

# UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: August 2025

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

REPORT DETAILS	
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Independent evaluation of the capacity of UNFPA in humanitarian action 2019-2025
<b>Region</b>	
<b>Country</b>	Multi-country
<b>Year of report</b>	2025
<b>Business Unit/programme country (managing evaluation)</b>	UNFPA Independent Evaluation Office
<b>Date of assessment review (dd/mm/yyyy)</b>	January 8, 2026
<b>Name of assessment review firm</b>	IOD PARC
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (list provided below)</b>	3, 5, 16
<b>UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered (lists provided below)</b>	
<b>Three transformative results</b>	Yes
<b>Six outputs</b>	Yes
<b>Six accelerators</b>	Yes
<b>Organizational effectiveness and efficiency</b>	Yes
<b>Humanitarian evaluation</b>	Yes
<b>Evaluation evaluand (e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)</b>	Thematic area
<b>Evaluation type (e.g. formative, summative, developmental)</b>	Summative and formative
<b>Geographic scope (e.g. global, regional, national)</b>	Global
<p><b>EQA Summary:</b> The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (strengths and weaknesses), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight good practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation. The rater should also highlight how cross-cutting issues were addressed in the report. Considerations of significant constraints (e.g. humanitarian crisis or political turmoil) should also be highlighted here.</p>	
<p>The evaluation report of the independent evaluation of the capacity of UNFPA in humanitarian action 2019-2025 is highly satisfactory. The key strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation are outlined below:</p>	
<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The executive summary is a clear standalone document that is useful for decision-making. It includes all necessary components for a comprehensive overview of the evaluation report.</li> <li>• The background section provides a clear description of the political, social and institutional context, including the challenges posed by conflicts, climate crisis and funding shortfalls.</li> <li>• The evaluation makes a clear distinction between its purpose, objectives and scope.</li> <li>• The methodology is sound and well-described in the report. The report contains a comprehensive assessment of the reconstructed Theory of Change (ToC). The evaluation design and methods are clearly described in the report</li> <li>• The report has a clear and good Evaluation Matrix which presents data collection methods and sources in a column format which allows for a clear distinction of the expected methods and sources to measure each indicator and to empirically test the assumptions. This is a good practice that could be replicated in other evaluations.</li> <li>• A solid multi-stage sampling strategy was applied and the description in the report contains a significant level of detail.</li> <li>• The report is candid in reporting on the evaluation's limitations and outlines planned mitigation strategies and outcomes.</li> <li>• The evaluation was conducted in accordance with and in full alignment with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluations and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations, in addition to WHO's Ethical and safety recommendations for researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies. The evaluation report provides clear references to the ethical norms, standards and guidelines and provides examples of situations where the evaluation principles were adhered to during data collection.</li> <li>• AI was used in the evaluation and a clear description of how this optimized the evaluation process is included in a dedicated annex. The annex is exemplary in demonstrating what AI tools were used and how. This is a good practice that could be replicated in other evaluations.</li> <li>• The evaluation findings are clearly presented and are organized along the evaluation questions. Each finding section corresponds to an evaluation question and opens with a summary statement. The findings are derived from credible data sources and are well supported by evidence.</li> <li>• The evaluation clearly identifies causal factors leading to the achievement or non-achievement of results across various dimensions.</li> <li>• The recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the conclusions. They are written in a clear and unambiguous language. They outline specific actions to be taken, providing operationalization plans for each recommendation.</li> <li>• The evaluation uses a diverse range of visual aids frequently to illustrate findings. This is a strength and it is recommended that other evaluations pay similar attention to data visualization.</li> <li>• Cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion are well-integrated into the core elements of the evaluation.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the executive summary includes all the required elements, it exceeds the recommended length of 5-7 pages, especially due to the detailed presentation of the action points for all the recommendations.</li> <li>• While the stakeholder map included in the inception report (Annex 5) provides an overview of the stakeholders to be interviewed, it focuses on the interview themes only and does not provide an analysis to understand their interests and needs, power and influence or their potential impact on the evaluand.</li> <li>• Assumptions about contextual factors, causal mechanisms, and stakeholders characteristics that affect the success of UNFPA humanitarian action are missing in the ToC diagram and narrative.</li> <li>• The evaluation does not demonstrate how ethical considerations were integrated across the entire process, including safeguards applied during preparation, design and reporting. In addition, while the report describes strong protections during data collection, these are not fully reflected. Specifically, the focus group discussion and key informant interview guides lack the necessary consent scripts.</li> <li>• Although lessons learned were requested in the inception report, the evaluation report does not contain specific lessons learned.</li> <li>• Many conclusions largely restate synthesized findings rather than consistently articulating judgements about the value, adequacy, or performance of UNFPA's humanitarian action.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Suggestions for future evaluators:</b> 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.</p>	

**Recommendations for improvement:**

- The evaluation team should strive for the executive summary to stay within the maximum page limit as requested by UNFPA. Recommendation headlines can be used in the executive summary, rather than presenting the complete recommendations including action points.
- The evaluation report should include a full stakeholder map and a detailed description of all stakeholder groups, in addition to providing a comprehensive analysis of their interests and needs, power and influence, and potential impact on the intervention.
- The ToC narrative should make explicit critical assumptions about the context, causality and stakeholders in the narrative and diagram and clearly label them as such. In the diagram, the three types of assumptions can be presented in a box next to the pathway of change or under it.
- The evaluation team should include a table in the report that explicitly outlines the ethical considerations across all the evaluation phases (for example, evaluator independence and conflict of interest, secure data management and storage, anonymization of quotes, balanced reporting, etc.). Standardized consent scripts should be integrated into all data collection tools and it should be clearly explained how consent was recorded (verbal, written, audio, digital).
- Conclusions should move beyond the synthesis of findings to articulate evidence-based judgements of the evaluation team, offering deeper analytical insights.
- As required in the inception report, The evaluation report should include carefully formulated lessons learned based on the design, implementation and monitoring of humanitarian action at UNFPA, so offices can learn from these experiences when designing, implementing and monitoring humanitarian preparedness and response efforts.

SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A:</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	67%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Can the executive summary inform decision-making?</b>		
	i Is a clear, standalone document useful for informing decision making, (a minimum of 5 pages, up to a maximum of 7 pages).	No	The executive summary is a clear standalone document that is useful for decision-making. It provides a sound overview of the evaluation, including the background, purpose, scope, objectives, methodology, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, it exceeds the recommended length for Executive Summaries with 13 pages in the PDF version and 10 pages in the MS Word version, especially because the complete recommendations (incl. action points) are presented.
	ii Includes all necessary components of the evaluation report, including: (1) overview of the context and intervention, (2) evaluation purpose, objectives and intended users, 3) scope and evaluation methodology, (4) summary of most significant findings, (5) main conclusions and (6) key recommendations	Yes	The executive summary includes all the necessary components for a comprehensive overview of the evaluation report. Overview of the Context and Intervention: It provides a detailed background of the global humanitarian context from 2019 to 2025, including the challenges posed by escalating conflicts, climate crises, and funding shortfalls. It outlines UNFPA's mandate to ensure rights and choices for all, with a focus on sexual and reproductive health (SRH) and gender-based violence (GBV) services in humanitarian settings. It also highlights key interventions such as the implementation of the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP), support for mobile clinics, provision of essential commodities, and innovative approaches like cash and voucher assistance (CVA). Evaluation Purpose, Objectives, and Intended Users: The executive summary clearly states the evaluation's dual purpose of accountability and learning, its objectives to assess UNFPA's capacity in humanitarian action, and its intended audience, including the UNFPA Executive Board, Humanitarian Response Division, and other stakeholders. Scope and Evaluation Methodology: It describes the evaluation's global, thematic, and temporal scope, as well as the mixed-methods approach used, including document reviews, interviews, focus group discussions, and sampling strategies. Summary of Most Significant Findings: The executive summary highlights key findings, such as UNFPA's progress in delivering SRH and GBV services, challenges in meeting the scale of humanitarian needs, and gaps in data collection and programmatic impact measurement. Main Conclusions: It provides six conclusions, addressing UNFPA's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and connectedness in humanitarian action. Key Recommendations: The executive summary outlines six critical recommendations, including elevating UNFPA's strategic role, focusing on high-impact services, enhancing operational agility, improving accountability and localization, strengthening continuum work, and developing a unified humanitarian data strategy.
	iii Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the evaluand (e.g., theme, intervention, programme, project, or strategy undergoing evaluation) and the evaluation.	Yes	The executive summary includes all significant information to understand the evaluand. The evaluation encompasses the entire humanitarian portfolio of UNFPA from 2019-2025. Overall, the information is clear and comprehensive, but not concise.
<b>SECTION B:</b>	<b>BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>	90%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Is the evaluand (i.e. intervention/policy/thematic area etc. that is to be evaluated) and context of the evaluation clearly described?</b>		

	i	Clear description of the evaluand (e.g., theme, intervention, programme, project or strategy undergoing evaluation), including: geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The background section provides a clear description of the evaluand, including the following details: <b>Theme/Intervention:</b> The evaluand is UNFPA's capacity in humanitarian action from 2019 to 2025. The evaluation assesses UNFPA's ability to prepare for and respond to emergencies, particularly in sexual and reproductive health (SRH), gender-based violence (GBV), youth, and data in humanitarian settings. <b>Geographic Coverage:</b> The evaluation is global in scope, covering all countries and regions where UNFPA has been active in humanitarian settings since 2019. It specifically includes 15 countries, with six selected for in-person field visits (Bangladesh, Chad, Colombia, Egypt, Moldova, and Uganda) and nine for desk reviews and remote interviews. <b>Implementation Period:</b> The evaluation covers the period from 2019 to 2025. <b>Main Partners:</b> The evaluation acknowledges collaboration with government partners, other United Nations agencies, multilateral development partners, women-led and women-focused organizations, and implementing partners. <b>Cost/Budget:</b> While the background section does not provide specific cost details, it mentions that over 40% of UNFPA's non-core resources were allocated to humanitarian interventions by late 2024. <b>Implementation Status:</b> The background section describes UNFPA's strategic evolution from a development-focused organization to a dual-mandate agency with a growing humanitarian footprint and highlights milestones such as the establishment of the Humanitarian Office in 2019, its reorganization into the Humanitarian Response Division in 2022, and the relocation to Geneva. However, an area for improvement in the background section is a limited presentation of the UNFPA key programming areas/priorities in humanitarian action, which are clearly reflected in the evaluation questions and findings: sexual and reproductive health (SRH) in emergencies, gender-based violence (GBV) in emergencies, meaningful engagement of young people in humanitarian action, and population data for humanitarian action. In addition, there are emerging areas such as cash and voucher assistance that could have been briefly described. Furthermore, UNFPA's support to implement key standards such as the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) and GBV in Emergencies are not mentioned, and flagship commodity support of UNFPA, notably provision of Inter-Agency Reproductive Health Kits and Dignity Kits, are also omitted. Overall, the assistance that UNFPA provides on the ground is not well-described. The context also does not sufficiently acknowledge the COVID-19 pandemic and its political, social and economic ramifications (e.g. reducing funding available for development and humanitarian support, increasing political polarization and helping right-wing populist movements to gain power, promoting a de-globalization effect given vulnerabilities of global supply chains, etc.).
	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 thematic area, intervention, programme, project or strategy).	Yes	There is a clear description of the political, social, economic and institutional context of the evaluand and how the context relates to the evaluand. It provides a detailed background of the global humanitarian context from 2019 to 2025, including the challenges posed by escalating conflicts, climate crises, and funding shortfalls. It also outlines UNFPA's evolving role as a dual-mandate agency integrating humanitarian and development work. A detailed overview of the evolving humanitarian reset is also provided. More detailed information could have been provided about the COVID-19 pandemic and its political, social and economic implications that influenced the evaluand.
	iii	Linkages between the evaluand and ICPD-related SDGs are outlined. This may include reference to ICPD benchmarks and relevant SDG targets and indicators.	Yes	The background section outlines the linkages between the evaluand and the ICPD-related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It highlights that UNFPA's humanitarian efforts contribute directly to achieving the SDGs, particularly: Goal 3: Health and well-being, through the provision of sexual and reproductive health (SRH) services and addressing preventable maternal deaths. Goal 5: Gender equality, through gender-based violence (GBV) prevention and response, and addressing harmful practices. Goal 16: Peace, justice, and strong institutions, through the Youth, Peace, and Security (YPS) agenda and other peace-responsive efforts. Furthermore, key international policy frameworks for humanitarian action are listed, such as the Grand Bargain, UNSC resolutions, Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction, etc. However, UNSC resolution 1325 on women, peace and security is not listed. While it is acknowledged that UN Women leads implementation of efforts in this area, UNFPA works across the triple continuum and therefore also should be guided by this resolution.
<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>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 (e.g., stakeholder map).	Yes	While the background section does not include a formal stakeholder map, a comprehensive stakeholder map is included as Annex 5 of the inception report, which clearly identifies the relevant stakeholders involved in or affected by the intervention, together with their roles and focus of engagement. The map covers stakeholders at country (field visit and desk review countries), regional, and headquarter levels, including UNFPA staff, UN entities (e.g. Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators, OCHA, other UN agencies), government counterparts, civil society and implementing partners, donors and service providers.
	ii	Stakeholders are analysed to understand their interests and needs, power and influence, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Partially	While the stakeholder map included in the inception report (Annex 5, p. 44) provides an overview of the stakeholders to be interviewed, it focuses on the interview themes only and does not provide an analysis to understand their interests and needs, power and influence (e.g. stakeholders' relative influence over the intervention or decision-making) or their potential impact (i.e. how stakeholders may positively or negatively affect, or be affected by, the intervention) on the evaluand.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>			100%
<b>Question 4.</b>	<b>Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>			

	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The evaluation makes a clear distinction between purpose, objectives and scope. The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined in the document; it is to assess UNFPA's capacity to address the growing humanitarian needs and challenges, including those driven by climate change, conflicts, and natural disasters. It is furthermore stated that the evaluation serves the dual purpose of accountability and learning to assess and report on UNFPA's evolving capacity to prepare for and respond to emergencies, and to analyze the extent to which lessons learned and recommendations from the 2019 evaluation of UNFPA's capacity in humanitarian action have been acted upon, in addition to drawing lessons for UNFPA's humanitarian action in view of the next UNFPA strategic plan. It explains why it was needed at that point in time, stating that the evaluation was commissioned in response to the evolving global humanitarian landscape, marked by an increase in the number and complexity of crises, as well as the need to take stock of progress made since the 2019 evaluation. The evaluation's intended use is to support evidence-based decision-making and demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources; and to contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base to accelerate the implementation of the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). The key intended users are UNFPA Humanitarian Response Division, UNFPA Programme Division, UNFPA business units at headquarters, and UNFPA Regional and Country Offices. The results of the evaluation are also expected to be of interest to a wider group of stakeholders, such as UNFPA Executive Board members and other UN organizations.
<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>		
	i Clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, including reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the inception report (if applicable).	Yes	The evaluation provides a clear and complete description of its objectives, including reference to changes made to the objectives outlined in the inception report. The objectives are explicitly stated as follows: Assess the relevance of UNFPA's humanitarian programming and its ability to adapt to the changing scale and nature of emergencies, as well as the needs of affected populations; Evaluate the efficiency of internal systems, processes, policies, and procedures in enabling timely and effective humanitarian action at all organizational levels; Assess the effectiveness and coverage of interventions across key thematic areas, including gender-based violence (GBV), sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), youth, and data; Analyze the integration of humanitarian principles, human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion, climate action, personal data protection, and social and environmental standards into programming; Examine UNFPA's ability to strengthen resilience and complementarity across the humanitarian-development-peace continuum; and Propose actionable recommendations for UNFPA's present and future humanitarian action. The references to changes in the report are as follows: The objectives were refined during the inception phase in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group. Additionally, one primary data collection tool (the online staff survey) was replaced by a secondary global staff survey that covered similar areas. No other changes to the objectives were made.
	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 evaluation's scope is explicitly stated and all three dimensions of the scope; thematic, geographic and temporal are covered.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	93%	<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 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 and sub-questions in the report are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation is framed by eight main questions, which are explicitly linked to the evaluation's objectives and purpose. These questions are structured around evaluation criteria such as relevance/appropriateness, effectiveness/coverage, efficiency, coherence, and connectedness.
	ii Evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators/ lines of inquiry, and methods for data collection, including relevant data sources.	Yes	The Evaluation Matrix is presented in Annex 5 of the report (and Annex 6 of the Inception Report). It contains the evaluation criteria, evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data collection methods and data sources. It is good practice to present data collection methods and sources in a column format in the evaluation Matrix, as this allows for a clear distinction of the expected methods and sources to measure each indicator and to empirically test the assumptions. This is a practice that could be replicated in other evaluations.
<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 relevant parts of the results chain-being tested by the evaluation, through a ToC, results chain or logical framework. This should be presented in both a visual (graphic or tabular) and accompanying narrative format.	Yes	There is a clear description of the intervention's intended results through a reconstructed Theory of Change (ToC). The ToC outlines how UNFPA's humanitarian inputs and activities are intended to contribute to its three transformative results: 1) Ending the unmet need for family planning; 2) Ending preventable maternal deaths; and 3) Ending gender-based violence and harmful practices. The ToC is presented both in narrative and graphic form. The ToC is described in detail in Section 1.4 (Reconstructed Theory of Change), explaining the inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes intended to achieve UNFPA's transformative results. The full Theory of Change is presented in Annex IV, providing a visual representation of the results chain.

	ii	Critical assumptions underlying the ToC, results chain or logical framework are clearly identified, including assumptions about causal relationships, contextual factors and stakeholder characteristics.	Partially	The ToC diagram situates the EQs along the pathway of change. However, the underlying assumptions are not explicitly described in the ToC narrative, neither in the main report, nor in the annex, or in the ToC diagram. While the ToC demonstrates how change is expected to happen, it fails to explain why it happens, under what conditions, and for whom as assumptions about causality, context, and stakeholders are missing. The ToC should have explicitly included the assumptions in the narrative, labelled as such, as well as in the diagram (for example, in a box next to the pathway of change or under it). Some assumptions regarding the context are implicit in the text, but assumptions about stakeholder characteristics and causal mechanisms are totally absent.
	iii	Comprehensive assessment of the logic, internal coherence and plausibility of the ToC; results chain or logical framework, and if required, it is refined or revised by the evaluators.	Yes	The report contains a comprehensive assessment of the logic, internal coherence, and plausibility of the Theory of Change (ToC). The evaluators analyzed the ToC during the evaluation process and refined it to ensure alignment with the evaluation questions and assumptions. The ToC includes all the required elements: Problem Statement: It is described as "needs" in the ToC diagram and narrative, identifying the global humanitarian challenges faced between 2019 and 2025. The specific needs relevant to UNFPA are sexual and reproductive health (SRH) services, disaggregated population data, gender-based violence (GBV) prevention and response, and youth access to essential services and opportunities. The ToC outlines Key Interventions, such as: Implementation of the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for SRH in crisis situations; Support for mobile clinics and Women and Girls Safe Spaces (WGSS); Provision of essential commodities like reproductive health kits; Advocacy for SRH and GBV as life-saving interventions; Capacity development of UNFPA staff and national partners to collect, manage, use and disseminate disaggregated population data; The Intended Results were: Outputs: This includes availability of SRH and GBV services; SRH, GBV and youth programming integrated across all humanitarian responses; and improve capacity of UNFPA staff and national partners to collect, manage, use and disseminate disaggregated population data. Outcomes: Improved access to quality SRH and GBV services, increased utilization of services, reduced exposure to GBV, and humanitarian action informed by population data. Impact: Achieving UNFPA's three transformative results: ending unmet need for family planning, preventable maternal deaths, and gender-based violence and harmful practices. The ToC outlines the Causal Connections (in the form of arrows) between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts, demonstrating how interventions are expected to lead to transformative results. The ToC furthermore identifies Assumptions about causal relationships (e.g., interventions will lead to measurable improvements in SRH and GBV outcomes), contextual factors (e.g., adaptability to evolving humanitarian crises), and stakeholder characteristics (e.g., effective partnerships with governments and local organizations).
<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	The evaluation design and methods are clearly described in the report, and they are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. Section 1.5 of the report provides a detailed explanation of the evaluation approach, methodology, and tools used to collect and analyze data. The evaluation applied a mixed-methods approach. AI technologies were used for content analysis, pattern recognition, and synthesis of large data sets, facilitating depth and speed in analysis. The use of AI adhered to UNFPA's AI Use Clause, ensuring ethical and responsible use, transparency, validation of results, and compliance with relevant internal regulations. Annex III provides further details on the specific AI methodologies and tools used, as well as the validation of AI-generated analysis and the ethical safeguards applied during the evaluation process. The dedicated annex on the AI use is exemplary. It is a good practice that all evaluations using AI should adopt to ensure full transparency of what and how it
	ii	Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources.	Yes	A mixed-methods approach was applied. Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust: Data collection methods were: In-depth document review: A comprehensive review of over 1,500 documents related to humanitarian response at UNFPA and within the wider humanitarian system; Key informant interviews (KIs): Remote and in-person interviews with 243 key stakeholders at global, regional, and country levels, including UNFPA staff, implementing partners, donors, government officials, and representatives from other United Nations agencies; Focus group discussions (FGDs): Conducted with 200 community members and rights holders, particularly women and girls, in six countries to ensure findings were contextually grounded.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	A multi-stage sampling strategy was applied to ensure representation across UNFPA's regions and different humanitarian contexts. The sampling strategy included the following: A) Country Selection: Stratified and purposive sampling was used to select 15 countries for the evaluation. Six countries (Bangladesh, Chad, Colombia, Egypt, Moldova, and Uganda) were selected for in-person field visits, representing one country per UNFPA region. Nine additional countries were selected for desk reviews and remote interviews. The report explains the criteria for country selection and provides justification for this design, including measures to ensure balance and representativeness (Annex I.); B) Key Informant Sampling: i) A stakeholder mapping exercise was conducted to identify key informants at global, regional, and country levels; ii) Purposive sampling was used to select key informants based on their engagement levels in the six field visits and nine desk reviews; and iii) A snowball sampling technique was employed, where interviewees were asked to identify further relevant key informants; and C) Focus Group Discussions (FGDs): Purposive and convenience sampling approaches were used to select participants for FGDs. Participants were grouped by sex and age where possible, with a focus on ensuring representation of vulnerable and marginalized groups, particularly women and adolescent girls.

	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.	Yes	The evaluation methods were adequate to test the Theory of Change (ToC). The methods were designed to ensure comprehensive data collection and analysis, addressing the evaluation questions and assumptions linked to the ToC. Overall, the methods were well-suited to rigorously test the ToC, providing a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of UNFPA's humanitarian action and its alignment with the intended outcomes.
	v) Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including explainability and full disclosure of the use of AI in the evaluation process, if applicable.	Yes	The evaluation provides a clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including explainability. The methodology is detailed and structured to ensure transparency and alignment with the evaluation's objectives. The evaluation team prepared a structured evaluation matrix during the inception phase, linking each evaluation question to specific assumptions and indicators derived from the theory of change (ToC). Data collection tools were designed around this matrix to ensure consistency between the evidence gathered and the evaluation framework. Qualitative data from interviews and focus group discussions were coded and categorized into pre-agreed themes based on the evaluation questions and assumptions. Thematic analysis was conducted to identify patterns and trends across the data set. Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical methods to assess coverage, effectiveness, and efficiency of interventions. Data from UNFPA dashboards, reports, and other sources were used to measure progress against targets and indicators. Artificial intelligence (AI) tools were employed to enhance content analysis, pattern recognition, and synthesis of large data sets. This approach improved the depth and speed of analysis while adhering to ethical and security guidelines. Findings were triangulated across multiple data sources (documents, interviews, FGDs, and quantitative data) to ensure reliability and validity.
	vi) Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation in its data collection and analysis, along with the mitigation measures implemented by the evaluation to address these limitations, where feasible.	Yes	Section 1.6 of the evaluation identifies several limitations, along with planned mitigation strategies and resulting outcomes. These limitations included: Incomplete Documentation and Stakeholder Availability; Transition to New Financial Management Systems; Limited Information from Key Informants; Security and Administrative Challenges; Impact of the 2025 Funding Crisis. Mitigation strategies and outcomes are presented for each limitation. These limitations were acknowledged and addressed to the extent possible.
<b>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:</b>			
	i) Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Yes	In Section 1.5, it is stated that the evaluation was conducted in accordance with (and in full alignment with the principles espoused by) the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluations, the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations, the UNFPA Country Programme Evaluation Handbook, and WHO Ethical and safety recommendations for researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies (p. 30). While stating that the evaluation is in full alignment with the principles embedded in the UNEG norms and standards for evaluation, it does not specifically mention them (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability). The specific ethical principles for evaluators, such as independence, impartiality, confidentiality, respect for stakeholders, and sensitivity to cultural and social contexts, are outlined in the evaluation report's Annex 5 (in Volume 2). The evaluation report reflects how ethical principles are applied in the evaluation's specific context. The report highlights the use of ethical safeguards in the data collection and analysis phase, including the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies that adhere to UNFPA's AI Use Clause, ensuring ethical and responsible use, transparency, validation of results, and compliance with internal regulations. Additionally, the report mentions that ethical guidelines precluded the participation of children under 12 years of age in focus group discussions, ensuring the protection of vulnerable populations, and that focus group discussions were conducted in safe spaces to ensure the safety and comfort of participants, particularly women and adolescent girls.
	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 evaluation report provides clear references to the ethical norms, standards and guidelines and examples of situations where the evaluation principles were adhered to (see question 9i). In addition, Annex II in the report's Volume 2 (pp. 11-12) provides an outline of how ethical issues were addressed in the evaluation. While ethical considerations related to data collection and data management are clearly addressed, particularly informed consent procedures, confidentiality safeguards, do-no-harm principles, and measures to protect sensitive information, the evaluation does not consistently articulate how ethical considerations were addressed across all the evaluation phases. The focus lies on the data collection phase. As a result, ethical considerations are only partially documented across the evaluation lifecycle. Furthermore, while the evaluation annex notes that "for rights holders participating in the evaluation, an appropriate script was developed to ensure their fully-informed consent in line with the evaluation obligation of respect for rights-holders", it is not included in the FGD protocol that is part of the research tools annex. The KII tool also misses a preamble to obtain informed consent and explain the voluntary nature of participation, protection of confidentiality and how the information will be used and who will have access to it.
<b>Question 10. 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.	Yes	Artificial Intelligence (AI) was used in the evaluation and clear descriptions of how this optimized the evaluation process are given in the report and the annex.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>100%</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	The findings are presented clearly and are organized along the evaluation criteria. Each finding section clearly corresponds to an evaluation question and opens with a summary statement. This structure is consistent throughout the document, ensuring clarity and alignment with the evaluation questions. All findings are numbered for ease of reference. Each finding is clearly labelled with a sequential number, making it easy to locate and reference specific findings throughout the document. While the findings section does not explicitly mention where supporting evidence can be found in the evaluation matrix, it is clearly stated in section 1.5.1 'Evaluation analytical approach' that the evaluation matrix links each criterion and question to clear assumptions tested via specific lines of inquiry, and that the Evaluation Matrix is provided in Annex V.
	ii Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Not Rated	As per the annotated EQA grid, this criterion is not rated since using the ToC in formulating findings is not an explicit requirement in the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook.
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?</b>		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.	Yes	The findings presented in the evaluation report are derived from credible data sources. The evaluation team employed a mixed-methods approach, including in-depth document reviews, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. The findings are supported by evidence collected from over 1,500 documents, 243 interviews, and 200 FGDs across six field visit countries and nine desk review countries. Additionally, the evaluation team used artificial intelligence tools to enhance content analysis and ensure the reliability of the findings. Each finding is explicitly linked to the evaluation questions and supported by data and stakeholder insights, ensuring credibility and transparency. Findings, data sources and data collection methods were triangulated. Triangulation was systematically applied to enhance the reliability of findings through the comparison of multiple data sources and methods. The presentation of findings reflects this approach, with triangulation explicitly referenced in several cases (e.g. Findings 17, 31, 33, and 34). In other findings, triangulation is evident through the integration of different data sources, even where it is not explicitly labelled as such (e.g. Findings 1 and 3). Overall, this demonstrates consistent use of triangulation to validate findings across the report. Furthermore, findings are presented both at the output and outcome levels. For example: findings 6, 10, 20 and 25 are at output level, while findings 9, 12 and 13 are at outcome level. While the evaluation provides detailed output-level data, it highlights challenges in systematically measuring and demonstrating sustained outcomes. As a good practice, findings include footnotes to the actual sources of data.
	ii Findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented, both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	The findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented, and the report is candid in presenting both positive and negative findings. The findings are supported by both quantitative data (e.g., service delivery statistics, funding trends, deployment metrics) and qualitative insights from the interviews and focus group discussions, and these are clearly referenced in the presentation of the findings. The evaluation also identifies gaps and challenges, such as inconsistent application of Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) mechanisms, fragmented data systems, and limited integration of youth, which are measured against the benchmarks and standards set by UNFPA and the broader humanitarian community, and as specified in the Evaluation Matrix. The evaluation effectively uses performance indicators, benchmarks, standards, and other means of comparison to assess the effectiveness of UNFPA's humanitarian action. It references globally recognized standards like MISP, Sphere, and IASC guidelines, as well as internal benchmarks such as strategic plan targets and evaluability assessments. These comparisons provide a robust framework for evaluating UNFPA's performance and adherence to humanitarian principles.
	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 lack thereof - from outputs to high level results).	Yes	The evaluation report clearly identifies causal factors leading to the achievement or non-achievement of results across various dimensions. These factors are categorized in the report as contextual, organizational, and managerial. Contextual Factors mentioned are: Global Humanitarian Challenges; Funding Constraints; Humanitarian Reset; and Variability in national and regional contexts. Organizational Factors are Strategic Gaps; Internal Fragmentation; Human Resources Challenges; and Supply Chain Inefficiencies. Managerial Factors are: Leadership Capacity; Operational Bottlenecks; and Data Management Deficits. Positive Factors Contributing to Results include: Innovative Programming; Localization Efforts; and Rapid Deployment Mechanisms. Overall, the report provides a comprehensive analysis of these causal factors, linking them to specific findings and recommendations to address gaps and build on strengths. The evaluation findings consistently identify causal factors, and the majority of them provide insights into the reasons behind observed outcomes or challenges. For example: under Finding 1: Strategic Positioning as a Humanitarian Actor, the evaluation identifies the absence of a stand-alone humanitarian strategy and inconsistent prioritization of humanitarian work as causal factors for UNFPA's limited strategic positioning as a global humanitarian actor. Under Finding 5: Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), the evaluation highlights gaps in community feedback mechanisms and inconsistent application of AAP as causal factors for limited responsiveness to community needs. Under Finding 7: SRHR Coverage, the evaluation identifies resource limitations, short-term funding cycles, and the global funding crisis of 2025 as causal factors for UNFPA's inability to meet the scale of SRHR needs. Under Finding 13: Humanitarian Data Systems, the evaluation points to fragmented systems, interdivisional disconnects, and a lack of unified data strategy as causal factors for UNFPA's limited ability to demonstrate programmatic impact; and under Finding 24: Humanitarian Supply Chain, the evaluation identifies long lead times, inflexible kit contents, and restrictions on local procurement as causal factors for delays in commodity delivery, which undermine UNFPA's credibility as a humanitarian actor.
<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 report assesses the adequacy of the intervention's planning, monitoring and reporting system. It assesses Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) tools and their usage and highlights several aspects related to M&E tools, for example: (i) Fragmentation and Inconsistency: UNFPA's systems for humanitarian data compilation, analysis, and sharing lack cohesion and organization-wide consistency. This fragmentation leads to challenges in evidence-based decision-making and limits the ability to demonstrate programmatic impact (Finding 13); and (ii) Heavy Administrative Burden: resources and energy are often captured by a heavy burden of administrative reporting, which overshadows genuine monitoring, in-depth analysis, and organizational learning (Finding 13).
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)</b>	<b>38%</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 judgements of the evaluand.	Partially	The conclusions are generally grounded in the findings and present a balanced view of both positive developments and persistent challenges. However, several conclusions largely restate synthesized findings rather than consistently articulating judgements about the value, adequacy, or performance of UNFPA's humanitarian capacity. For example, conclusions on effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and humanitarian data describe progress and constraints but fall short of clearly judging whether performance is sufficient for the given scale of humanitarian needs. This weakness is most visible in the executive summary where the conclusions largely repeat information in the findings.
	ii Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings.	Yes	All conclusions are well-substantiated. They are directly supported by findings and there is a logical and traceable link to the findings. Each conclusion is derived from multiple findings.
<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Are lessons learned identified?</b>		
	i Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	No	The inception report (p. 1) specifically requested that lessons were to be drawn from this evaluation: "Draw lessons for UNFPA's present and future humanitarian action in view of the operationalization and implementation of the next UNFPA strategic plan." While lessons learned may be said to be incorporated in the conclusions of the report, there is no specific reference to lessons learned in the report, and no separate section dedicated to it
	ii Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluand as well as any areas of improvement.	No	Although lessons learned was requested in the inception report, the evaluation report does not contain specific lessons learned.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>100%</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 conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the conclusions. They are written in a clear and unambiguous language. They outline specific actions to be taken, providing operationalization plans for each recommendation. These plans include detailed steps, responsible units, priority levels, and estimated resource requirements, making them actionable and practical. Each recommendation is explicitly traced back to one or more conclusions, with a clear line of logic. For example: Recommendation 1: Elevating UNFPA's strategic and leadership role in humanitarian action is directly linked to conclusions 1 and 5, which highlight the need for a stand-alone humanitarian strategy and improved leadership to address inter-agency competition and strengthen UNFPA's positioning; Recommendation 2: Focusing on targeted, high-quality SRH and GBV services is derived from conclusions 2 and 5, emphasizing the need to prioritize vulnerable populations and safeguard UNFPA's leadership role in coordination. The recommendations are well-structured, actionable, and logically connected to the findings and conclusions, ensuring clarity and alignment with the evaluation's objectives.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users. Specific guidance is provided for its implementation (e.g. strategic or programmatic level, suggested actions/operational implications, and-responsible actors), as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are useful and actionable for the primary intended users. Specific guidance is presented for its implementation with clear actions presented in "Operationalization action plans" and "Additional operational actions for consideration" and identify the units responsible for their implementation. Furthermore, all proposed actions under each recommendation are classified as either high, medium or low priority with an indication of the level of funds needed for implementation. A minor point for improvement is that the target units for implementation do not include a clearly defined lead unit, and this is not the case for the proposed actions under all the recommendations. The UNFPA management response template differentiates between lead and supporting units. Hence, to facilitate the drafting of the management response, it would have been useful to indicate the lead unit under each recommendation.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the involvement of key stakeholders (e.g. evaluation reference group members), including those who will be affected by the recommendations.	Yes	The process to co-create recommendations with the evaluation reference group is clearly described in the evaluation report. It is stated that the recommendations were formulated and agreed via a multi-stage process: First, the evaluation team drafted suggestions for recommendations based on the reviewed and agreed (in principle) draft findings and conclusions that were reviewed by the Evaluation Reference Group and evaluation manager. Second, the suggestions for recommendations were then shared with the Evaluation Reference Group in advance of a recommendations workshop, during which the evaluators presented the draft recommendations for review and discussion. Third, feedback from this process was used to develop a revised set of draft recommendations that were then presented to the Evaluation Reference Group with the full, second draft report. Subsequent feedback informed the finalization of the recommendations and the report itself.
	iv Recommendations are prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	The three-tiered prioritization system is applied across all the recommendations. Each recommendation is rated either High, Medium or Low Priority, including an indication of the level of potential cost of implementation.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<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 evaluation, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of the evaluation manager, name of organization commissioning the evaluation, list of the evaluation reference group members, acknowledgements, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables,	Yes	All required elements are present in the opening pages of the report. They include the following elements: Title of evaluation; Timeframe of the evaluation; The Date of the report (year, as per IEO standard practice); Location of evaluation; Names of the evaluators; Name of the evaluation managers: Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation; A list of the evaluation reference group members and their roles; Acknowledgements; Table of contents; and a list of acronyms/abbreviations.
	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), additional details on ethical considerations, (country) case study reports, thematic papers or "deep dives."	Yes	The document includes all the required elements: The Evaluation's Terms of Reference is included as Annex XI. The Evaluation Matrix is included as Annex V. The list of Respondents/Interviewees is included as Annex IX. The Theory of Change is included as Annex IV (Reconstructed Humanitarian Theory of Change). The list of Site Visits is included in Annex I (Selection of Countries for Evaluation). Data Collection Instruments are included as Annex VI (Primary Research Tools, including Key Informant Interview and Focus Group Discussion templates). A list of Documentary Evidence is included as Annex VIII (List of Key References). Other appropriate annexes included: Additional details on methodology: Found in Annex II (Expanded Methodology). Additional details on ethical considerations: Discussed in the Evaluation Ethics section and Annex III.
<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 with numbered sections and clear titles, and it is well formatted. It adheres to the principles of clear organization and formatting: All main sections of the report are numbered and titled, making it easy to navigate the content; The report uses clear and descriptive headings throughout, ensuring that readers can easily identify the content of each section; The document maintains consistent formatting in terms of fonts, spacing, and layout, which enhances readability and professionalism; The table of contents is presented and detailed, allowing users to locate sections and annexes easily; The sections of the report follow a logical order, starting with the introduction, context, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations. This structure ensures that the report is coherent and easy to follow. Overall, the report is well-organized and formatted to meet the needs of its intended users.
	ii Structure and length accords to UNFPA guidelines for evaluation reports; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Partially	The PDF version of the evaluation report substantially exceeds the recommended page limit with its 146 pages of the main report, excluding annexes and country reports. The MS Word version of the report was 92 pages, only slightly beyond the page limit. Hence, this criterion is rated "partially."
<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 written in an accessible way for the intended audience. The language is professional, clear, and concise, with well-structured sections and subheadings that make it easy to navigate. The report is generally free from grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors, ensuring readability and comprehension.
	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	The report frequently uses visual aids such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, and photos to convey key information. These visual aids are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in the text. These visual aids are effectively integrated into the report, with clear references in the text to guide the reader to the relevant figures, tables, or maps. Multiple types of visual aids are used and they are clearly labelled with titles/captions, numbers, and legends. They are well formatted and easy to read. They are consistently referenced in the text to enhance the intended users' understanding of the report's key results.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)</b>	92%	<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 rights 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	Cross-cutting issues such as a human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, and Leave No One Behind (LNOB) are integrated into the core elements of the evaluation. In the Evaluation Design and Methodology: The evaluation explicitly incorporates these cross-cutting issues into its analytical framework and evaluation questions. For example, the evaluation assesses the integration of humanitarian principles, human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion, and LNOB into UNFPA's humanitarian programming (Evaluation Question 4). The data collection tools demonstrate deliberate efforts to capture the perspectives of vulnerable and marginalized groups, particularly women, adolescent girls and crisis-affected community members, including through focus group discussions and rights-holder consultations. However, some population groups that are vulnerable are not addressed at all, such as LGBTQ+. In addition, it is unclear how questions considered context-specific left-behind groups that may only exist in a specific country within the sample. However, this does not affect the rating as it is clear that the evaluation made a conscious effort to consider the needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups and asked questions about them, including during focus group discussions.

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	All the evaluation questions were the integration of cross-cutting issues can be reasonably expected address cross-cutting issues such as the human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, Leave No One Behind (LNOB), and social and environmental standards. Evaluation questions 1, 3, 4, and 5 collectively address cross-cutting issues. Human rights and gender equality are primarily examined through evaluation questions 1, 3, and 5. Evaluation Question 1 (Relevance/Appropriateness) assesses the extent to which UNFPA's humanitarian strategy and interventions align with the needs and rights of affected populations, particularly women, girls, and other marginalized and vulnerable groups. Evaluation Question 3 (Effectiveness/Coverage) examines how UNFPA's humanitarian interventions contribute to the prevention, mitigation, and response to gender-based violence and harmful practices, which are central to both human rights and gender equality objectives. Evaluation Question 5 (Effectiveness/Coverage) further explores UNFPA's leadership in GBV in Emergencies coordination and its efforts to advance system-wide engagement on this issue. Disability inclusion is addressed mainly through evaluation questions 1 and 3. These questions assess whether UNFPA's humanitarian strategies and programmes adequately respond to the needs of marginalized and vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities. LNOB considerations are implicitly reflected in Evaluation Question 4 (Effectiveness/Coverage), which assesses how UNFPA supports the use of disaggregated population data to inform humanitarian responses. This focus enables the identification of populations furthest behind and supports more equal and inclusive assistance.
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), as feasible.	Yes	This is a corporate thematic evaluation of UNFPAs humanitarian work, and as such, disaggregation by population groups directly in the evaluation may not be relevant or feasible. The evaluation does provide examples of disaggregated data and differential results, however, and it identifies gaps in UNFPA's systematic data collection and analysis. It notes that UNFPA struggles to consistently measure and demonstrate sustained outcomes for specific population groups, such as reductions in maternal mortality or GBV risks.
iv	Intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis, looking at various and multiple forms of exclusion and discrimination (and how they overlap with each other) and how this may impact the performance or results of the evaluand.	Yes	Some intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis, where feasible given the quality of secondary data and limited disaggregation of primary data. While the evaluation explicitly considers various and multiple forms of exclusion and discrimination, such as gender, age, disability, and other vulnerabilities, analysis of how these factors overlap and impact the performance or results of UNFPA's humanitarian interventions is limited. For example, the evaluation highlights how UNFPA's programming addresses the needs of women and girls with disabilities. The evaluation found that UNFPA partnered with local organizations to improve accessibility to Women and Girls Safe Spaces (WGSS) for women and girls with disabilities in Egypt and Cox's Bazar. However, challenges in meeting the needs of these groups were noted, emphasizing the importance of addressing overlapping vulnerabilities (p. 69). The analysis also identifies specific exclusions faced by transgender women and <i>Hijra</i> communities in Bangladesh and populations with diverse sexual orientations and gender identities in Colombia (pp. 69-70). Furthermore, the evaluation shows that UNFPA's work in South Sudan integrates climate vulnerability assessments with GBV programming, revealing a 50% rise in GBV incidents in climate-affected areas. This demonstrates how environmental factors intersect with gender-based vulnerabilities, influencing the achievement of results (p. 54). Although other findings identify gaps in reaching vulnerable and marginalized populations, they focus on single forms of exclusion and discrimination only. For instance, the analysis of AAP mechanisms scrutinizes whether they effectively reach vulnerable people, noting specific failures to solicit feedback from rights holders in refugee settlements (p. 53). However, it falls short of analyzing whether, for example, it is more challenging for women with disabilities living in refugee settlements than others. Similarly, the evaluation assessed how UNFPA identifies the needs of groups facing intersecting vulnerabilities. Although it observed gaps in humanitarian needs assessments regarding the needs of young people and people with disabilities (p. 51), it does not provide an assessment of whether intersectionality was built into needs assessments or not. However, it is understandable that data constraints - a major finding of the evaluation - precluded more systematic intersecting data analysis.
v	Findings, conclusions and recommendations, address cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no-one behind, social and environmental as relevant.	Yes	All three components of the evaluation report - findings, conclusions, and recommendations - address cross-cutting issues, and they are integrated in several of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. In the Findings: The evaluation highlights the importance of addressing the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups, including women, girls, youth, and people with disabilities. It identifies gaps in the systematic application of LNOB and AAP mechanisms, as well as challenges in ensuring equitable partnerships with local actors. Disability inclusion is specifically mentioned in relation to SRHR and GBV programming, with examples of efforts to make services accessible to women and girls with disabilities. In the Conclusions: The evaluation concludes that while UNFPA has made progress in integrating cross-cutting issues, their operational application remains inconsistent. It emphasizes the need for more robust data and systematic approaches to demonstrate the impact of interventions on human rights, gender equality, and disability inclusion. In the Recommendations: The recommendations address these cross-cutting issues directly. For example: Recommendation 4 focuses on enhancing AAP and localization efforts, emphasizing community feedback mechanisms and participatory decision-making. Recommendation 5 calls for integrating and strengthening humanitarian-development-peace continuum work, including climate adaptation and the Youth, Peace, and Security agenda, which aligns with LNOB principles. Recommendation 6 emphasizes the need for a unified humanitarian data strategy to measure outcomes for SRHR and GBV, including disaggregated data to better address the needs of marginalized groups. Overall, the evaluation integrates throughout the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
vi	Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group.	Not Rated	There is no mention of recruitment of a young evaluator in the evaluation report, and it was not a requirement in the ToR.

Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	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.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation includes evaluation questions that explicitly focus on human rights and gender equality (HR&GE), especially Evaluation Questions 1,2,3,4 and 5. The evaluation criteria include HR&GE principles such as equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness and empowerment. The evaluation does not include a gender and power analysis. The evaluation uses rights-based and gender-sensitive indicators to measure progress on HR&GE results. Examples of gender-sensitive indicator applied in the evaluation are (see Evaluation Matrix in Annex V): Evaluation Question 1: Evidence of available, appropriate and practical rights-holder consultation mechanisms; Extent of UNFPA responsiveness to the needs and concerns expressed by crisis-affected populations; Evidence that UNFPA humanitarian programming adequately identifies and addresses the specific needs of the most vulnerable groups and those left furthest behind. Evaluation Question 2: Evidence that UNFPA humanitarian interventions reach the most vulnerable and those left furthest behind; Degree to which humanitarian principles, human rights and gender equality are integrated in the implementation of and reporting on UNFPA SRHR humanitarian interventions. Evaluation Question 3: Humanitarian principles, human rights and gender equality are integrated in the implementation of and reporting on UNFPA GBV humanitarian interventions; Satisfaction levels of assisted populations (women, men, boys, girls, and marginalised/vulnerable groups) with UNFPA-supported GBV services. Evaluation question 4: Presence of up-to date, disaggregated population dynamics data at country level. Evaluation question 5: Evidence of advocacy efforts to mainstream SRHR across joint work/coordination forums with other actors; Evidence of advocacy efforts to mainstream GBV across joint work/coordination forums with other actors.
	ii) A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation's stakeholder analysis and sampling methods integrate human rights and gender equality (HR&GE) considerations. Data sources are diverse and include HR&GE-relevant primary and secondary data. The evaluation methodology addresses gender issues, including the use of mixed methods data collection appropriate to evaluating gender equality and women's empowerment considerations. The sampling approach in the evaluation explicitly addresses HR&GE considerations through the following measures: (i) The evaluation used purposive sampling to ensure the inclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups, such as women, girls, youth, and people with disabilities, in the data collection process; (ii) where possible, FGD participants were organized into sex- and age-disaggregated groups to capture gender-specific insights; (iii) the sampling strategy for selecting countries considered diverse humanitarian contexts, including those with significant gender-based vulnerabilities, such as conflict zones, refugee settings, and areas affected by climate change. In addition, the evaluation team conducted a stakeholder mapping exercise to identify key informants and rights holders who could provide insights into HR&GE issues. This included representatives from women-led organizations, local NGOs, and community groups advocating for gender equality and human rights. Data analysis methods integrate gender considerations and disaggregate data by sex/gender and other relevant intersectional characteristics when feasible and relevant. Ethical standards are considered during data collection (for example, children under 12 years of age were not included in FGDs, referrals made available for women disclosing experience of violence during FGDs, etc.). However, it is unclear to what extent ethical standards were considered in other evaluation phases since the report provides limited information on <u>safeguards beyond data collection, processing and analysis.</u>
	iii) The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The findings include disaggregated data and explicitly present differences between diverse groups where feasible and relevant. The findings are transparently triangulated and validated to credibly represent the diverse groups. The conclusions discuss human rights and gender equality implications, but do not include the interventions' unintended or unanticipated impacts on diverse groups. The recommendations clearly address gender equality and women's empowerment issues and implications, and provide specific priorities for action to strengthen gender equality and women's empowerment efforts in the future.

- 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