



Organizational unit: Mongolia CO **Year of report:** 2021

Title of evaluation report: EVALUATION OF THE UNFPA SIXTH COUNTRY PROGRAMME OF ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MONGOLIA

Overall quality of report: Very good **Date of assessment:** 31 May 2021

Overall comments: This is a solid evaluation of the UNFPA Sixth Country Programme of Assistance to the Government of Mongolia. It covers all provinces and the six different types of UNFPA projects implemented across the country. (i) Telemedicine on MCH (ii) Combating GBV and Gender based projects (iii) Youth development Programme (iv) Support for Adolescent and Youth Health Cabinet (v) ISP, and (vi) UN Joint programme on Social Protection. The evaluation uses the OECD/DAC key criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability in addition to assessing coordination. It is a very thorough evaluation despite being carried out under covid restrictions. In terms of presentation, the summary as well as the report follow the permitted page limit. The Background section comprehensively describes development challenges, national strategies, gender statistics, and emerging issues related to COVID-19. The evaluators used a standard mixed methods approach. Findings are well presented and substantiated by qualitative as well as quantitative data, however, it would have been useful to discuss data reliability. Conclusions and recommendations are well presented and appear useful. Gender is integrated throughout the report, although there could have been a more detailed description of ethical considerations. The evaluation makes reference to CRPD and adequately cover people with disabilities, especially under question 1 (relevance) and there is a specific recommendation on improved targeting and inclusion of people with disabilities. The evaluators could have gone one step further by including a description in the mythology of efforts made to encourage the participation of people with disabilities in the evaluation process (since low involvement was noted). The report would also have benefitted from more sub-headings within the findings section, a formal table of contents for the annexes, and final editing.

Assessment Levels

Very Good strong, above average, best practice	Good satisfactory, respectable	Fair with some weaknesses, still acceptable	Unsatisfactory weak, does not meet minimal quality standards
--	--	---	--

Quality Assessment Criteria *Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)*

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
--	----------------------	--------------------------	------------------

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Partial	The report is clearly structured with distinction between each section. Although the language is appropriate, there are a number of grammatical issues and long sentences that suggest the report could have benefitted from further editing. i.e. "An interviewed CSO staff highlighted to take advocacy work for the action plan and demand its implementation" (p 46)
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	Yes	The report is 65 pages, which is less than the 70 page limit set for CPEs.
3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?	Yes	There are two separate annex documents. One is titled Obligatory Annexes and contains the required elements - therefore this criteria is met. However, it is suggested that all 77 pages of the ToR was not necessary to include and made it difficult to find the other elements especially as there was no page numbering. It was also difficult to navigate the second volume as there was not a formatted table of contents.

Executive summary

4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	Yes	The executive summary includes all required elements and contains adequate information to serve as a stand-alone document.
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	At 5 pages, the executive summary is reasonable in length.

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
----------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	------------------

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context

1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The evaluation report comprehensively describes the country background in terms of development challenges, national strategies, gender statistics, and emerging issues related to COVID-19.
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	The process of reviewing the ToC in a half day workshop with CO staff is described, and limitations are noted. There is minimal reference to the ToC in the findings although shortcomings with the programme logic are pointed out. For example, it is noted that the output indicators for the Integrated Support Programme need to be revisited (p 31). Annex E includes the reformulated ToC. It is quite an intricate diagram but with small type face. It would be easier to navigate if it also had explanatory text, including for why it covers Strategic Plan Outcomes #2 and #3 but not #1.
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>		
3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	Yes	The evaluation report body makes reference to the evaluation matrix provided in Annex 5 which includes criteria, evaluation questions, assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information, and methods and tools for data collection.
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The evaluation report clearly describes the data collection tools used to collect qualitative as well as quantitative data and provides the rationale for their selection. In addition, limitations with regards to data are also described. For example, It is noted that "it was difficult to find reliable source for data on the exact government budget on allocation for adolescents and youth SRH services".
5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	Yes	The evaluation report notes that the stakeholder mapping exercise was conducted during the design phase to identify both UNFPA direct and indirect partners (Annex 3). The evaluators also note that key stakeholders provided input into the design of the evaluation, validated the findings, and contributed towards finalization of recommendations.
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	Data analysis techniques for qualitative as well as quantitative data are clearly described.
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	Limitations related to data gaps and use of a purposive sampling strategy due to the COVID-19 pandemic and time constraints, along with mitigation strategies, are comprehensively described.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy is comprehensively described. Evaluators note that site selection was based on a purposive sampling method and the sample is not fully representative of CP6 interventions in the provinces, however, due consideration was given to reflect a combination of interventions covering diverse populations in the sampled sites. In addition it is noted that potential bias due to missing some populations was mitigated by information gathered via secondary sources and interviewing sources that were familiar with these projects and populations.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The evaluation report provides a total list of evaluation participants disaggregated by type and gender. Other characteristics such as visitors with disabilities are also highlighted.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues dealing with gender, human rights, disabilities, vulnerability, and coordination are integrated into the design. Furthermore, the methodology notes that a wide range of stakeholders were covered to fully assess the human rights and gender dimensions, as well as the extent that rightsholders (including the representatives of the most vulnerable and marginalized groups) were assessed.
3. Reliability of Data		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The evaluation team notes that data quality was maintained by triangulating the data sources and methods of collection and analysis.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Partial	The report describes qualitative as well as quantitative data sources used, however, it would have been helpful to discuss their reliability.

3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	Evaluators note that the evaluation follows UNEG guidelines and standards, as well as UNFPA's Handbook on "How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation at UNFPA". In addition, informed consent, confidentiality and gender representation were addressed in data collection. However ethical considerations could have been further explained, for example by including efforts to maximize participation of all participants in focus group discussions and to encourage people with disabilities to participate.
4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings in the evaluation report are backed by sources of evidence in the text, footnotes and the annexes.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The interpretations are clearly described and based on multiple sources of data which was made available during the evaluation period.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Partial	The findings and analysis are structured by outputs under the question. However, it would have been helpful if findings were structured in the order of the question numbers, and if more subheadings were used to break up text-heavy sections.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Causal connections are described wherever they are observed. In addition, the evaluators have noted unintended outcomes under section 4.6.1.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The findings analyze and show outcomes across different target groups including ethnic minorities.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The analysis presents different contextual factors which facilitate or hinder achievements under different outputs.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report covers marginalized and vulnerable groups including people with disabilities.
5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The conclusions are clearly derived from the evaluation findings and refer to the corresponding EQs and criteria.
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The conclusions are generally broader than the issues and findings and they reflect appropriate cross-cutting issues including gender and disability inclusion.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	These clearly stem from the findings and do not reflect any inherent bias.
6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations makes reference to the conclusions from where they are drawn.
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	They are directed towards responsible entities, and provide a detailed set of operational steps (labeled as Action Plans). They do not describe financial implications but it is noted that information on available resources for the next CP was not available.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Recommendations appear impartial, balanced and address key cross cutting issues including vulnerability, gender rights, and disability-inclusion.

4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	They are prioritized.
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?		<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) The objectives and scope do not indicate that the evaluation will assess whether the CP as a whole is gender responsive. = 0</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation does not have a standalone criterion on gender or human rights, however, it is covered under relevance. = 2</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) Gender is covered under 'EQ2: How the design and implementation of the country programme align with human rights and gender responsive?'. =3</p> <p>d. 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?(Score: 0-3) This is taken up to some extent in the evaluation matrix = 2</p>
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?		<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? (Score: 0-3) Methodology section notes that evaluation used approaches that were gender and human rights-based and theory-driven. In addition, evaluators mention that a range of stakeholders were consulted to reflect multiple views to fully assess the human rights and gender dimensions. However, it would have been helpful to discuss more about how gender disaggregated data was collected. = 2</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation uses standard mixed-methods approach to collect data which is appropriate to evaluate GEEW considerations, however, it would have been helpful to describe how the universe was defined in sampling. = 2</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) Evaluation respondents include a diverse range of stakeholders including implementing partners, civil society, programme participants as well as donors. = 3</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3) Rightsholders, including representatives of vulnerable and marginalized groups, are among the respondents. = 3</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) Ethical considerations are adequately described including informed consent, integrity and respect for confidentiality. =3</p>

<p>3. Do 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? (Score: 0-3) The country context section includes analysis on HRGE and social issues including GBV, SRH rights, and urban vs rural poverty levels. = 3</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? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation findings triangulate the sources of data and there is use of quotes from rightsholders including victims of GBV, however, it would have been helpful to highlight voices of different groups a bit more. = 2</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) The subsection on Unintended Effects touches on unanticipated effects on HRGE such as new formats developed for documenting sensitive information at clinics. However, data collection tools do not have questions to explicitly capture this data. = 2</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3) Multiple recommendations address GEEW. = 3</p>
--	--

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels (**)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)	7			
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			
3. Reliability of data (11)		11		
4. Analysis and findings (40)	40			
5. Conclusions (11)	11			
6. Recommendations (11)	11			
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	89	11		
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very good			