

# UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: January 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		<b>96%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
●●●●●	Excellent	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory	3	
●●○●●	Fair	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Formative evaluation of the organizational resilience of UNFPA in light of its response to the COVID-19 pandemic
<b>Region</b>	
<b>Country</b>	Global
<b>Year of report</b>	2024
<b>Business Unit/programme country (manaqina evaluation)</b>	UNFPA Evaluation Office
<b>Date of assessment review (month/year)</b>	June 2024
<b>Name of assessment review firm</b>	IOD-PARC

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (list provided below)</b>	3, 5
<b>UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered (lists provided below)</b>	
Three transformative results	Applicable to all
Six outputs	Applicable to all
Six accelerators	Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	Yes
Humanitarian evaluation	Yes
<b>Evaluation evaluand (e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)</b>	Thematic area
<b>Evaluation type (e.g. formative, summative, developmental)</b>	Formative
<b>Geographic scope (e.g. global, regional, national)</b>	Global

**EQA Summary:** The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (strengths and weaknesses), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight good practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation. The rater should also highlight how cross-cutting issues were addressed in the report. Considerations of significant constraints (e.g. humanitarian crisis or political turmoil) should also be highlighted here.

This report is highly rated for its thoroughness and clarity, fully meeting UNFPA evaluation standards, and in some aspects, going beyond what is required. It showcases good practice across several aspects of the report, considering the global scope, humanitarian crisis, and numerous questions addressed. The evaluand is clearly described, covering the aetiology, history, and impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Stakeholders at global, regional, and country levels are well-identified and analyzed, aiding data collection direction. The purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation are well-defined. The Theory of Change is detailed, with relevant evaluation questions and causal chains supported by an analytical narrative.

The evaluation methodology is robust, featuring a complex sampling strategy for case study and desk study countries. Evaluation questions align with the Theory of Change and UNFPA corporate strategies, targeting transformative results and preparedness characteristics. Limitations were identified and mitigated during the inception phase, minimizing issues in data collection. Guidance and ethical standards are adhered to. The evaluation and management team systematically organized the process, involving stakeholders through structured workshops and regular consultations.

Findings are based on in-depth evidence, assessing UNFPA's policies, strategies, preparedness, and response. They are balanced, presenting both positive and negative aspects with examples from six case study countries and nine desk review countries. Cross-cutting issues like monitoring, gender equity, gender-based violence, and attention to marginalized groups are well incorporated. The report is highly rated according to UNSWAP standards. Conclusions are clear and well-connected to findings and recommendations, which are actionable, prioritized, and time-bound. The report is comprehensive, including numerous visuals to illustrate key points.

Key strengths of the evaluation report include:

- The evaluand is clearly described including the aetiology, history and impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Stakeholders at global, regional and country levels are clearly identified in matrix form and are analyzed with regard to their potential contribution to the evaluation giving strong direction to data collection by the evaluation team.
- The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clearly described.
- The Theory of Change is well presented in diagrammatic form in Annex 4, noting the relevant evaluation questions pertaining to the outputs and outcomes and the causal chains, accompanied by a well-developed analytical narrative.
- The evaluation methodology is strong and includes a complex sampling strategy for identifying the case study countries and desk study countries to be representative and balanced.
- Evaluation questions clearly follow the Theory of Change and its basis in UNFPA corporate strategies and policies aiming for the transformative results as well as the six key characteristics of preparedness.
- Limitations and mitigation measures identified in the inception phase allowed most limitations to be minimized in the data collection phase.
- Guidance and ethical standards are well respected.
- Systematic organization of the process by the evaluation and management team to draw in stakeholders and gain their agreements and advice through frequent consultations with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), among others, occurred through carefully structured workshops early in the process with agreed topics of discussion that facilitated regular communications.
- The findings provide in-depth use of the evidence to assess how well UNFPA carried out policies and strategies including its level of preparedness and response as well as in post-crisis.
- Findings are both positive and negative and effectively draw in examples from the six case study countries and nine desk review countries.
- Cross cutting issues such as monitoring, gender equity including gender-based violence, and attention to marginalized and most vulnerable groups are well incorporated.
- The report is highly rated according to UNSWAP standards.

Conclusions are clearly presented and well connected to findings and recommendations with connections clearly highlighted.

**Suggestions for future evaluations:** 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.

Key suggestions are as follows.

1. The executive summary should be suitable for the needs of executive readers with no more than the seven maximum recommended number of pages, but preferably five. To meet the page length standard, the spacing and text not needed by executive readers can be reduced.
2. The executive summary should represent the contents of the report as much as possible and avoid including findings in the conclusions, phrasing conclusions in a succinct analytical form to allow readers to effectively connect them to the recommendations.
3. The SDGs 3 and 5 are important to mention with relevant indicators in Section 2.2. The fact that disaster risk reduction is cross cutting in 10 of the 17 SDGs is also important and SDG 1 is key to increasing resilience.
4. The evaluation matrix in Annex 5 should indicate the data sources more specifically, such as case study countries, desk review countries, global or regional sources, and the possible informants such as management, government partners, youth groups, among others, as well as the main secondary sources.
5. Since the six country notes would be of great interest, the text should mention whether they are found in a separate document or forthcoming. If Annex 9 will not be completed, it should be removed from the Table of Contents.
6. It is useful to mention the members of the ERG in the annexes and note in the main text whether youth are included in the ERG or in other advisory capacities

SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A:</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 1.</b>	Can the executive summary inform decision-making? i. Is a clear, standalone document useful for informing decision making, (a minimum of 5 pages, up to a maximum of 7 pages).  Note: YES - the executive summary is within the indicated maximum page limit. PARTIAL - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by 1 to 2 pages. NO - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by more than 2 pages.	Partially	The executive summary is a clear, standalone document useful to inform decision making. It is a total of 9 pages which is two pages over the 7 page maximum limit. The summary is widely spaced which adds to its length. To be accessible to executive readers, the maximum page length of 7 should be respected but 5 pages is optimum. This can be achieved by decreasing the spacing and reducing or eliminate text not specifically needed by executive readers.

	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	Partially	The summary includes almost all the necessary components including 1) the overview of the context and intervention, 2) the purpose and objective, 3) scope and evaluation methodology; 4) summary of most significant findings, 5) main conclusions, and 6) key recommendations. It does not mention the users which according to the introduction section are extensive and include seven sections of UNFPA and a wider group of stakeholders. The users should be summarized and placed in the purpose and scope section. The conclusions contain findings to some degree and findings should be included in the previous section with conclusions expressed in a succinct and analytical form to allow readers to more readily connect them to the recommendations.
	iii	Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Yes	The summary includes all significant information in a concise clear manner to allow readers to understand the theme and the evaluation.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>			90%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 2.</b>		Is the evaluand (i.e. intervention/policy/thematic area etc. that is to be evaluated) and context of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Clear description of the evaluand (e.g. intervention), including: geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	Section 2 covers the background and context. The report includes a clear description of the background of the intervention in organizational resilience from a strategic point of view, including the roots in the UN system, Organizational Resilience Management System (ORMS) and in UNFPA corporate policy and strategic plans for emergency preparedness and response. Section 2.2 covers the UN and UNFPA responses to COVID-19. The response covered global, regional and country levels, and was targeted particularly toward the fragile contexts. The UNFPA budget covered 63 fragile and humanitarian countries. Global partners mentioned are members of the IASC, WHO and OCHA over the period of 2020 to 2023.
	ii	Clear description of the context of the evaluand (e.g. economic, social and political context, relevant aspects of UNFPA's institutional, normative and strategic framework, cross cutting issues such as gender equality and human rights, disability and LNOB dimensions) and how the context relates to the evaluand (e.g. key drivers and challenges that affect the implementation of the intervention/policy/thematic area	Yes	Section 2.2 covers the history of the COVID-19 pandemic and its aetiology, its socio-economic and environmental impacts, and notes that the pandemic added to the vulnerabilities of marginalized and excluded populations. Leadership of the UN response is discussed. The objectives of the UNFPA response are set within the overall UN response and relevant strategies and plans specific to the pandemic reviewed.
	iii	Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Partially	In Section 2.2 mention is made of the setbacks in countries toward reaching the SDGs but no specific SDGs are mentioned with regard to the evaluand. In the least the report should refer to SDGs 3 and 5 and mention some of the relevant SDG indicators. The fact that disaster risk reduction is cross cutting in 10 of the 17 SDGs is also important and SDG 1 is key to increasing resilience. The ICPD benchmarks are not specifically mentioned although they are set out in the objectives of the evaluand. The ICPD is referred to in the Theory of Change discussion (Annex 5), however, since the ICPD forms the basic functioning of UNFPA, it deserves mention in the main text.
<b>Question 3.</b>		Are key stakeholders clearly identified and analysed?		
	i	Clear identification of key stakeholders which should include implementing partner(s), development partners, rights holders, and duty bearers among others; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map).	Yes	A stakeholder mapping is found in Annex 3 under the Methodology discussion. (Note: This mapping matrix should be specifically referred in the main text so it can be easily located as it is a critical feature of the final report.) The mapping is comprehensive and includes stakeholders for consultation at the country level for both country visits and desk review countries, at the headquarters level, and regional level. The matrix has a column dedicated to the foci of the data collection and data that the evaluation team should collect from each of the stakeholder individuals and groups. Duty bearers are referred to and community members included. This is a somewhat different organization of the typical stakeholder information but is very useful and notes the roles and relationships.
	ii	Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Yes	The stakeholder mapping in Annex 3 covers the duties and interests and the relevant information that will be obtained to contribute to the evaluand.
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>			100%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 4.</b>		Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	In Section 1, the Introduction, the purpose of evaluation and scope are clearly defined. It is stated that the evaluation was needed at this point in time to strengthen UNFPA organizational and programmatic resilience. The intended use and users in UNFPA (7 sections or divisions) are listed and mention is made of external stakeholders who will find the report useful.
<b>Question 5.</b>		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i	Clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, including reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	The Introduction section notes that the aim of the evaluation builds on the ToR which is annexed in Volume II. The objectives match those of the TOR.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope (e.g. thematic, geographic, and temporal) of the evaluation, covering what will and will not be covered, as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political, humanitarian or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	The scope is clearly described geographically, thematically and temporally and specifies that the timing started from March 2020 when COVID-19 was officially declared a pandemic. The scope includes UNFPA strategies and programmes implemented within the COVID-19 context not limited to the response and includes both development and humanitarian settings. Geographically the evaluation includes all countries and regions globally.
<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>			96%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>

<b>Question 6.</b>	<p>Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use?</p> <p><i>Note: UNFPA evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria such as: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (not necessarily applicable to all evaluations) and, for country programmes that include circumscribed and limited humanitarian and/or emergency interventions, the criteria of coverage and connectedness.</i></p>		
	<p>i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.</p>	Yes	<p>Section 3.1 discusses the nine evaluation questions and notes that the evaluation team with the Independent Evaluation Office and the evaluation reference group further refined the questions and divided them where necessary making them suitably analytical. The relevant criteria are specified and aligned with the questions. They are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation.</p>
	<p>ii Evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, indicators, lines of inquiry, benchmarks, assumptions, source of data, methods for data collection and analysis, and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.</p>	Partially	<p>The evaluation matrix (Annex 5) clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, assumptions to be tested as sub-questions, and illustrative indicators. The methods of data collection are noted (desk review, key informant interview or focus group discussion) and are checked as appropriate. To be fully developed, the matrix should indicate the sources more specifically, such as case study countries, desk review countries, global or regional sources, and the possible informants such as management, government partners, youth groups, among others. Typically, the secondary sources to be reviewed by the team are also noted.</p>
<b>Question 7.</b>	<p>Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?</p>		
	<p>i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.</p>	Yes	<p>Annex 4 presents the reconstructed Theory of Change (ToC) with diagram and in-depth discussion of the intervention's intended results. The ToC had been reconstructed for this evaluation and thus it entirely pertains to and is being tested by the evaluation.</p>
	<p>ii Causal relationships between the various elements (e.g. outcomes, including the three or relevant Transformative Results, outputs) of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework are presented in narrative and/or graphic form).</p>	Yes	<p>The causal relationships between the various elements of the ToC are very well articulated. Annex 4 presents both narrative and graphic forms of the reconstructed ToC. The causal relationships are analyzed in the narrative and based on the UNFPA strategic approach, the three transformative results, and the characteristics of preparedness which would contribute to UNFPA resilience. Assumptions and barriers are restricted to the responsibilities held by UNFPA. Five key output areas are articulated and lead to three outcomes which feed into the transformative results.</p>
	<p>iii Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework, and if requested in the ToR, it is retrofitted/reconstructed by the evaluators.</p>	Yes	<p>The comprehensive analysis and assessment of the theory of change had been requested by the ToR and was reconstructed by the evaluation team. It was also reviewed by the evaluation reference group. The evaluation in Annex 4 effectively provides the analysis.</p>
<b>Question 8.</b>	<p>Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</p>		
	<p>i Evaluation design and set of methods are clearly described, and are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope.</p>	Yes	<p>The evaluation approach and methodology are discussed in Section 3 with more details provided in Annex 3. Evaluation design and set of methods are clearly described and are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and particularly given the enormous scope. The evaluation approach is clearly participative and the stage was set by discussions held by the evaluation team with stakeholders and the evaluation reference group. Data collection tools were tested in a pilot country, Lebanon.</p>
	<p>ii Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR).</p>	Yes	<p>Data sources are clearly described and relevant and robust and include mainly qualitative and to some degree quantitative sources. The stakeholder mapping in Annex 3 provides the qualitative data sources and the quantitative are noted as being found in the secondary sources or as possible derived from qualitative analysis. Annex 6 provides a listing and content of seven additional analyses such as continuity plans, expenses, and key performance indicators. The previous evaluations at global, country and regional levels are also reviewed.</p>
	<p>iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).</p>	Yes	<p>The methodology sections 3 and Annex 3 provide a sampling strategy for selection of the countries for the 6 countries to be visited by the team and 9 additional countries for desk review. The criteria for selection is set out and include seven factors to be considered. The countries were then shortlisted on a matrix found in Annex 3 and contains additional criteria. The diversity of perspectives captured is well illustrated through the stakeholder mapping and the country selection which included a cross section of country typologies.</p>
	<p>iv Methods allow for rigorous testing of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework (e.g. methods help to understand the causal connections, if any, between outputs and expected outcomes (3TRs).</p>	Yes	<p>The methods allow for rigorous testing of the theory of change, and the evaluation questions are linked to the Theory of Change both in outputs and outcomes as applicable as found in the listing in Annex 3.</p>
	<p>v Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.</p>	Yes	<p>Data Synthesis and analysis is discussed on page 26. Data was coded to determine themes and patterns for analysis by the team. The methods employed included descriptive analysis, content analysis, comparative analysis and triangulation, all of which are fully described.</p>
	<p>vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation in its data collection and analysis, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).</p>	Yes	<p>Section 3.2 presents a matrix on limitations and mitigation measures. Four limitations were envisaged in the inception phase but three did not substantially materialize. The limitation noted on data gaps was experienced to some degree and discussed by the team in the findings. The exercise illustrates the value of advance identification of the risks and early mitigation including careful planning and communication to avoid problems with data availability and logistics for field work.</p>

<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Are ethical issues and considerations described?</b> The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Yes	There is explicit and contextualized reference to United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) obligations. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluations and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. It also conforms to the evaluation handbook How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation at UNFPA, the WHO publication Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Researching, Documenting and Monitoring Sexual Violence in Emergencies and adheres to the principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility.
	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 as well 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). If Artificial Intelligence is used in the evaluation, there should be transparency and disclosure on the ethical and responsible use of AI in the report.	Yes	There is a clear description of ethical issues and considerations. Pages 29 and 30 of the Volume 2 Annex 3 present a matrix of relevant principles and how the evaluation has put the principles into practice. These included confidentiality, safeguarding, integration of human rights and gender equality, dignity, and continuous consultation with stakeholders. No AI was used. Youth were not directly interviewed.
<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?</b>		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of AI or new technology for data gathering, content analysis, outcome harvesting), or components introduced to enhance inclusion and participation in the evaluation processes (e.g. youth steering committee), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Not Rated	The evaluation was very systematically organized throughout the phases to collect agreements and advice and enhance inclusion and participation. This was partly decreed by the ToR. The degree of consultation and participation with stakeholders demonstrated by the team was extremely strong while not quite explicitly innovative. The team held consultations prior to the data collection and vetted themes in order to initiate further discussions with UNFPA.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	100%	<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 of the evaluation's questions	Yes	Section 4 presents the findings (54 in all) which are clearly organized by the evaluation questions. The section usefully presents a summary of findings pertaining to the questions ahead of the relevant findings discussion. The sources of the findings are footnoted and a wealth of sources is noted to provide sufficient levels of evidence. All evaluation questions are answered and well substantiated.
	ii Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	While the findings do not explicitly mention the Theory of Change, they are analyzed according to the main outputs and outcomes as seen in the Theory and carefully follow the main tenets of the theoretical underpinnings such as the preparedness characteristics, the transformative results, the five key output areas, and the three outcomes. The Theory diagram in Annex 3 Figure 6 has been labeled according to the questions that pertain to each of the inputs, outputs and outcomes. Seven of the main questions are noted with the relevant pre-crisis, response and post-crisis phases.
<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 through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data and presents outputs and outcomes as relevant for the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.
	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 supported by the evidence presented and revert back to the indicative indicators mentioned on the evaluation matrix and as noted in the Theory of Change. Findings appear in both positive and negative forms and these are clearly supported by the evidence presented. Evidence is brought in from the case study and review countries as well as regional and global sources.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from outputs to high level results).	Yes	The causal factors are brought into the discussion and follow the causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) which are found in the Theory of Change diagram with the causal pathways for each indicated by arrows. Although the causal factors would vary from country to country, the findings capture both positive and less successful activities and strategies. The findings are rich with examples to illustrate the overarching analysis.
<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	Monitoring is effectively addressed in the evaluation and is a cross cutting theme touched upon in many of the questions, with several questions being focused on the adequacy of the planning, monitoring, and reporting system. For example, Findings 20, 21 and 22 under Evaluation Question 4, among others, review the positives and negatives in the monitoring systems and tools at country and global levels given the high demand for data during the pandemic. Various M&E tools are brought in and the use of them by vertical and horizontal structures that supported decision making. Remote monitoring is discussed under Evaluation Question 7.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)</b>	100%	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluand?</b>		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	Section 5 presents the Conclusions. Given the large numbers of findings, there are only six and they are well formulated, well balanced and unbiased, and note the linkages to the numbered findings with each conclusion.
	ii Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings which are linked to each conclusions. Given the broad expanse of the evaluation scope, they are necessarily providing deeper insight and analytical and summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.

<b>Question 15.</b>	Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]		
	i Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	Not Rated	Lessons learned do not form a separate section of the report and this is not required by the ToR.
	ii Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluand as well as any areas of improvement.	Not Rated	Lessons learned do not form a separate analytical section.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 16.</b>	Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?		
	i Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Section 6 presents the recommendations which consist of seven key recommendations and key actions. (Note: the introduction to the section incorrectly mentions eight recommendations.) Recommendations are clearly formulated and illustrated in a matrix for each which notes relevant responsible business units and the priority/timeframe. They are linked to specific conclusions which are linked to the findings.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users. Specific guidance is provided for its implementation (e.g. actions, deadlines, responsible actors), as appropriate.	Yes	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users. Specific guidance is provided for its implementation including the responsible actors, the actions and the priority and urgency of time deadlines.
	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 introductory paragraph to Section 6 describes the process for vetting the draft recommendations which included the evaluation reference group and relevant business unit heads via a recommendations workshop and bilateral meetings held in mid-October 2023. The key actions were assigned to the relevant business unit.
	iv Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized. A matrix provided after the introduction defines high, medium and low priority and the short (immediate), medium (1-2 year) and long (2-3 years) timelines.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>	Does the evaluation report include all required information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluation and/title of evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluand, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes); list of acronyms/abbreviations.	Yes	The opening pages include the name, title, timeframe, location of evaluand, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes); list of acronyms/abbreviations. Only the date of the report is missing however, it seems to be still in process.
	ii Annexes include, if not in body of report: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology (e.g. inception report), case study reports.	Yes	The Annexes form a separate volume and include the terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, the Theory of change, data collection instruments, list of documentary evidence as well as additional details on methodology. The Annex 9 which provides space for country notes on the six case study countries is blank. If the case studies have been submitted as a separate document or are forthcoming, this should be noted in the main text. If the Annex will not be completed, it should be removed from the Table of Contents.
<b>Question 18.</b>	Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?		
	i The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report structure is logical and navigable. It is well formatted with main titles and sub-titles all numbered.
	ii Structure and length accords to UNFPA guidelines for evaluation reports; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.  <i>Note: Maximum pages for the main report, excluding executive summary and annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations and 50 for other types of evaluations)</i>	Partially	The structure accords to UNFPA guidelines for evaluation reports. The page count is 87 without the exec sum which exceeds the 80 page recommended limits for thematic evaluations. The ToR is not seen to recommend the page limits insofar as it is found in Annex 1. The broad scope of the evaluation is well noted and assumptions can be made that the evaluation management agreed with the page length.
<b>Question 19.</b>	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for the intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is very well written and accessible to all audiences. It is generally free from grammatical and spelling errors.
	ii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report employs a range of visuals including 14 tables and 10 Figures in the main report with additional in the annexes such as the Theory of Change diagram.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 20.</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)?		
	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	The evaluation questions and data collection methods were designed to capture the perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders including rights holders and duty bearers. The evaluation questions include assessing the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized persons, young people, and groups that may be left behind.
	ii Evaluation questions address cross cutting issues, such as human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB, social and environmental standards as appropriate.	Yes	Evaluation questions address cross cutting issues, such as human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, and Leave No One Behind (LNOB). Evaluation questions and findings focused on gender based violence, and people living with disabilities as included in the UNFPA corporate guidance on the human rights based approach and the evaluation assessed compliance with this policy. The degree to which UNFPA and partners reached out to persons living with disabilities is assessed. The degree of compliance to the LNOB agenda was also assessed through questions to targeted stakeholders.

	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).	Not Rated	Quantitative data relevant to the COVID-19 response is not presented on specific groups and thus disaggregated data requirement is not applicable. The evaluation was focused on strategy and policy to a large extent.
	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 evaluation.	Yes	An 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 evaluation.
	v Findings, conclusions and recommendations, address cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no-one behind, social and environmental as relevant.	Yes	Cross cutting issues addressed included degree of a human rights based focus, vulnerability and inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups, gender based violence issues, participation and inclusion of youth and persons living with disabilities, and monitoring of data.
	vi Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Partially	It is unclear whether young people were included in the evaluation reference group (ERG) or other advisory body as the members of the ERG are not listed. However, youth is focused upon in several evaluation questions so their participation would be valuable. It is helpful to list the ERG members in the annexes and to note in the main text whether youth are included. Including youth in some type of advisory capacity is important for UNFPA evaluations.
<b>Question 21.</b>	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?  <i>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below</i>	9	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Fully integrated	Gender equality and particularly gender based violence 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. The evaluation contains specific objectives to assess human rights and the Theory of Change adheres to UNFPA policies and guidelines. There are dedicated questions and sub-questions, for example, in Relevance, regarding ending maternal preventable deaths, Gender based violence and unmet need for family planning, in terms of the three transformative results.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	Since UNFPA mandate is focused on sexual and reproductive health and rights, the methodology necessarily was designed to capture relevant data on persons of reproductive ages. The data collection tools designed for Key Informants and Focus Group discussions found in Annex 3 particularly in terms of the effectiveness questions gather data on adequacy of family planning and targeting particularly women and young people in marginalized and more vulnerable groups.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis and respond to questions on reproductive rights and gender based violence.

## SWAP Rating Guidance

### **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.**

- a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?
- b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
- c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
- d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

### **ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.**

- 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?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

### **iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.**

- 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?
- 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?
- c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?

#### **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