- 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.

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

- No Poverty
- Zero Hunger
- Good Health and Well-being
- Quality Education
- Gender Equality
- Clean Water and Sanitation
- Affordable and Clean Energy
- Decent Work and Economic Growth
- Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
- Reduced Inequality
- Sustainable Cities and Communities
- Responsible Consumption and Production
- Climate Action
- Life Below Water
- Life on Land
- Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
- Partnerships for the Goals

#### Three transformative results

- Ending unmet need for family planning
- Ending preventable maternal deaths
- Ending gender-based violence and harmful practices

#### Six outputs

- Policy and accountability
- Quality of care and services
- Gender and social norms
- Population change and data
- Humanitarian action
- Adolescents and youth

#### Six accelerators

- Human rights-based and gender-transformative approaches
- Innovation and digitalization
- Partnerships, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing
- Data and evidence
- Leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first
- Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and peace-responsive efforts