

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	Country programme evaluation of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Kazakhstan 5th Country Programme (2021-2025)
Region	EECA
Country	Kazakhstan
Year of report	2024
Business Unit/programme country <i>(managing evaluation)</i>	UNFPA Kazakhstan CO
Date of assessment review <i>(dd/mm/yyyy)</i>	December 20, 2024
Name of assessment review firm	IOD PARC
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Primary SDG(s) covered <i>(list provided below)</i>	3, 5
UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered <i>(lists provided below)</i>	
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
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	Yes
Humanitarian evaluation	No
Evaluation evaluand <i>(e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)</i>	Country Programme
Evaluation type <i>(e.g. formative, summative, developmental)</i>	Summative and formative
Geographic scope <i>(e.g. global, regional, national)</i>	National
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 an excellent Country programme evaluation of the UNFPA Kazakhstan 5th Country Programme (2021-2025), which meets almost all UNFPA expectations for a high quality evaluation. Two of the three results areas/ two of the three outputs were covered: namely changing discriminatory social norms toward accelerating the reduction in the unmet need for family planning and the reduction of gender-based violence. Other points to note include:

- There is a description of the purpose and objectives, however, the evaluation could be more explicit about which elements of the CP, and its results framework are being evaluated.
- The country context is clear and detailed as is wider external assistance and roles of other UN agencies, with UNFPAs interventions situated in the wider operating context.
- The evaluation questions are appropriate and the matrix is a thorough and detailed document from which analysis can be based and conclusions drawn. However, to ensure UNFPAs contribution to the UNSDCF are captured (as outlined in the ToR), it may have been appropriate to include an additional element of investigation under the coherence or coordination criteria
- There is excellent and contextualised description of UNEG ethical obligations (and other frameworks) in understanding of ethical issues and considerations in the conduct of this evaluation including safeguarding, potential for harm, consent, power and privilege, consideration of religious and cultural issues, and careful consideration of disability inclusion in the conduct of field work. This represents an example of innovation and excellence in how inclusion and ethics can be considered, implemented, and reported in an evaluation.
- Stakeholders are clearly identified and analysed and a stakeholder mapping exercise was undertaken in the design phase of the evaluation (annexed to the Inception Report) - an example of good practice.
- There is thorough and detailed attention to SDGs indicators relating to the evaluand, set out in Annex 5, which is an example of good practice.
- The design and methodology are robust and appropriate for the evaluation, with good ability to collect disaggregated data by age, gender and disability. Sampling is well explained, and limitations are clear and concise with excellent mitigation strategies. Methods of analysis are clearly articulated and an example of good practice.
- Overall findings are clear, and follow a succinct and logical pattern, with each evaluation question addressed, summaries of findings included, and key findings numbered throughout the section in a clear and logical way. Monitoring and results based approaches are well addressed and importantly the role of implementing partners is well documented in their role in monitoring, and close collaboration with, UNFPA on shared monitoring and planning - which is identified as a success factor in its own right.
- Conclusions follow clearly from findings and add additional insight and value.
- Recommendations are clear and well formulated and relate directly to conclusions and findings. However, they could be strengthened if the process for developing them was described.
- The evaluation takes good account of GEEW with the evaluation designed in a way to gather gender related data and undertake sound analysis of it, as well as development of GEEW sensitive conclusions and recommendations. This could have been strengthened if an intersectional approach/ lens had been applied.

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 this is an excellent evaluation there are minor areas for improvement. These are outlined below.

- The evaluation would be strengthened if in describing the evaluand there was greater clarity at the outset regarding which aspects of the CP were being evaluated.
- While evaluation questions are appropriate and clear, the ToR noted that "One specific criterion is strategic positioning of UNFPA CO within UNCT and added value of UNFPA CP to UNSDCF outputs." This additional criterion is not included in the final evaluation report (or the design report), and it has not been discussed clearly why. It may have been appropriate to include a further element of investigation under the coherence or coordination criterion to ensure this issue was addressed.
- Other than noting briefly in the methodology section that recommendations would be validated by the ERG, there is not detailed discussion of the process by which recommendations were developed, and how key stakeholders were involved. This would strengthen the evaluation if included.
- The data analysis would have been strengthened if an intersectional lens had been applied.

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). <i>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.</i>	Yes	The executive summary is a clear and standalone document, appropriate for informing decision and meets the required length at 5 pages.
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 included in a concise clear manner to enable understanding of the country programme and evaluation of it.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	80%	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	There is a clear description of the country programme, including geographic areas of interventions and implementation period. Cost/ budget is outlined narratively and in table 4 (overall budget) table 5 (by outcome areas) and table 6 (by programme areas). Main partners are also clearly described. However, this section could be improved if there was clarity at the outset that the country programme would only be evaluating two of the three results in the Country Programme framework (changing discriminatory social norms toward accelerating the reduction in the unmet need for family planning and the reduction of gender-based violence). It is appreciated this is noted briefly in later section and covered in limitations section well, and also follows requirements in the ToR. However, the description of the evaluand could be clearer, although it is appreciated that this was also not included in the ToR.

	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 description of the country context, and of wider external and UN assistance in Kazakhstan, and UNFPAs role is well situated within that and outlined in Table 3. Cross cutting issues are well addressed, such as gender equality, disability and LNOB dimensions, and how they relate to the specific areas of this evaluation.
	iii Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	Clear links are drawn between the CP and relevant SDGs, with Annex 5 setting out SDGs, indicators and sources as well as links made to the ICPD Programme of Action and 2030 agenda. A minor point of improvement for Annex 5 would be to indicate the corresponding year for each SDG indicator provided, to allow assessment of change over time. This should ideally include baseline data, and cover the timeline of the UNFPA country programme.
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, development partners, rights holders and duty bearers. A stakeholder mapping exercise was undertaken in the design phase to identify key stakeholders and understand the linkages between them. This ensured that all relevant stakeholders were identified at/ prior to the evaluation design stage and is an example of good practice. Due to the work undertaken at design phase this final evaluation does a good job of narratively describing the different stakeholders, but could have included the stakeholder map as an annex of this final report.
	ii Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Partially	There is excellent analysis of stakeholders narratively, and outlined in Table 2, where the type of partner, and whether they are an implementing partner or not is clearly outlined -- this illustrates that government and NGOs are both implementing partners, so their situated positions are clearly outlined along with their role in contributing to CP outcomes. However, the specific interests/ positioning of each stakeholder, as well as their links between each other could be described in more detail.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		83%	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 evaluation is clearly described as being to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance on achieving development results and on invested resources • To support evidence-based decision-making to inform the development of the country programme • To generate learning and share good practices and credible evaluative evidence to support organizational learning. There is an explanation of the target audience and why this was necessary at this time.
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	There is a complete description of the objectives of the evaluation which in addition to the wider objectives of providing additional evidence and an independent assessment of the 5th Kazakhstan CPE and accountability for UNFPA and wider stakeholders the evaluation outlines specific objectives for this CPE. While these specific elements could have been more clearly outlined (as noted above), they are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of UNFPA support within the 2021-2025 country programme in changing discriminatory social norms to accelerate the reduction in the unmet need for family planning and in reducing gender-based violence. •To provide an assessment of the role played by the UNFPA Kazakhstan CO in the coordination mechanisms of the UNCT and UNFPA contribution toward the achievement of UNSDCF outputs. •To draw key conclusions from past and current cooperation and provide a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations for the next programme cycle (pp 6).

	<p>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).</p>	Partially	<p>There is a clear and relevant description of the scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Geographically the evaluation covers the areas of UNFPA interventions which are in Almaty city and the Turkestan region. •Thematically the evaluation is focused on the country programme contribution to the changing discriminatory social norms in Kazakhstan toward accelerating the reduction in the unmet need for family planning and the reduction of gender based violence. •Temporally the scope of the CPE covered interventions planned and/or implemented within the time period of the current CP: starting from January 2021 up to the period of the evaluation data collection in June 2024. <p>However, it is not explained why the evaluation does not examine results across the entire results framework of the country programme, and why the thematic scope was narrowed. This does stem from the ToR, but should have been explained in the final evaluation report.</p>
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	93%	Comments on Rating
Question 6.	<p>Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use?</p> <p><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></p>		
	<p>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.</p>	Partially	<p>Seven evaluation questions were identified in the ToR and used in this CPE. The evaluation questions are aligned with three relevant OECD DAC criteria - relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability. Assumptions related to each evaluation questions are also identified. Sub questions are outlined in the evaluation matrix.</p> <p>However, the ToR also noted that "One specific criterion is strategic positioning of UNFPA CO within UNCT and added value of UNFPA CP to UNSDCF outputs." This is missing from the final evaluation report (and the design report), and it has not been discussed clearly why. It may be that as the extent to which UNFPA has contributed to UNSDCF outputs is addressed in the indicators section of the evaluation matrix, therefore it will be addressed in answering the evaluation questions. However, it may have been useful to have an additional criteria on coherence or coordination to explore how UNFPA has worked with other UN agencies in achieving the aims of the CP and of the UNSDCF.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>The evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used along with corresponding evaluation questions and sub questions. It also clearly outlines assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information and methods and tools for the data collection, as well as fieldwork findings. The evaluation questions are appropriate and the matrix is a thorough and detailed document from which analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.</p>
Question 7.	Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?		
	<p>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.</p>	Partially	<p>There is a clear description of the intervention intended results. However, there could have been more clarity about the fact that only two of the CP ToC outputs were being tested but the evaluation, and the associated UNSDCF and UNFPA plan outcomes could have usefully been included.</p>
	<p>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).</p>	Yes	<p>The logical framework, and narrative description of it explore outputs and outcomes, as well as risks and assumptions. Casual relationships are identified narratively, and in graphical form (figure 1).</p>
	<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.</p>	Yes	<p>There is an analysis and assessment of the ToC. The logical framework is presented in graphical form at Figure 1, it has not been retrofitted by the evaluators, but was reconstructed to fit the 5th CP which cut across two strategic plan periods.</p>
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.	Yes	<p>The evaluation approach is theory based, integrating a human rights and gender equality approach. A mixed methods approach that aligns with the UNFPA evaluation handbook is outlined and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Desk review of documents and other pertinent programme data. •Online and offline key informant interviews, both individual and group. •Survey of stakeholders and beneficiaries, and; •Field visits and observation of stakeholders' sites as appropriate. <p>The design and methods are clearly described, relevant and robust to the evaluation purpose and scope. The use of AI is not mentioned in the report.</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 include qualitative and quantitative sources, all are clearly described, relevant and robust.
	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 provided for site visit and KIIs. For the site visits, the evaluation followed the recommendations in the ToR for sites where UNFPA interventions were being implemented. For KIIs purposeful and convenience sampling approaches were used, which was appropriate to ensure key and relevant stakeholders are identified. IPs were also asked to complete an online survey, and beneficiaries who had recently attended training were asked to complete an online survey also. This process was based on the initial stakeholder mapping.</p> <p>The breakdown of beneficiaries shows that diverse perspectives were captured and beneficiary data is disaggregated by gender, age and disability.</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 testing/ assessing the logic framework, and to identify connections between outputs and expected outcomes.
	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 clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, which are appropriate for a CPE and include theory based and contribution analysis, content analysis, process mapping, interrogation of statistics/ quantitative data and triangulation.
	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	The limitations are detailed and thorough, with clear mitigation measures. A key limitation of this evaluation is that it is not all elements of the CP, but of parts of it, namely changing discriminatory social norms toward accelerating the reduction in the unmet need for family planning and the reduction of gender-based violence. This does mean the CPE is biased towards these programmatic elements but this is clearly described, and mitigation measures included, such as clear shared communication with UNFPA and wider stakeholders.
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.	Yes	There is clear and contextualised reference to the UNEG obligations on evaluators, and the evaluation goes beyond simply stating what these are, but describes how they will be applied in practice for this evaluation, which is an example of good 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.	Yes	There is excellent description and understanding of ethical issues and considerations, including safeguarding, potential for harm, consent, power and privilege (e.g. not meeting in government spaces), consideration of religious and cultural issues, and crucially careful consideration of disability inclusion in the conduct of field work. An extract from the evaluation report is set out below as an example of excellence in describing how fieldwork will be conducted and ensuring it is ethical and inclusive: <i>"Preceding fieldwork ET reviewed cultural and religious sensitivities existing in Kazakhstan and considered potential harm to participants evaluation can make. While setting the interviews the ET considered respondents availability, place of face-to-face meeting, and possibility and convenience for online interview. Often the interviews were conducted outside of government offices to make public officials feel more free and relaxed. While meeting vulnerable groups like persons with disabilities, ET came to place where there were necessary conditions (like path, space for wheelchairs) and evaluation participants felt comfortable. Every meeting started with acknowledgement that all received information from respondents will be treated as confidential, respondents' privacy and anonymity will be guaranteed and information they shared will not be linked to them as well as their participation in evaluation is voluntary and free and they can stop interview at any moment (ET was prepared where deemed necessary, to obtain statements of informed consent)."</i> (page 10) A minor area for improvement would be present ethical considerations in a separate sub-section, instead of weaving this into the sections on data collection and analysis, this would provide greater clarity on this important issue.
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.	Yes	The careful and detailed consideration of a wide range of ethical and inclusion issues, particularly relating to disability to ensure that people with disabilities can participate in face to face or online interviews, is innovative and excellent. It should serve to enhance inclusion and participation in the evaluation process and ensure the safety and comfort of participants in data collection processes.
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	Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluations questions.
	ii Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	There is an explicit assessment of the logical framework, and its use is evident in the findings section.
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 qualitative and quantitative data, and references document review, KIs and online surveys throughout the findings section. Both output and outcome level data is presented. Triangulation is clearly evident through reference to data in programme documentation supported by KIs, and other sources of data.
	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	Both positive and negative evidence is presented for example the shared understanding between UNFPA and implementing partners on objectives of programmes, and indicators and targets and milestones to track progress has contributed to success of interventions. However, the evaluation also notes the challenges in, for example, interagency coordination and multi-partnership events. The evaluation takes a detailed and thorough approach to assessing evidence against indicators and benchmarks, even identifying gaps in indicators, for example, that no output indicators specifically address process changes in discriminatory social norms. Outcomes, and indicators relating to them, with baseline data are usefully outlined in Table 11.
	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	Causal factors are identified, for example changes in government staff/ high turnover leading to loss of institutional knowledge. Table 10 clearly outlines causal factors to take into account when implementing behaviour change and discriminatory social norms. There is specific analysis of the logical framework in section 3 and further reference to this in section 4 (findings).

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.	Yes	The interventions monitoring system is assessed as is the results orientated planning system, finding it has been effective. The monitoring system is integrated in UNFPA interventions, with systems in place for planning, performance measurement and milestone tracking. Importantly, the role of implementing partners is well documented in their role in monitoring, along with close collaboration with UNFPA on shared monitoring and planning. Tools are assessed as appropriate for decision making and vertical and horizontal logic is addressed. As noted above the lack of indicators to measure change in harmful social norms means this a gap in the M&E system/ results framework.
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 and provide unbiased, summative statements that address the evaluation findings. They are organised into strategic and programmatic categories. While not directly aligned with the evaluation questions, the conclusions effectively address them by summarizing key findings and relevant evidence.
	ii Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings. They add deeper insight to key issues such as cultural sensitives and legislative practices. Each conclusion is linked to the evaluation question to which it responds, and the recommendation to which it informs.
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.
	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.
SECTION G:	EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	63%	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	Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from findings and conclusions. There is a strong focus on measuring and changing social norms, as well as other issues outlined in findings and conclusions, with clear links to which conclusions each recommendation relates.
	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 useful and actionable for primary intended users, specific guidance for implementation is given in the form of operational implications for each recommendation.
	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.	No	Other than noting briefly in the methodology section that recommendations would be validated by the ERG, there is not a detailed discussion of the process by which recommendations were developed, and how key stakeholders were involved.
	iv Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Partially	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on importance, urgency and potential impact. However, they are too broadly directed at the CO and IPs. The report would benefit from more precise targeting, such as identifying the specific thematic unit or team within the CO responsible for implementation.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	100%	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	Opening pages contain all expected and relevant information for a UNFPA evaluation. A minor point to note is that in describing the evaluation team instead of two of the evaluators' being noted only as "expert", their thematic expertise / expert role on the team should be more clearly described.
	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 contain all expected information including ToRs, evaluation matrix, list of documentary evidence, list of stakeholders and other relevant information. The logical framework/ ToC is contained in the main body of the report so not included as an Annex.
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 has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate it has numbered sections, clear titles and is well formatted. One minor point of improvement would be to include paragraph numbering.
	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>	Yes	The structure accords with UNFPA guidelines of evaluation reports and at 63 pages in length meets the expected length requirements for a CPE (though it should be noted that this includes the executive summary).
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 very well written and each to understand. It is clear on its intended audience and accessible to them. 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, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is frequent use of visual aids such as figures, maps and tables. These are used to good effect throughout the report. They are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
SECTION I: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)		83%	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	Data collection methods are well designed to capture the voices of a wide range of stakeholders, including young people, rightsholders, people with disabilities and vulnerable people.
	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 are cross cutting and integrate a human rights based approach, show excellent attention to disability inclusion and gender equality, as well as other wider issues of inclusion.
	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 disaggregated by population group, including a detailed breakdown of beneficiaries who participated in data collection, categorised by gender, age, and disability. There is discussion of different groups by age and people with disabilities, as well as religion. This could be built on and strengthened, but there is evidence of assessment of results across different population groups.
	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.	No	An intersectional lens was not applied in the data analysis.
	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 and conclusions address cross cuttings issues well, including gender, disability inclusion, age and wider LNOB considerations.
	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? <i>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below</i>		8	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	GEEW is integrated into the scope of analysis and evaluation questions are designed in a way to ensure that GEEW data will 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 should allow for good account of gender in the collection of data, and analysis of it.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	Findings, conclusions and recommendations take good account of gender and reflect a gendered analysis. This could have been strengthened, if an intersectional lens had been applied.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>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?</p>

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