UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		70%	Satisfactory
● ● ● ● ● Excellent		5	
● ● ● ● Highly Satisfactory		4	
● ● ● – Satisfactory		**3**	The report meets UNFPA/UNEG standards for evaluation reports, but some indicators are inadequately addressed or missing. Decision makers may use the evaluation with some confidence.
● ● – – Fair		2	
● – – – Unsatisfactory		1	

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	UNFPA South Africa CPE 2020-2025
Region	ESA
Country	South Africa
Year of report	2024
Business Unit/programme country *(managing evaluation)*	South Africa Country Office
Date of assessment review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 29, 2025
Name of assessment review firm	IODPARC
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Primary SDG(s) covered *(list provided below)*	1, 3, 5, 10, 16, 17
UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered *(lists provided below)*	
Three transformative results	Ending preventable maternal deaths, ending unmet need for FP, ending GBV and harmful practices.
Six outputs	Policy and accountability Quality of care and services Gender and social norms Population change and data 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
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	No
Humanitarian evaluation	No
Evaluation evaluand *(e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)*	Country Programme
Evaluation type *(e.g. formative, summative, developmental)*	Summative and formative
Geographic scope *(e.g. global, regional, national)*	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 Country Programme Evaluation is of moderate quality, with a solid design, well-executed research plan and some interesting, if overly positively-framed and activity/output-oriented findings. Key points of this evaluation include:
• The executive summary provides a clear reflection of the main report and aligns with decision-making needs.
• The evaluation criteria and questions are well-structured and linked to OECD DAC evaluation criteria.
• There is a very comprehensive description of the programme context, including links to national strategies and UN frameworks.
• Stakeholder mapping and the sampling strategy are detailed and ensures diversity among stakeholders, including rights-holders and duty-bearers.
• The evaluation has good inclusion of relevant cross-cutting issues, such as gender and equity, in the design and findings.
• Findings are systematically organized by evaluation questions and sub-questions – this ensures comprehensiveness and clarity in relation to the evaluation design.
• Although not required for UNFPA evaluations, best practices and lessons learned are provided, providing (some) actionable insights for future programming.
• The recommendations, in particular, appear to be well-thought through, and are actionable, well-prioritized, and linked to operational implications for stakeholders.
• A solid suite of annexes that add to the utility of the report.

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.*

The major flaw in the report is that the analysis is overly positive in many places - focusing on a listing of activities and outputs that UNFPA supported, and treating them as a proxy for good performance, rather than elements in the logical chain of progression to results. Where outcomes among rights-holders are explored, the performance is not always commensurate with the positivity of the findings. Further, the report suffers from a considerable amount of "filler" text - summaries at the beginning and end of finding subsections, "analysis" summaries within findings - much of this is redolent of the output of AI tools in that it is repetitive, summative and does not add to the quality of the report. Instead, it serves to mask shortcomings of genuine analysis of clear evidence and sources, which would have benefited from greater attention. Some other, more specific, areas for improvement are as follows:
• The executive summary is overly narrative, with dense text blocks reducing readability and clarity.
• The theory of change analysis is brief and lacks critical insight into programme logic and assumptions.
• Ethical considerations are minimally addressed, with insufficient details on safeguards for vulnerable groups.
• The results chain and intended programme outcomes are poorly articulated in the main report, leading to some findings lacking robust evidence or specific data sources, weakening their credibility.
• Disaggregated data is underrepresented in the findings, limiting insight into specific outcomes.
• Analysis of human rights and cross-cutting issues like disability is cursory and lacks depth.
• Some evaluation questions, such as those addressing stakeholder voices, are insufficiently analyzed.
• Lessons learned are generic in places and overlap with best practices, limiting their practical value.
• Recommendations are not explicitly linked to specific conclusions.
• Poor editing and formatting issues detract from the report's professionalism and coherence.

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)**	83%	**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 presented clearly as a separate section in the report and should be useful for informing decision-making by UNFPA. It is slightly over 5 pages, so within this UNFPA guidance (the TOR makes no reference to a page length for the summary).
	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 of these components are present, although (as noted below) they are provided as hard-to-read blocks of narrative text, rather than a judicious formatting using bullets, subheadings etc. to improve readability.
	iii Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Partially	While all of the information in the summary is a reflection of that within the main report, some of this is unnecessary and could have been removed. Specifically, the background information on the country context (covered in the Purpose of the Evaluation section, pg. 1) is overly detailed - readers do not need to know the socio-economic and health data related to the programme. Beyond this, the report presents much of the same analysis that is found in the findings (including the limitations of this analysis, which are a key flaw of the evaluation). The summary is overly narrative, however, with the findings and conclusions in big blocks of text which are difficult to parse and read. The summary could be made considerably more concise and clear yet convey the same essential information.

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	In the case of this evaluation, the evaluand is the 5th country programme of UNFPA South Africa. The evaluators present a description of this in Section 3, more relevantly Section 3.2, which outlines many of the required details, such as the timescale (2020-2025), the geographical areas (three provinces - and the rationale for their selection), a brief on the reach of the previous country programme, the intervention logic of the country programme (by output) and the budget details. This is all important and useful detail. However, there are issues with the section that should be addressed: 1. The financial details are duplicated between sections 3.2.1 (table 9) and 3.2.3 (table 10) - table 9 is unnecessary in this section. Further, there is an error in 3.2.1 (para 4) which notes the population & development budget as $61.2m, whereas it should be $1.2m. 2. The "Key lessons from the CPE of 4th Country Programme (2013-2019)" subsection presented under 3.2.1 (pg. 29) is somewhat out of place here, and does not add to the section - it is more usefully under findings, or indeed simply summarised there (perhaps in a table) and the page moved to an annex. Further, the footnote to the subsection is incorrect (refers to the source as the 5th CPE). 4. Although the detail on the country programme outputs in section 3.2.2 is useful, it does not anywhere here or in the overall section clearly explain what the intended *outcomes* of the 5th CP are. It is necessary to review the actual CPD to understand that it is structured around the three *Outcome Areas* of adolescents and youth, Gender equality and women's empowerment, and population dynamics. The text could have been clearer in explaining this. 5. Finally, the implementation status of the country programme is not explained. Subsection 3.2.1.4 notes that the achievement of 'planned targets' by the country office will be assessed, but does not provide any more details here.
	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	Partially	Sections 2 and 3.1 provides some good description of the overall context of the 5th CP. The evaluators go into considerable detail in section 2 on the geographic, demographic, political and socio-economic background to South Africa (including ODA trends). The section goes into some detail on the "challenges and national strategies" for the relevant programme areas for UNFPA (SRHR, adolescents/youth, gender, population data) which is useful and directly relates to the context of UNFPA programming in South Africa. The following section (3.1) provides additional important detail on the linkages between the UNFPA country programme and the overall UN and Government strategic frameworks for South Africa, with a useful table linking the CPD outputs to the UNFPA Strategic Plan outcomes (for both the relevant Strategic Plans). However, the sections miss some key elements, notably some cross-cutting issues related to LNOB - disability, exclusion/human rights (although gender issues are well covered). Further, there is some unexplained text in section 3.1 (pgs. 26-27) - there are four bullets relating to important impact areas for UNFPA - there is no explanation of where these come from or to what extent they determine UNFPA interventions. Immediately after these bullets is some text relating to the methodological approach of the evaluation (relating to "competing time schedules" for evaluation interviews). This appears to be a limitation that is in the incorrect place. This out-of-place text is also present in the evaluation Design Report, from which much of sections 2 and 3 have been copied.
	iii Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	On page 13 the evaluators present a very comprehensive summary table of the SDGs relevant to UNFPA South Africa, with their status of achievement as of the time of research (per latest available data). The table includes the relevant indicators, though not the targets. Further, the programme description in Section 3.1 also draws a link between UNFPA activities and SDGs 1, 3 ,5 ,10, 16 and 17, for which the evaluators note that a review of country office documentation indicates a direct contribution.
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	Although not included in the Country Programme background section (as noted above), there is a summary table of "programme stakeholders" provided in the overall context section (2.1.1., pg. 20). There are further details of the key institutional stakeholders provided in the methods section (1.3.3.3), which notes the specific details of the stakeholders and the rationale for their inclusion in the evaluation. The subsection also notes the inclusion of rights-holders at community level that benefited from UNFPA support in the evaluation. All the relevant categories of stakeholders are included or described, including their linkages to UNFPA, are clearly identified, meeting this criterion.
	ii Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Yes	The specific roles, needs and interaction of the different stakeholders are analysed and/or itemised across sections 1 and 2. The narrative and stakeholder map table in section 1 (table 3) provides details on the relevance of the specific stakeholders to UNFPA (i.e. the rationale for inclusion in the evaluation), and section 2 provides expanded details on the institutional stakeholders (duty-bearers) in the table on pg. 20 (which includes columns on their duties, interests and concerns). The section also describes the needs of rights-holders in the specific areas related to UNFPA's programme priorities (sections 2.1.2-2.1.4), linking them to the areas under evaluation.

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 opening line of the evaluation report, which describes the purpose, erroneously refers to the "2019 UNFPA Evaluation Policy", whereas this has been supplanted by the 2024 policy - this latter is referenced in the evaluation TOR (Introduction section and section 4.1) and should have been mirrored in the main report. Indeed, the 2024 edition of the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook is noted in footnote 39. Despite this, the purpose is otherwise very clearly noted, in line with the UNFPA Evaluation Policy specified in the TOR. It is clear that the CPE is aligned with the conclusion of the 2020-2025 CP, and hence required. The evaluation audiences are clearly explained (both primary and secondary), with the relevant national government stakeholders, in particular, itemised clearly.
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 objectives are clearly and fully described. They are in complete alignment with the objectives set out in the evaluation TOR with no changes.
	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).	Partially	Section 1.2 covers the scope of the evaluation. It covers thematic, geographical and temporal. The description is largely aligned with the scope as set out in the TOR, with some additional justification for the geographical scope which is useful. However, the thematic scope in the main report differs from the scope as specified in both the TOR and the Design Report, namely, both of the latter omit SRHR as within scope (Adolescent and Youth, Gender and Social Norms are the main thematic areas, with other cross-cutting issues such as P&D, M&E etc. also noted), but the CPE report includes "Integrated sexual and reproductive health" in the scope, without explanation or noting of the change. Given that the evaluation questions in the TOR include clear reference to SRH services and rights (e.g. EQ4, EQ 5), this appears to be more of an omission rather than by design. The inclusion should have been noted nonetheless.
SECTION D:		**EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)**	75%	**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.	Yes	The evaluation has eight primary questions, organised under the criteria of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability. These are well laid out in the report (in section 1.2, as part of the scope), with a short explanation of what each criterion aspires to measure, which is helpful. They are well-aligned with the overall purpose of the evaluation, although the objective related to coordination with the UNCT (objective 2) is not explicitly seen in the evaluation questions, though is reflected in the evaluation matrix under the Coherence criterion (EQ4). Further, the evaluation questions are as per the TOR - no changes have been made.
	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	The evaluation matrix (Annex 1) presents the evaluation criteria and the evaluation questions under each in a systematic manner. Each evaluation questions is broken down into one or more assumptions, with multiple indicators allocated for each assumption. The matrix also includes detailed sources of information (noting the specific types of documentation and/or stakeholders to be accessed to gather evidence against the indicators), and finally the specific methods used to obtain the information (e.g. KIIs, document/data reviews etc.). This is quite comprehensive and, if applied correctly, should result in a comprehensive primary and secondary dataset on which sound analysis and conclusions can be based.
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.	Partially	Section 1.3.1 provides some outline details on the intended results of the country programme. These are quite summary and do not go into any specifics. The section notes in the first sentence the "*aforementioned three outcomes and five outputs* " of the country programme - but no such outcomes or outputs were noted in the previous text. The text may be referring to subsequent section 3, which provides more details on the programme outputs and activities (but does not clearly explain that the country programme has three outcome areas - as noted above). Section 3 does provide more specific details on the intended activities, but the actual results of the country programme to be tested by the evaluation (for example, measurement of the achievement of the CPD results framework outcome or output indicators) are not described. Further in Section 3 (3.2.1.4) there is a note stating that progress against each of the planned targets (i.e. via results framework indicators) "will be assessed for each thematic area", which is positive, but the results themselves are not clearly described. In summary, while there is some description of the country programme's intended results, it is unclear and disjointed.
	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	Section 3.2 (and particularly the introduction text, the initial part of subsection 3.2.1 and subsection 3.2.2) does provide a logical linkage between the UNFPA transformative results, the intended outputs (under the outcome *areas* although the subsection refers to them as *components* - the correct nomenclature would go a long way to provide clarity here) and the specific interventions under each. This is presented in narrative form, which is adequate. There is also reference to a "fairly comprehensive" theory of change in section 1.3.1, but this is not linked here (and is discussed under the next criterion).
	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.	Partially	The evaluators reference a theory of change for the country programme in section 1.3.1, deeming it "fairly comprehensive" (which is a subjective description). The origin of this document is not explained (presumably it originated with the country programme, and is presented as such in the TORs for the evaluation). There is no link to the TOC itself anywhere in the report, although it is presented in Annex 5. While the evaluators do present an "Analysis of TOC" [sic] and "Critique" in this subsection, this covers two paragraphs only, and while has some useful points of analysis, it is not 'comprehensive', as the criterion specifies, and as is clearly referenced as an evaluation requirement throughout the TOR. This brief analysis is reproduced essentially in its entirety from the evaluation Design Report. There was no explicit requirement for reconstruction of the TOC in the evaluation TORs, and indeed the evaluators note that no reconstruction is required for the next country programme. There is no further reference to the TOC in the report. Thus, although the TOC has been analysed/assessed, this is quite cursory (and not comprehensive), particularly when the requirements of the TOR are taken into account.
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	The evaluation approach and methods are described under section 1 (Introduction), which is per the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook guidance. The section provides an overall description of the evaluation approach (use of a theory-based approach and contribution analysis) followed by a more detailed description of the methods (document review, KIIs, FGDs, observations) which are standard good practice for evaluations of this nature and, if applied correctly to the sample of stakeholders specified as targets for the evaluation, should result in robust evaluation evidence. There is no mention of the use of AI in the evaluation.
	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	The list of targets for the evaluation research (i.e. the data sources) are presented in good detail - there is a full list of stakeholder presented in section 1.3.3.3 (in narrative and tabular form), with a further breakdown of the stakeholder typologies presented in section 1.3.3.4. Secondary data sources are briefly described in section 1.3.2.1, but alluded to in the analysis description, with further details in the evaluation matrix in the annexes, and a more comprehensive bibliography provided in annex 2. This is well described and all seem 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	The sampling strategy is well described in section 1.3.3. It includes both purposive and convenience sampling processes - both clearly noted and explained (and in line with relevant UNFPA evaluation guidance). The section goes on to explain in detail the geographical sampling process and the selection of stakeholders within these locations. This is clear and very well described, including noting the capturing of diverse perspectives from both institutional/duty-bearer stakeholders (different typologies of partners) and rights-holders (including vulnerable groups). Stakeholders are further differentiated by gender and age (for rights-holders participating in FGDs - presented in table 5). This section is a strength of the evaluation report.
	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	The evaluation questions are clearly articulated in line with the overall logic of the country programme, for example EQ5 specifically notes achievement of the relevant outcomes (across SRH, youth, gender) which, in turn, are clearly linked in the theory of change to the UNFPA transformative results. These elements of the design are, in turn, clearly reflected in the data collection tools, so there is an evident logical link between what is being asked of the research targets and the ultimate intended outcomes of the country programme. The research tools are also designed so as to explore the underlying causes or barriers to achievement of programme outputs and outcomes through the solicitation of lessons to be learned and best practices seen in activities.
	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.	Partially	There is a very brief section on data analysis (section 1.3.2.4) which covers the bare essentials of analysis of quantitative and qualitative data separately. The information that is presented can be summarised as (a) Qualitative: "*tabulation and graphing of data*" and (b) Quantitative: "*thematic analysis with a coding framework*". There is little additional germane detail, such as how the specific codes were developed, data compilation, cleaning and coding processes, the data analysis software to be used, data storage etc. More would be expected here, particularly given extensive detail in other areas of the methods. There is no mention of the use of AI in the evaluation. One other minor issue is on disaggregation - the report notes in section 1.3.2 that quantitative data would include "*disaggregation by gender, age and et cetera*." (emphasis added) - there is clearly something missing here.
	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 concise list of evaluation limitations presented in section 1.3.4. It is presented as a table, with the limitations noted, followed by the implication for the evaluation (the risk) and the appropriate mitigation strategy. This is well-presented and easy to understand. There are no evident limitations missing, so the list can be deemed complete. As noted in 2ii above, there is some text in the main report that appears to be a repetition of one of the limitations (specifically the second-to-last in the table) that is out of place and should be removed.
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 Ethical Considerations subsection (1.3.2.3) makes specific reference to some of the norms and standards around evaluations, specifically the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook, the UNEG ethical guidelines and the UNEG code of conduct for evaluations. The subsection provides a list of "accepted codes of conduct" but these are not the UNEG principles or obligations. Further, they are simply listed, without any contextualization and thus only partially meet this criterion.
	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	The Ethical Considerations subsection is very brief (two short paragraphs) that covers the basic elements of relevant obligations of the evaluators, but not specifically listing the UNEG principles. The section does cover key elements such as ensuring informed consent from adults and assent from minors (with the appropriate consent having been received from parents/guardians). This is positive. Otherwise the section is very brief. Given that the evaluators conducted focus group discussions with adolescents girls and boys, and with members of vulnerable groups (i.e. LGBTQ individuals) some additional details on the specific safeguards employed (such as gender-balanced pairs of interviewers/facilitators, processes for referral if sensitive disclosures were made etc.) should have been included. There is no indication of AI being used as part of the evaluation (or otherwise).
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.	No	The report notes that data was analysed using "content analysis" and that this represented an innovation - it is unclear what is meant here, as content analysis is not innovative (it dates from the 1800s). No other specifically innovative approaches were noted (there is mention of the use of "virtual platforms" as a backstop for overcoming the limitation of access in the limitations section, but this does not appear to have materialised). The TOR encourages the use of innovative tools, hence the rating.
SECTION E:		**EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)**	50%	**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	Partially	The evaluation report approaches development of findings in a systematic manner, presenting these against each of the evaluation questions (under the evaluation criteria as subheadings) sequentially and clearly in accordance with the evaluation matrix. There is a useful summary of findings under each evaluation question except for #3 (which is very short - <0.5pages) and for each of the outcome areas under EQ 5, (although the background colour of the text box changes between EQs 1 and 2, a minor formatting issue). However, each EQ has a *second* summary of findings at the end of the analysis under each (except for EQ5) - this is duplicative and potentially confusing for the reader, so unnecessary. Findings themselves are mostly presented clearly, in bold, under each area of analysis, which is positive, although they are not numbered, which makes referring to specific findings a challenge for readers. Further, some are simply the start of longer (unhighlighted) sentences, so it is unclear where the finding ends. Others are provided a footnoted reference to a stakeholder source (e.g. pg. 42, "finding 4") which suggests the finding is actually a piece of evidence, rather than a synthesis of analysis. The levels of evidence under each finding are somewhat mixed, with some (particularly EQ5) providing substantial levels to make a case for the analysis. There are exceptions, however. EQ3 (which relates to the inclusion (voices of rights-holders), is very cursory (a single paragraph) and does not reflect the nuances of the question and related assumption/indicators. The same can be said of EQ6, which has essentially three short paragraphs of analysis, and to a lesser extent EQ7. Other evaluation questions/findings have more substantial levels of evidence against them.
	ii	Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The evaluation relies on the country programme results framework for formulation of the findings, most specifically related to the Effectiveness questions. These findings are explicitly formulated with reference to the indicators, targets and reported achievements (via UNFPA annual results reporting) against same. Some of this reconciliation of results against targets is supported by additional evidence to enhance the quality of the findings.
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.	Partially	Overall, the evaluators have made efforts (where the evidence sources are noted - see 11i above and 12ii below) to utilize credible forms of data. Specifically, the cited evidence is typically reporting from UNFPA (results reporting, annual/quarterly reports etc.) or interviews with key informants. As such (and as noted under 11ii above) the evaluation does discuss the performance of UNFPA not just in relation to activities and outputs, but does seek to link these to specific country programme outcomes. One key issue with the use of triangulation of findings across multiple sources is that many of the footnoted KII sources do not specify whether they are UNFPA or external sources, they are simply presented as "KII stakeholders" or similar. Thus, some findings that are supported by UNFPA reporting are triangulated with UNFPA interviewees, and cannot be considered triangulated as such. Some footnoted sources are appropriately described (e.g. pg. 64 notes "KIIs with IPs" and "KIIs with UNFPA CO staff") - all footnoted sources should have been presented in this manner.
	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.	Partially	With reference to the basis of findings, the report does follow the evaluation matrix questions and criteria systematically, using UNFPA performance indicators where appropriate. However, there is an apparent reference to specific indicators presented in the analysis - text in italics that begins "*Evidence for…*" - the phrasing is similar to that of the indicators in the evaluation matrix and many of them map, at least partially, against the matrix indicators. But these are not the matrix indicators, hence it is unclear where these derive from. From an evidential perspective, the report is mixed in quality. While many findings clearly note the evidence and the source (either directly in the text or via footnotes), which is positive, others are either fully unreferenced statements of supposed achievements or cite unspecific data sources. An example of the former is the first finding on pg. 70, which finds enhanced technical capacities of data partners but poor advocacy capacity - no evidence for this finding is presented. An example of the latter is under the first finding of EQ4, which makes a positive finding regarding the national coordination forum "based on documented evidence" but without presenting any of this evidence. There is also quite limited evidence in relation to specific outcomes of the programme, particularly evidence from rights-holders via FGDs, which are very thinly represented. For example, under EQ5, the analysis of achievement of adolescents and youth outcomes (subsection 4.3.2.2, pg. 46) simply presents a list of activities/outputs from the UNFPA annual reports. The subsequent finding (on the effectiveness of the Nzululwazi model for youth SRH) is simply a blanket positive statement, citing positive outputs (largely drawn from the UNFPA reporting, if referenced at all) and the short analysis paragraph states that it was "highly effective" in reducing teenage pregnancies without citing any evidence regarding this. In summary, the evaluation reads in many places as a positively-framed report intended to showcase UNFPA's achievement, rather than an independent and triangulated assessment of the extent to which UNFPA is meeting its goals in South Africa.
	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).	Partially	As with much of the findings, the report has a mixed performance when it comes to exploring the causal factors related to achievement or non-achievement of results. In many cases (discussed above), the evidence base for results is not substantial, with more focus on simply reporting the stated results rather than unpacking the drivers of these. For example, the underperformance of UNFPA with respect to one of the country programme output indicators relating to sex workers accessing SRH information and services was discussed, with COVID-19 being ascribed as the causal factor (noted via document review and triangulated via KIIs - though it is not clear whether the KIIs were UNFPA or independent verification). However, further analysis of this intervention (under EQ5) notes the discontinuation of an implementation model for this intervention due to unspecified "challenges faced during its implementation" - the exploration of such challenges should have been central to the evaluation. Another notable example is under provision of integrated SRH services (4.3.1) - the report praises the performance of UNFPA in meeting output targets for assistance and activities, but at the end of the section notes (very briefly) that outcome targets were *not* met, and indeed key indicators (condom use and adolescent pregnancies) saw regression or stagnation. These are very important (negative) results, but the evaluators do not unpack or even highlight these, ascribing potential causes to (again) COVID-19 or (unspecified) " limitations in delivery mechanisms", rather than exploring the efficacy of the many activities that UNFPA has undertaken. There are examples of some useful unpacking of results, however. For example, in relation to limited success in reducing adolescent pregnancies noted under EQ5 (pg. 50) - a key area of programme interventions. The evaluators note some specific challenges that have impacted the performance of this element of programming (turnover of nurses, community resistance/stigma) that can form the basis of guidance/recommendations for future programming and are hence useful. Overall, however, the links from outputs to outcomes/impacts are not well explained - the report focuses more on listing activities than exploring how these have resulted in concrete or measurable gains for rights-holders.
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.	No	The evaluation terms of reference note that the evaluation should include monitoring and evaluation as a cross-cutting issue. However, there is no such assessment in the evaluation. There is some reference to the importance of M&E under EQ7 (efficiency) and constraints on M&E in the recommendations, but no treatment in the analysis/findings section. Given that this was a specific ask of the TOR that has not been met in any way, a "no" rating is justified.
SECTION F:		**EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)**	67%	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	In as much as the conclusions are presented, they are clear, with reference to the relevant evaluation criteria, evaluation question and are split into strategic and programmatic categories, thus responding to the evaluation questions accurately. They are very much summative, in that they are derived from the analysis and findings (although with some issues, noted below) and do not introduce any significant bias beyond the findings section. A minor issue is the use of colloquial language around the phrasing of the conclusions, specifically Conclusion 1, which refers to the country programme as "spot-on" - this should be rephrased.
	ii	Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	While the conclusions do represent a generally accurate reflection of the findings, they also reflect some of the issues of limited analysis and evidence that are a characteristic flaw of many findings. For example, Conclusion 2 notes key sectoral issues for UNFPA to continue work on, which is both important to note and is a reflection of the findings. This is positive. However, the issues noted there are not very well fleshed out in the findings or supported by hard data (e.g. there is no data in the report under EQ5 on the unmet need for family planning or inequality levels - highlighted as key areas for UNFPA to work on). Further, some of the conclusions lack depth. For example, Conclusion 1 notes that the programme is highly relevant, most significantly (as articulated by the conclusion) due to feedback on design from external stakeholders. However, the findings under the Relevance questions are slightly more nuanced (and less positive) - under EQs 1 and 3 the evaluators note that rights-holders, while having been consulted, did feel that this could have been more extensive. Further, EQ1 discusses the "upstream" alignment further - i.e. alignment with national strategies and policies, but this is not reflected in the conclusion. Other conclusions are simply not accompanied by any substantiating text, for example Conclusions 4, 5, 7 and 10 which are a single statement only. Further, there is no conclusion related to the sustainability evaluation criterion, despite this forming a key part of the evaluation research. The evaluation would have been better served by shortening the number of conclusions (there are 15 in total) to no more than 1-2 per evaluation criterion and providing some more nuanced insight and analysis.
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	The ToR does not request lessons-learned identification or a dedicated lessons learned section, hence this criterion is set as "not rated". Feedback is nevertheless provided for learning purposes. Some of the lessons learned and best-practices sections (4.7 and 4.8) are quite good - they are clearly linked to specific findings (although no reference to specific findings are made, it is obvious that the text of the finding refers to elements of the analysis, for example the UNFPA response to the COVID-19 pandemic). There are also some good examples offered, for example around the issues relating to integration of adolescent boys into programming (noted under EQ4, pg. 54) For others, they are not clearly linked to findings, for example the role of monitoring and evaluation (under lesson (d)) by UNFPA has no corollary in the findings (as discussed under 13i above).
	ii	Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluand as well as any areas of improvement.	Partially	The ToR does not request lessons-learned identification or a dedicated lessons learned section, hence this criterion is set as "not rated". Feedback is nevertheless provided for learning purposes. The lessons and best practices are quite clearly written and presented. Some of them have genuine and potentially useful insights that can be useful to UNFPA in future programme. For example, the adaptation to COVID-19 to more remote/digital programming that dovetailed with the preference of youth and key populations for social media and other digital tools is a useful lesson and insight. Another example of a good practice highlighted is that of the use of provincial sub-offices - the value-add of such decentralisation is important to highlight in evaluations such as these, due to the investment required that can often dissuade management from such a measure. However, many of the lessons/practices are quite generic or obvious, for example the importance and value-add of multi-sectoral collaboration and joint programming (lesson (b), practices 5 & 6), focusing on vulnerable populations (lesson (c)), the importance of disaggregated monitoring data (lesson (d)). These are guiding principles for UNFPA programming, so are not particularly insightful.
SECTION G:		**EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)**	88%	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 ten recommendations are quite clearly formulated, in a table layout, and organized (as were the conclusions) into strategic and programmatic categories (per guidance from UNFPA). They are further organized clearly according to the relevant conclusion and are logically linked to each. The issue with linking of conclusions to findings, however (discussed above) is reflected in the recommendations.
	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	The recommendations are useful and actionable, being broken down into sub-recommendations with key stakeholders and "operational implications" (i.e. key actions) for achieving them itemized. The implementation guidance provides additional detail and granularity that can assist stakeholders to apply them, although the business units targeted by the recommendations could be more clearly identified, rather than just referring to the UNFPA CO (e.g., it could be M&E unit or SRH unit, etc.).
	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 recommendations section notes clearly that the recommendations development involved "consultations with stakeholders, UNFPA SACO, and a validation round with the ERG, supported by ESARO and UNFPA headquarters". The ERG, in particular, had representation from a wide range of institutional stakeholders (mostly government, but some representation from the NGO/CSO sector and academia) and also youth representatives to UNFPA. This is acceptable and good practice.
	iv	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	The recommendations are very clearly articulated - it is evident that some considerable work has been devoted to them. They are allocated a priority level (high, medium or low) and the headline recommendations are directed at specific stakeholders (although the action items might have been more usefully targeted specifically, rather than the overall recommendation).
SECTION H:		**REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)**	67%	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	All of these elements are present, although the list of tables and figures is not correct, and the embedded hyperlinks for the latter two lead to incorrect locations in the text. This requires revision.

	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	All of the required annexes are present, with supplementary details on the performance of the country programme against the CPD results framework indicators, and specific notes from the focus group discussions. These additional annexes are useful and add to the 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, as per the UNFPA Evaluation Guidebook, with numbered sections and clear titles. There are some relatively minor editing/formatting issues that remain (e.g. bulleting/numbered lists not formatted correctly (see pg. 7 list item iv under "Purpose"), and the language editing is poor, but this is discussed in 19i below.
	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)*	No	The TOR specifies 80 pages for the final evaluation report, excluding opening pages and annexes. This report is 83 pages in total, so marginally beyond this guidance (and the 70 pages noted per the criterion for CPEs here). The structure is sound and per UNFPA guidelines. Some judicious formatting and editing of the text could have facilitated bringing the report under the requested 80 page mark.
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.	Partially	The report is reasonably well-written overall, being largely accessible and comprehensible. While there are not many grammar, spelling and punctuation errors, there are still quite a few obvious ones in the text that have not been caught, indicating an inadequate editing process. For example, the page numbering of the table of contents (including the introductory pages - the table of contents uses roman numerals whereas each page is numbered "page 1" etc - and the numbering is also out). Other poor editing issues identified (there are many more) include: - duplication of subheading numbers 2.1.2, - misnumbering of subquestions in the data collection tools, - misnumbering EQ8 as EQ7, duplicated text of EQ2 (pg. 38)) - duplicated text (see above for the limitation text and EQ2 duplication) - duplication of evidence (e.g. the computer-assisted interview research with UN Women during COVID is cited three separate times as an example of activities in pages 38-40). - misplaced text (e.g. see the sentence re. provincial partnerships after the summary of EQ4). - some formatting not in line with the UN/UNFPA style guidelines (e.g. use of numerals for 1-9 instead of spelled words - one, two, etc.).
	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	The report includes a variety of tables, charts and graphics. These convey important information well and add to the quality of the report. Not all are properly formatted or labelled, however. For example table between tables 6 and 7 (pg. 20) is not labelled. Further, many of the graphics are skewed in their formatting which makes them unclear and looks unprofessional. Some basic editing would address this issue.
SECTION I:		**CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)**	74%	**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	The design of the evaluation included the implementation of focus group discussions intended to solicit participation of rights holders as central to this evaluation. The methods note the sample of rights-holders reached, which included young people and members of key populations that are subject to particular marginalisation. Notwithstanding some issues of documenting optimal ethical treatment of these subgroups (noted above), the evaluation was reasonably well-designed to obtain their testimony and input, as well as a selection of duty-bearers. Although limited in terms of the extent to which their voices are reflected in the final analysis, the report does makes some efforts to ensure that the inputs received were reflected in the analysis and findings. This is interesting and important to ground-truth the findings and could have been reflected to a greater extent. Finally, the ERG included six members of a UNFPA Youth Advisory Group and some CSO representatives, providing a further opportunity for inputs.
	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	Most of the evaluation questions included specific reference to the needs of vulnerable and marginalized populations, with specific groups such as people with disabilities and adolescents being specified in several. In particular, EQ6 explores the inclusion of "human rights, gender perspectives, environment sustainability and disability inclusion" in the design and implementation of the country programme. Although not explicitly referenced in the evaluation questions, LNOB was also explicitly built into the evaluation design, through ensuring that the sampling considered vulnerable and marginalized groups and purposively sampling members of such groups.
	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).	No	Despite extensive discussion of the achievements of the country programme and various initiatives conducted or supported under its auspices, there is no actual presentation of disaggregated data in the report. Quantitative data, such as it is, is presented in aggregate, and the analysis of programme indicators in the main report and the annexes does not disaggregate. There is disaggregation of stakeholders consulted in the evaluation process (presented in Tables 4 & 5, section 1.3), which is a minor positive feature.
	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.	Partially	Although the consideration of intersectionality is noted in the evaluation recommendations (specifically covered by recommendation 8), the evaluation analysis does not directly or explicitly apply an intersectional lens. It does, however, present examples of country programme-supported activities related to multi-sectoral approaches that address various intersecting issues (such as youth, exclusion, GBV, HIV, socio-economic inequality) in an integrated manner, in line with the country programme design. This is noted in the 'best practices' section (4.8, #5). It is discussed primarily under the effectiveness criterion (EQ5) but, as with much of the analysis, it presents examples of initiatives that are positively-framed, without unpacking or detailing the evidence that might justify this. For example, the first finding under Effectiveness (section 4.3, pg. 43) notes the positive impact of integrated HIV/SRH and GBV services on vulnerable and marginalized groups that are "disproportionately affected" (thus implying an intersectional lens) - but attributing positive changes to UNFPA support hinges on "document review and interviews with stakeholders" with no further details. This limited recourse to evidence is a significant issue with the evaluation.

	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.	Partially	Although issues such as equality, vulnerability, disability etc. were built into the evaluation design, the analysis and findings are less comprehensive in their treatment of these groups. The primary evaluation question that addressed these groups (EQ6), is quite cursory - covering approximately half a page of analysis (there is another page of summaries and filler text but the essential analysis is in the latter half of pg. 62). This section briefly discusses some examples of how the country programme addressed gender equality/human rights, disability and "environmental sustainability" and provides some rather sweeping generalisations on the (positive) performance of the country programme as a whole. This is overly brief and lacking in considered analysis of triangulated evidence and is a failing of the evaluation. This said, some of these issues are covered under other questions, for example issues of LNOB are noted under various programme components in the analysis of effectiveness under EQ4 (e.g. see section 4.3.3.3, pg. 57), so the analysis does not hinge on the partial treatment under EQ6.
	vi	Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Yes	The evaluation team includes a young and emerging evaluator, noted on the cover pages - this is good practice as encouraged by the UNFPA IEO. The Evaluation Reference Group further involves six "Youth Advisory Members" as part of a UNFPA panel - this is also promising (although the nature of these individuals isn't clear - i.e. their backgrounds etc. - this could have been explained).
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*	**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	Gender and equality were included in the evaluation scope at the outset (i.e. in the TOR) and are well-represented across several of the evaluation questions (notably EQs 4, 5 & 6). This was carried over to the evaluation analysis via the evaluation matrix. The extent of this gender dimension is reasonably comprehensive.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The evaluation approach specifically noted integration of a "gender sensitive" focus from the outset (see section 1.3) reflecting the design of the country programme which included gender and equality as core components. Further, the evaluation specifies that it sought to obtain *"gender balance in key informant interviews, applied a gender lens to the analysis, and included gender analysis in results "*. The data collection tools themselves fully integrated gender considerations, with specific KII and FGD tools for the gender equality component of the country programme and other KII tools including 3-4 questions that specifically explored gender dimensions (some as part of other dimensions such as human rights) The methods chosen also selected for gender-disaggregated groups of rights-holders for focus group discussions, and the data analysis plan notes the intention to disaggregate by gender, where appropriate.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	Reflecting the significance placed on gender equality by the country programme and the evaluation design, the report covers many of the reported activities and achievements related to gender equality by UNFPA South Africa, with a specific section related to the Gender Equality component of the country programme. This said, GEEW does not have prominence in the conclusions and recommendations sections, with references to gender in these sections focused mainly on GBV rather than the broader aspect of social norms change around gender to promote equity and equality, as would have been expected.

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.
ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.
iii The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

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