

# UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		85%	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	
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Country Programme Evaluation of UNFPA Rwanda 8th Country Programme
<b>Region</b>	ESA
<b>Country</b>	Rwanda
<b>Year of report</b>	2023
<b>Business Unit/programme country</b> <i>(managing evaluation)</i>	UNFPA Rwanda CO
<b>Date of assessment review</b> <i>(dd/mm/yyyy)</i>	December 17, 2024
<b>Name of assessment review firm</b>	IOD PARC
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered</b> <i>(list provided below)</i>	3, 5
<b>UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered</b> <i>(lists provided below)</i>	
Three transformative results	(a) an end to preventable maternal deaths; (b) an end to the unmet need for family planning; and (c) an end to gender-based violence and all harmful practices, including female genital mutilation and child, early and forced marriage
Six outputs	(a) policy and accountability, (b) quality of care and services, (c) gender and norms, (d) data and evidence, including on population changes, (e) humanitarian action, and (f) adolescent and youth.
Six accelerators	(a) Human rights-based and gender transformative approaches (b) Innovation and digitalization (c) Partnership, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing; (d) Data and evidence; (e) “Leaving no one behind” and “reaching the furthest left behind first”; (f) Resilience and adaptation,
<b>Organizational effectiveness and efficiency</b>	Yes
<b>Humanitarian evaluation</b>	Yes
<b>Evaluation evaluand</b> <i>(e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)</i>	Country Programme
<b>Evaluation type</b> <i>(e.g. formative, summative, developmental)</i>	Summative and formative
<b>Geographic scope</b> <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 a strong Country Programme Evaluation of UNFPA Rwanda 8th Country Programme. Key points to note in the evaluation are outlined below.

- The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clearly defined, as per the requirements of the UNFPA Evaluation Policy (2019).
- The methodology is strong, with a theory based and contribution analysis approach, with robust methods, clear sampling strategies and thorough data collection tools outlined as an Annex. The limitations section would benefit from more detail on a wider range of limitations, as well as mitigation of them.
- The evaluation matrix is detailed and includes indicators, assumptions, data sources broken down by criteria, question and sub question, with fieldwork findings included.
- Stakeholders are outlined, but more detail could usefully be provided on types of stakeholder, their roles in working with UNFPA as well as linkages between them.
- While there is reference to UNEG guidance and ethics in evaluation this could be described and discussed in greater detail, particularly given that vulnerable people were included in data collection.
- The report contained a particularly strong section on validation of evidence in multiple ways, including through the ERG, ongoing conversation with UNFPA CO programme outcome leads, as well as the triangulation of the multiple data sources outlined in the comprehensive evaluation matrix.
- The country context is well described with particular relevance to UNFPAs mandate, and work in Rwanda, along with a strong section outlining the role of external assistance and UN wide approaches and programmes.
- Findings are clear and broken down by criteria with each evaluation question addressed systematically. There is good signposting as to where findings came from, such as KIIs, document review etc, though the evaluation would benefit from more explicit detail on the type of KII / partners interviewed, as well as a more balanced presentation of positive and negative evidence. The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data presenting output and outcome level data, and providing baseline indicator data against which to measure current performance - this is an example of good practice as it clearly sets out which indicators, and outcomes related to them have been met/achieved by the 8th CP.
- Conclusions are broken down by strategic and programmatic domains, and within that each criteria and question is addressed, some conclusions to greater depth than others and this would benefit from consistency and ensure each conclusion adds additional insight to the findings. Conclusions are usefully linked to the findings and recommendations to which they relate.
- Recommendations are also broken down by strategic and programmatic domains and clearly prioritised. If detail of how recommendations had been developed, and detail of responsible actors provided, were explicitly included in the recommendations section this would improve the utility of this section.
- GEEW is integrated into the scope of analysis and evaluation questions were designed to ensure that GEEW data is collected. This was accomplished by integrating sub questions relating to GEEW into each relevant criteria, and also including questions specifically on cross cutting issues. One area for improvement is the explicit discussion and analysis of intersectionality.
- The evaluation is well written and follows the UNFPA guidance for report structure, however at 79 pages in length it is longer than the 70 pages requested in the ToRs.
- The evaluation went beyond the requirements of the UNFPA evaluation handbook as it usefully includes a lessons learned section.

**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.**

Overall this is a strong evaluation, with some minor areas for improvement. These are outlined below.

- The structure accords to UNFPA guidelines, and also includes an additional section on lessons learned. However, at 79 pages in length it is over the 70 page limit which was specified in the TORs.
- There is an assessment of the ToC, however this is not explicit in the findings section and the findings could be improved if the ToC were referenced within this section.
- Ethical guidance, and a brief outline of UNEG ethical practice in the conduct of fieldwork is mentioned; however, there is not a detailed description of the wider ethical considerations to be taken into account, particularly when speaking with vulnerable groups including young people and refugees, about potentially sensitive topics.
- The limitations section would benefit from more detail on a variety of limitations, not just those related to data collection, and more explicit mitigation measures.
- An updated stakeholder map could usefully have been provided.
- Findings could provide more balanced evidence that presents negative findings, equally with positive evidence.
- Conclusions could more concisely provide detail and analysis that adds insight beyond the findings.
- Recommendations would benefit from greater specificity on who responsible actors are to increase utility of the evaluation.
- GEEW and other equity considerations are well considered, but would have benefited from an intersectional analysis, and analysis of results across different groups, such as people with disabilities.

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).  <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 standalone document useful for informing decision making. It is clear and succinct, and does not exceed the maximum page requirements.
	ii Includes all necessary components of the evaluation report, including: (1) overview of the context and intervention, (2) evaluation purpose, objectives and intended users, 3) scope and evaluation methodology, (4) summary of most significant findings, (5) main conclusions and (6) key recommendations	Yes	The executive summary includes all necessary components of the evaluation report.
	iii Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Partially	Most significant information is included in the executive summary in a clear and concise manner to enable a contextualised and situated understanding of this CPE. However, unlike in the main body of the report, conclusions are not broken down by strategic and programmatic, and do not explain why only two criteria are presented and summarised, rather the conclusions section in their entirety.
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.	Yes	There is a clear description of the 8th Rwanda CP, including programme areas, activities, geographic coverage, main partners (outlined in more detail in Annex 3) and cost budget broken down for each programmatic area in section 3.2.4 and Annex 5.
	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 clear description of the country context from economic, social and political perspectives, set out in Section 2. This includes an outline of sexual health and rights, adolescent and youth sexual health, population dynamics, and the key drivers and challenges of each, as they relate to the context of UNFPAs mandate and work in Rwanda. There is good reference, and links, to national policies and plans, as well as to the wider UNSDCF.

	iii Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	There are clear links drawn to SDGs, and Agenda 2030 more generally, both in narrative format and outlined in Figure 4. There is explicit reference to ICPD benchmarks, and relevant SDG targets and indicators are outlined in the key facts table at the start of the report.
<b>Question 3. Are key stakeholders clearly identified and analysed?</b>			
	i Clear identification of key stakeholders which should include implementing partner(s), development partners, rights holders, and duty bearers among others; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map).	Partially	Stakeholders are identified and broken down by type and geographic region (Table 2). They include government, implementing partners, development partners, donors and beneficiaries. As noted in the ToRs (Annex 6) initial stakeholder mapping was provided by the UNFPA CO to outline which interventions each stakeholder contributes to.  However, further detail could have been provided on the role of different stakeholders, particularly if they were duty bearers. Additionally links between stakeholders could have been usefully provided in an updated stakeholder map presented in the final report (noting a draft stakeholder map is present in the design report)
	ii Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Partially	The rights of beneficiaries are clearly outlined in the country context (section 2), and for each intervention and relating to UNFPAs transformative results in section 3, particularly 3.3.2, which outlines the rights of beneficiaries in Rwanda in relation to sexual and reproductive health broken down outputs of the CP, and provides detail of those needs will be met (Table 8).  Other stakeholders are not analysed to this level of detail - partners could have been more clearly described, and implementing partners in particular, to enable a full understanding of how UNFPA interventions are being delivered, and by who, for example it is unclear if government is an implementing partners (at national or sub national levels) or if implementing partners are comprised solely of NGOs/ CSOs.
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>		100%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 4. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>			
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, and as per the requirements of the UNFPA Evaluation Policy 2019 (as this evaluation was conducted in 2023 it relates to the previous evaluation policy) is described as being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To demonstrate accountability assess performance in achieving development results of the 8th CP</li> <li>• To support evidence based decision-making</li> <li>• To contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to accelerate the implementation of the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD)</li> </ul>
<b>Question 5. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>			
	i Clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, including reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	The objectives of the CPE were clearly defined, and appropriate for this CP Evaluation they were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide an independent assessment of the progress of the 8th Country Programme towards the expected outputs and outcomes set forth in the results framework.</li> <li>• To provide an assessment of country office positioning within the development community and national partners</li> <li>• To draw key lessons from the past and current cooperation and provide a set of clear, specific and action-oriented, forward-looking strategic recommendations in light of Agenda 2030 for the next programming cycle.</li> </ul> <p>If there were any changes to the ToR they could be included here, or a statement made to indicate there were no deviations.</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).	Yes	The scope is well described in a succinct and clear manner, it is thorough and detailed and the wide ranging programmatic scope should serve to increase the utility of the CPE. The scope is outlined in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporally, the scope covers activities implemented within the framework of UNFPA Rwanda 8th CP from July 2018 to June 2024 (with fieldwork covering up until end June 2023).</li> <li>• Thematically, the evaluation scope covers three programmatic areas: SRHR, adolescents and youth, and population dynamics, importantly is also includes an examination of cross-cutting areas including gender equality and human rights, resource mobilization and partnerships, M&amp;E, and communication.</li> <li>• Geographically, the 8th CP interventions were implemented nationally (upstream activities), and in three districts and five refugee camps (downstream interventions).</li> </ul>
<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>		88%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>

<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use?</b>  <i>Note: UNFPA evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria such as: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (not necessarily applicable to all evaluations) and, for country programmes that include circumscribed and limited humanitarian and/or emergency interventions, the criteria of coverage and connectedness.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. Five OECD DAC criteria are appropriately referenced, and "connectedness" included as a UN humanitarian evaluation specific criteria (in addition to sustainability). The questions and sub questions are clear and aligned with appropriate criteria.
	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 is at Annex 1, it is clear and thorough, and follows the layout expected by the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook. It sets out each evaluation question, broken down by OECD DAC criteria, with sub questions aligned to each programmatic element. This is an excellent way of setting out clearly the different programmatic elements which are evaluated, under each criteria and questions.  The framework clearly outline the assumption for verification, relevant indicators, and data collection tools and instruments. For this final report the evidence gathered during fieldwork is also compiled here to create a complete and thorough evaluation matrix upon which analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.  A minor point of improvement, to reduce duplication, would be to note thematic areas of work differently, and not use them as headings within the evaluation matrix.
<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?</b>		
	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	There is a clear description of the interventions intended results and the result chain and Theory of change are outlined and assessed in the methodology section.
	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	While the evaluation team note that the ToC does not adequately address the links between outputs and outcomes, the evaluation takes account of this in the design of methods to enable causal relationships to be identified through primary data collection. As part of this the three transformative results are clearly outlined.
	iii Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework, and if requested in the ToR, it is retrofitted/reconstructed by the evaluators.	Yes	There was a sound assessment of the ToC and results/ logic chain overall. Findings from this will inform decision making an development of the 9th CP and its ToC.
<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are clearly described, and are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, including the use of AI in the evaluation process if applicable.	Yes	Evaluation design is theory based and utilises contribution analysis, while methods are clearly described and appropriate for the design, with a mixed methods approach set out comprised of the following key elements:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Semi-structured group and individual interviews with organisational level stakeholders,</li> <li>• Site visits to CP targeted areas in three districts and two selected refugee camps</li> <li>• Focus group discussions with beneficiaries</li> </ul>
	ii Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR).	Yes	Data sources are all clearly described, relevant and robust., They include qualitative and quantitative sources. Data collection tools are clearly outlined and interview and observation guides provided at Annex 4.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	Sampling strategy is provided and is clear and appropriate. For KIs with key stakeholders purposeful sampling was used to ensure that for each outcome there was a representative sample of different types of stakeholder (Government ministries, implementing partners, NGOs etc). While for FGD discussion with beneficiaries, people using services in the sites visited were purposefully targeted. These included women attending antenatal clinics, adolescents at adolescent and youth centres, first-time young mothers, women at family planning clinics, and student midwives. Development partners were also consulted.  Geographic sites to visit were also chosen purposefully, with three of the five intervention areas visited by the evaluation team. Places to visit were selected to ensure a representative sample of health centres, young people centres, district level health services and refugee camps. This is outlined clearly in table 2 for the types of stakeholders consulted, while table 3 outlines the number of people interviewed disaggregated by type of stakeholder, programmatic areas of interest and gender.
	iv Methods allow for rigorous testing of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework (e.g. methods help to understand the causal connections, if any, between outputs and expected outcomes (3TRs).	Yes	Methods allow for rigorous testing of the ToC and results chains to identify causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes. There is explicit reference to the three transformative changes.

	v Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including explainability and full disclosure of the use of AI in the evaluation process, if applicable.	Yes	<p>There is a clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, which involved two phases one at end of fieldwork involving workshops to test and validate evidence gathered. The second phase involved the interrogation and analysis of the evidence using multiple approaches, these are appropriate and include descriptive, content and contribution analysis approaches.</p> <p>The report also contained a particularly strong section on validation of evidence in multiple ways, including through the ERG (which included government and implementing partners), ongoing conversation with UNFPA CO, in particular programme outcome leads, as well as the triangulation of the multiple data sources outlined in the comprehensive evaluation matrix.</p> <p>AI was not used in the conduct of this evaluation.</p>
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation in its data collection and analysis, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Partially	<p>Limitations are described only in relation to fieldwork/ primary data collection where it is noted that there were programmes relating primary to youth interventions where participants and partners were not available for interviews. It is noted that the evaluation team could not mitigate against this explicitly, so instead focused more on areas where evidence could be gathered.</p> <p>This section could have been improved by explicitly mentioning the types of documentary evidence that could mitigate the absence of stakeholders and beneficiaries for interviews, such as program documentation. Additionally, an analysis of existing M&amp;E data, particularly for the youth component, could have been included to demonstrate how all program areas might be addressed, even if only partially.</p> <p>Additionally it might be expected that limitations relating to other aspects of the evaluation would be included here, not only relating to fieldwork, for example access to disaggregated data in programme and M&amp;E data, or gaps in the results chain/ ToC.</p>
<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:</b>		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Partially	There is reference to the UNEG guidelines and obligations, but this section could be improved if this was made more explicit and contextualised to this CPE.
	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	<p>Ethical guidance, and a brief outline of ethical practice in the conduct of fieldwork is mentioned in the methodology and data collection section, and also in the data collection tools (for example peoples right to refuse to take part and confidentiality). However, there is not a detailed description of the wider ethical considerations to be taken into account, particular when speaking with vulnerable groups including young people and refugees about potentially sensitive topics.</p> <p>The use of AI is not mentioned in the report.</p>
<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?</b>		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could include efforts to optimize the evaluation process (e.g., use of AI or new technology for data gathering, content analysis, outcome harvesting among others), or components introduced to enhance inclusion and participation in the evaluation processes (e.g. a youth steering committee), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Not Rated	There is not explicit reference to innovation, nor is any requested in the ToR.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 11.</b>	<b>Do the findings clearly and adequately address all evaluation questions and sub-questions?</b>		
	i Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions	Yes	Findings are presented clearly by criteria, question and sub question. Sufficient levels of evidence are provided 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 assessment of the ToC, however this is not explicit in the findings section, but rather discussed in earlier sections. The findings could have been improved if the ToC were also discussed in more detail (except within the effectiveness section).
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?</b>		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.	Yes	<p>The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data presenting output and outcome level data, as outlined in the evaluation framework. Table 12 explicitly outlines outcomes, linked to output indicators, the baseline indicator data in 2018 and the current indicator performance in 2023. This is an example of good practice as it clearly sets out which indicators, and outcomes related to them have been met/ achieved.</p> <p>There is good evidence of triangulation, with the report noting where evidence relating to individual findings came from, such as KIIs, document review or FGDs. This is an excellent approach but could be improved if the more detail was provided on the KIIs, at the moment it is difficult to tease out whether findings relate to views of implementing partners, development partners, or government.</p>

	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	Findings are clearly supported by the evidence with positive elements well presented, for example section 4.3.3. outlines findings relating to cross-cutting issues and the progress that has been made in enabling young people to access sexual and reproductive health services, and that these health centres are accessible for disabled people. However, it also notes that while gender equality is at the core of the CP, UNFPA did not explore or address the root causes of gender inequality, and that services provided (particularly in refugee) camps were limited in terms of finances and ability to reach more people. Those who were reached did, however, reported positive outcomes. This represents a limited reporting of negative evidence, and the evaluation would be strengthened if it presented positive and negative evidence in a more balanced way.  Findings are based on performance indicators and standards, with reference to indicators such as increases of contraception usage, and decrease in maternal mortality rate.
	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 which have contributed to achievement of outcomes are explicitly outlined, for example joint delivery with implementing partners and district programme coordinators was a key success factor, along with the strong partnerships between IPs and the CO. Political will and government support also played a key role.
<b>Question 13.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?</b>		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's planning, monitoring, and reporting system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	The monitoring and evaluation system of the CP is assessed as a cross-cutting issues (section 4.7). It is noted that the M&E system uses harmonized tools, linked to progress against outputs and outcomes to support decision-making. The gathering of baseline and endline data is also an important point, and it is an example of good practice to do this, and for a CPE to note the importance of holding this data for comparison purposes and analysis of performance. Areas for improvement were also outlined to support the continuous improvement process and decision-making in the next CP.  It is well noted that issues remain with regard to disaggregate data collected and held by all partners (implementing partners in particular), remains challenging, as well as the capacity to undertake research and analysis of gender equality.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluand?</b>		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions. They are broken down into strategic conclusions, and programmatic conclusion, and within each section criteria and questions are summarised and wider conclusions outlined. There could be greater consistency in the way each conclusion is addressed, particularly with regard to information on how each question relates to the findings.
	ii Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	Conclusions are well substantiated and clearly derived from findings, with forward links also made to recommendations to which the conclusions relate. Some links to the origin of the conclusions contain detail on the finding to which the conclusions relate, but only one does this. This would benefit from a consistent approach. Some of the conclusions add deeper insight at strategic and programmatic levels beyond the findings, though this could also be more consistently applied across all conclusions.
<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]</b>		
	i Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	Not Rated	Lessons learned are provided - they are derived from findings and have illustrative examples. The recommendations section also includes a lessons learned sub section. However, as this is not a required section of a UNFPA report, this has not been rated.
	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	Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide insights on positive aspects of the evaluand. However, as this is not a required section of a UNFPA report, this has not been rated.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 16.</b>	<b>Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?</b>		
	i Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from findings and conclusions. They are usefully linked to the relevant conclusions which they relate to.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users. Specific guidance is provided for its implementation (e.g. actions, deadlines, responsible actors), as appropriate.	Partially	Recommendations are actionable for primary users, and guidance is provided for implementation of each recommendation; however, utility could be improved if greater clarity was provided as to which units/ teams/ individuals within the CO were responsible for each recommendation (as relevant) as well as specificity on partners. Human resource and financial implications of each recommendation are usefully provided, though this could be presented, and analysed, more clearly.
	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.	Partially	While section 1 outlines processes for engagement with the ERG and UNFPA CO in the conduct of all aspects of the evaluation, there is not an explicit paragraph at the start of the recommendations section stating the process by which they were developed. This is important to include to ensure intended users have been adequately involved and consulted in the development of the recommendations, and that there is shared ownership.

	iv Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on urgency, importance and potential impact, with relation to strategic and programmatic elements.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	92%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation report include all required information?</b>		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluation and/title of evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluand, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes); list of acronyms/abbreviations.	Yes	The opening pages contain all relevant information expected of a UNFPA evaluation including the title of the evaluation, timeframe, date of report, location of evaluand and map of UNFPA intervention areas, names of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents and list of acronyms/abbreviations. Membership of the ERG is also presented in the opening pages of the report.
	ii Annexes include, if not in body of report: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology (e.g. inception report), case study reports.	Yes	Annexes include all expected information for a UNFPA evaluation including evaluation matrix, ToRs, list of stakeholders, list of site visits, data collection instruments, list of documentary evidence. The ToC is included in the main body of the report so not necessary to also include as an Annex.
<b>Question 18.</b>	<b>Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?</b>		
	i The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate, and follows UNFPA guidelines for an evaluation report. There are clear titles, heading and use of numbering and the report is well formatted. One improvement is that it would be useful 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>	Partially	The structure accords to UNFPA guidelines, and also includes an additional section on lessons learned. However, at 79 pages in length it is over the 70 page limit expected for CPEs, and also specified in the TORs.
<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Is the report well presented?</b>		
	i Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for the intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is easy to understand and written in an accessible way, it is free from grammar spelling and punctuation errors.
	ii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is excellent and frequent use of visual aids including maps tables and figures. There are used to good effect to convey and simplify key information, They are almost all clearly presented and labelled and referenced in text. There is one minor issue which is a table which is not numbered or referenced at the foot of Annex 2.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)</b>	79%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Are cross cutting issues - in particular, human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB - integrated in the core elements of the evaluation (e.g. evaluation design, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations)?</b>		
	i Evaluation's data collection methods designed to capture the voices/perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders including right holders, marginalized and vulnerable persons, young people, people with disabilities, migrants or refugee populations, indigenous communities, and other persons that are often left behind.	Yes	The evaluations data collection methods are designed to capture the voices of a wide range of people. The voices of women and refugee populations are particularly well addressed, along with young people, notably in relation to their access to SRH services. Other vulnerable groups are also explicitly mentioned, and data collecting methods are well designed to capture multiple voices and perspectives.
	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 address cross cutting issues very well, under effectiveness, and relevance in particular, sub questions include those which will:  • Assess to what extent there has been usage of disaggregated data to inform policies and programmes? • Assess to what extent has UNFPA successfully integrated human rights, gender perspectives and disability inclusion into the country programme?  The scope of this evaluation explicitly includes cross-cutting issues, including gender equality and human rights. This is an example of good practice in integrating cross cutting issues across all evaluation questions, as relevant.
	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).	Partially	While the methodology did allow for collection of data that was disaggregated by gender, the findings do not provide an in-depth analysis of the people by different population groups, nor are any quotes attributed to anyone of a particular gender. Results are provided for some groups, such as young people, new mothers etc., but not assessed across other marginalised groups such as people with disabilities. However, the evaluation does usefully disaggregate stakeholders consulted (table 3).
	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	While various forms of exclusion are explored, often in great detail, for example young people in refugee camps, there is not any explicit mention of intersectionality, and how this may impact the evaluation findings.
	v Findings, conclusions and recommendations, address cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no-one behind, social and environmental as relevant.	Yes	Findings, conclusions and recommendations address cross cutting issues well; this was integrated into the evaluation from the outset and carried throughout. There is explicit reference to LNOB, equality and inclusion throughout.
	vi Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Not Rated	Not applicable, as not requested in ToR.

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>	7	Comments on Rating
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Fully integrated	GEEW is integrated into the scope of analysis and evaluation questions (based on six key criteria) and are designed to ensure that GEEW data is collected. This is accomplished by integrating sub questions relating to GEEW into each relevant criteria. This is clearly outlined in the main body of the report, and in detail at Annex 1 in the evaluation matrix.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	While the methodology does not state it will take a gender-transformative approach, it is gender responsive, with methods and tools designed to ensure that gendered data can, and will be gathered and analysed.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	As well as being integrated throughout the findings section, where gender is well addressed and reflects a strong gendered analysis, there is also a separate section in the findings that explicitly focuses on findings related to gender equality (section 4.7). Conclusions and recommendations also take good account of gender. The only area for improvement would be to apply an intersectional lens to analysis.



## 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