

UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY		
Overall Rating	#REF1	#REF1
●●●●● 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	
Title of the evaluation report	Formative evaluation of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2022-2025
Region	
Country	Global
Year of report	2024
Business Unit/programme country (managing evaluation)	Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)
Date of assessment review (dd/mm/yyyy)	November 7, 2024
Name of assessment review firm	IOD PARC
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Primary SDG(s) covered (list provided below)	3, 4, 5 and others
UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered (lists provided below)	
Three transformative results	All three
Six outputs	All six
Six accelerators	All six
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	Yes
Humanitarian evaluation	No
Evaluation evaluated (e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)	Strategy
Evaluation type (e.g. formative, summative, developmental)	Formative
Geographic scope (e.g. global, regional, national)	Global
<p>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.</p>	

This is a highly satisfactory evaluation report, with minor adjustments it would be an excellent report. A summary of the key strengths and areas for improvement are provided below.

Strengths

- Section A: Executive Summary** – The Executive Summary is clearly written and well-presented. It provides useful information for decision-making. It includes all the necessary components. Overall, it incorporates key information in a concise manner but incorporates sufficient detail to understand the background, purpose of the evaluation, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Section C: Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope** – The purpose and objectives of the evaluation are clearly defined. The Evaluation Report makes clear why it is needed at this point in time, its intended use and its primary audience. The scope of the evaluation is also clearly outlined including geographic, temporary, and the elements introduced in the Strategic plan such as the six accelerators and 12 strategic shifts.
- Section D: Evaluation Design and Methodology** – The Evaluation questions are relevant and appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. Adjustments were made to the evaluation questions during the inception period using an analytical framework evaluators developed. The evaluation is thorough and clearly presented, identifying assessment indicators to base the analysis from which conclusions can be drawn. The evaluation design and methods are clearly described, relevant and robust. The data sources are clearly described with the full list of documents reviewed and stakeholders interviewed in the Annex. The data analysis is also clearly described. It also clearly describes the use of AI. It also includes reflections such as lessons learned and key limitations that will be useful in informing other evaluations.
- Section E: Evaluation Findings** – The findings are clearly presented. They are structured according to the four main evaluation questions. Furthermore, it is evident that the sub-questions are also addressed. The key findings are summarised in a text box, which is followed by supporting evidence. Triangulation is demonstrated through the inclusion of both primary and secondary sources, with references provided in the footnotes on nearly every page of the findings section.
- Section F: Evaluation Conclusions** – The conclusions are clearly formulated and presented. They are clearly derived from the findings. The conclusions are not mere summaries of the findings, as relevant to each evaluation question, but they take a step back to look across all the findings. In so doing, they offer a deeper level of insight and analysis beyond the findings.
- Section G: Evaluation Recommendations** – The evaluation report combines the conclusion and recommendation section together. This structure makes sense as it avoids duplicating information and also increases the line of sight between the recommendations and conclusion. Each recommendation includes a series of suggested actions. The targeted responsible units (lead and additional units) are identified against each suggested actions.

Areas for improvement

- Section A: Executive Summary** – While there are several strengths with the way the Executive Summary is written and presented, it exceeds the page limit specified in the ToRs by 2 pages.
- Section B: Background** – There is limited information identifying stakeholders in the main report. However, there is a stakeholder map provided in the Annex of the Inception Report. The mapping lists the stakeholders involved at global, regional and country level with corresponding columns that outline their general responsibilities and role and interests in the Strategic Plan. This lays the groundwork for the sampling strategy and evaluators are encouraged to include it in the Annex of the main report.
- Section D: Evaluation Design and Methodology** – The Evaluation Report does not refer to a sampling strategy. However, there is some components of the sampling in the Annex of the Main Report and the Inception Report, such as for the country case selection and the sampling for the selection of deep dives. To enhance transparency, it would be beneficial for evaluators to describe the strategy for selecting informants. The data collection instruments are not included in the Annex, although interview questions are provided in the Annex of the Inception Report. The Evaluation Report does not refer to a sampling strategy. However, there is some components of the sampling in the Annex of the Main Report and the Inception Report, such as for the country case selection and the sampling for the selection of deep dives. To enhance transparency, it would be beneficial for evaluators to describe the strategy for selecting informants. Evaluators could also consider incorporating an assessment of the evidence strength used in the analysis. However, this is not a requirement under the evaluation criteria and therefore does not affect the scoring. This suggestion is intended to enhance the transparency and credibility of the presented evidence.
- Section H: Report Structure and Presentation** – The data collection instruments are not included in the Annex, although interview questions are provided in the Annex of the Inception Report.

Suggestions for future evaluators: The rater will identify key suggestions to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, examples will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing Recommendations

SECTION RATINGS		
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	#REF1	Comments on Rating
Question 1. Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i) Is a clear, standalone document useful for informing decision making, (a minimum of 5 pages, up to a maximum of 7 pages). <i>Note: YES - the executive summary is within the indicated maximum page limit. PARTIAL - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by 1 to 2 pages. NO - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by more than 2 pages.</i>	Partially	The Executive Summary is clearly written and well-presented. It provides useful information for decision-making. Unfortunately, it only slightly exceeds the page limit (by 2.5 lines) with just over 7 pages long. This could easily be addressed by formatting as there is space on pg. 1 of the Executive Summary to absorb additional rows. However, the ToR suggests a page limit of 5 pages (see Annex 5 of the ToRs). For this reason, it is rated as 'partial'. In order to meet this criterion, reducing the length of the main findings section, which currently spans 2.5 pages. One option for this is to present the 'overall response' for each evaluation question in the findings section. Evaluators can also consider reducing the length of the conclusions section.
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	It includes all the necessary components of the evaluation report. This includes the an overview of the context (para 1-4), the evaluation purpose, objectives and intended users (para 5-8), scope of the evaluation and methodology (para 9-11), summary of the main findings (para 12-29), main conclusions (para 30-44), and key recommendations (p.xiv-p.xv).
iii) Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Yes	As mentioned in Q1), the Executive Summary is very well written, incorporating key information in a concise manner but incorporates sufficient detail to understand the background, purpose of the evaluation, the key findings and conclusion.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	#REF1	Comments on Rating
Question 2. Is the evaluand (i.e. intervention/policy/thematic area etc. that is to be evaluated) and context of the evaluation clearly described?		
i) Clear description of the evaluand (e.g. intervention), including: geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The Evaluation Report provides a clear description of the UNFPA's strategic plan. This includes an overview of strategic planning including alignment with global frameworks, integrated results and resources framework, business model and the UNFPA global programme and six regional programmes (section 2.1). It also provides a description of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2022-2025, relevant for this evaluation (section 2.2). It clearly describes the six accelerators and the strategic shifts. In addition, Annex 3 elaborates further on the Strategic Plans. The implementation period and status is provided under Section 2.1, which describe the current strategic plan including the other two Strategic plan leading to 2030. This is well depicted in figure 1. The geographic coverage is global including regional and country (para 21). There is a brief description of the integrated budget (para 22). There are no references to partners in the background of the report as this is largely internally focused.
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 UNOD dimensions) and how the context relates to the evaluand (e.g. key drivers and challenges that affect the implementation of the intervention/policy/thematic area	Partially	As mentioned above in Q2), there is a clear description of the Strategic Planning. Some of the information presented, such as alignment with SDGs, global frameworks and the strategic plans, provide contextual information. In addition, given this evaluation is 'global' in scope, offering the same level of contextual information typically found in programmatic evaluation is not possible. Nevertheless, while the Evaluation Report provides a clear description of the Strategic Plan, it could benefit from taking a step back to elaborate on the factors driving the need for the accelerators and strategic shifts. While there is a brief mention on para 24 to 'recognizing the setbacks resulting from recent global events,' it would be helpful if evaluators elaborated on these further and the challenges they aim to overcome, for this criterion to be met.
iii) Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	There are clear linkages drawn between the Strategic Plan and the ICPD Programme of Action (see para 18 on alignment) and the SDGs (para 17).
Question 3. Are key stakeholders clearly identified and analysed?		
i) Clear identification of key stakeholders which should include implementing partner(s), development partners, rights holders, and duty bearers among others; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map).	Yes	There is a section that identifies the primary audiences for the report (para 9), which are mainly from UNFPA. A stakeholder map is provided in the Annex of the Inception Report (Annex 5). Evaluators can consider including the stakeholder map in the Annex of the main report.
ii) Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Yes	As mentioned above, there is limited information on stakeholders in the main report. However, Annex 5 of the inception report provides a fairly comprehensive stakeholder mapping. The mapping is presented in the form of a table, which lists the stakeholders involved at global, regional and country level. It also includes corresponding columns outlining general responsibilities within UNFPA as well as their role and interest in the Strategic Plan. Evaluators are encouraged to include these tables in the Annex of the main report, which can be signposted in the main report. It provides a good description of the key stakeholders, relevant to this evaluation, and helps set the foundation for a sampling strategy.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	#REF1	Comments on Rating
Question 4. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
i) Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined on p.2 (para 7-8). It explains why it was needed at this point in time and its intended use i.e. to 'provide evidence... what works (and what does not) to accelerate progress... and inform the design of the strategic plan for 2026-2029' (p.2). The key intended users are defined in para 9. The list is slightly longer and more specific than what is presented in the ToRs.
Question 5. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		

	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	There is a clear description of the objectives of the evaluation provided in para 10. No changes have been made to the objectives from those provided in the ToRs.
	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 of the evaluation is described in para 11. It includes the temporal scope, the elements introduced in the Strategic Plan such as six accelerators and 12 strategic shifts, and the geographic scope i.e. UNFPA's work at global, regional and country levels. It does not state if there are any components that will not be covered.
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		#REF!	Comments on Rating
Question 6.	Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use? <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>		
	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.	Partially	The evaluation questions are relevant and appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation (p.3). The evaluators made adjustments to the evaluation questions during the inception period by identifying the main questions against four key areas 'accelerators', 'strategic shifts', 'enablers', and 'forward-looking perspective'. They evaluation team had developed an analytical framework and the questions were adjusted accordingly. This is elaborated on in Annex 4 of the main report and in the Inception Report. The OECD DAC criteria are no longer specified against the questions, as presented in the ToR. As the questions cut across several OECD DAC criteria (p.6 of ToR), this may be why they are not presented. It would be helpful if evaluators provided a rationale or justification for not specifying the relevant criteria in order to fully meet this criterion.
	Evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, indicators, lines of inquiry, benchmarks, assumptions, source of data, methods for data collection and analysis, and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.	Yes	The evaluation matrix is clearly presented. As mentioned above, the OECD DAC criteria are not used. However, the evaluation matrix includes assessment indicators, identifies main lines of inquiry, and sources, methods and tools for each evaluation sub-question. The indicators and lines of inquiry provide a basis for analysis from which conclusions can be drawn.
Question 7.	Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?		
	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.	Not Rated	As this is a formative evaluation, it looks specifically at the use of new elements introduced in the current Strategic Plan (i.e. the six accelerators and strategic shifts) to assess 'organizational readiness and strategic position to accelerate the progress towards the achievement of the 3TRs and catalyse a discussion on the design of the next strategic plan given the state of progress on the SDGs' (para 11 on evaluation objectives). It explains in para 31 that the "evaluation did not assess this contribution nor use a theory of change that tested the associated assumptions in a model. Rather, it was based on the macro-level assumption that the strategic and programmatic shifts would result in an increased contribution by UNFPA while recognizing that some may be more relevant than others."
	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.	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
	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.	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
Question 8.	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	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. The Evaluation Report provides an overall approach to the evaluation. They are relevant and robust for meeting the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope. What is very helpful is the analytical framework (section 3.2), developed by the evaluation team, to provide a way to better understand and assess the accelerators and strategic shifts. The analytical framework includes a visual (figure 2) that maps the EQs to the framework. The Evaluation Matrix is quite thorough, providing the assessment indicators and inquiries for analysing data. The design also builds on the findings from the evaluability assessment (see 5.1 of the Inception Report). The use of AI in the evaluation process is mentioned on p.8. It is further elaborated in Annex 4 under 'lesson learned from using AI', outlining how it was used and some of the limitations (p 27-30). Annex 7 also outlines some reflections and ethical considerations for using AI.
	Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR).	Yes	The data sources are clearly described in Section 3.3. It includes a table with the types of data sources including review of over 100 documents, including qualitative and quantitative data (Annex 6 includes the full list), key informants interviews with 60 stakeholders (Annex 8 includes the full list), five subject deepdives, 12 country-level studies, and findings from six regional programme evaluations that were being conducted at the same time.
	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The main report does not reference a sampling strategy. Annex 4 provides details on the data collection process. However, information on sampling for key informants is limited. Para 42 of Annex 4 states that "interviewees were identified in the process of stakeholder mapping (see Annex 5)". However, Annex 5 appears to be the Evaluation Matrix, suggesting that the reference might have been intended for the Inception Report. Annex 5 of the Inception Report contains a stakeholder mapping, but it does not outline a sampling strategy or specify the criteria or process used to identify key informants, including measures taken to ensure diverse perspectives. For greater transparency, it would be beneficial for evaluators to describe the strategy for selecting informants. Nevertheless, additional information on the selection of deep dives is available in Annex 10 of the Inception Report, and the criteria for selecting country-level studies are clearly outlined in both Annex 4 of the Evaluation Report and Annex 10 of the Inception Report. To strengthen this criterion, evaluators are encouraged to include a brief description of the sampling strategy in the main report, with references to the Annex for additional details, as necessary. It is important to describe the process used for selecting key informants, as well as how diverse perspectives were considered. Evaluators might also consider including the selection process for deep dives within the Annex of the main report, in addition to the Inception Report.
	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).	Not Rated	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
	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	There is a clear description of the method of analysis in Section 3.4. This includes the use of the evaluation matrix as the framework for analysis and synthesis of data. It describes the use of the indicators and process of triangulation. The sub-questions were used as unit of analysis to develop findings. It also explains how different contexts were analysed to identify patterns and findings, as appropriate. The use of AI in the evaluation is elaborated on in Annex 4 (Section 6.5). It explains how AI model was trained, what checks were in place, as well as the limitations.
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation in its data collection and analysis, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	There is a clear description of the limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation team as well as the mitigating steps on p11 (Section 3.5) of the main report. The gaps in evidence are discussed in relation to the Regional Programme Evaluations (RPE) that ran concurrently with the SPEs as not all the reports were ready during the data synthesis phase.
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:		
	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Partially	The main report explicitly refers to adhering to UNEG's Norms and Standards for Evaluation and that it abides by UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct. It also refers to the team's adherence to UNEG's gender-related norms and standards. It describes doing so by 'incorporating a systematic approach to the analysis' and it included a deep dive on gender and social norms. It also outlines its alignment with UNFPA's cross-cutting principles such as disability inclusion, leaving no one behind and social and environmental standards. These references are found in Section 3.1. However, there is a lack of contextualization, describing how the norms and standards were used in the evaluation.
	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	This report would benefit from additional details on ethical considerations. While it makes references to several ethical guidelines and principles in 9i above, it lacks detail on specific areas such as confidentiality and data protection. Including data collection protocols in the Annex would also enhance transparency, as these often clarify how the evaluation was conducted, including methods of obtaining consent. The report does, however, provide a clear description of the ethical and responsible use of AI, with dedicated steps outlined to ensure these standards are met. Annex 7, titled 'Leveraging Ethical and Responsible Use of AI', covers this aspect in detail.
Question 10.	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	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	This evaluation incorporates the use of AI to 'leverage ethical and responsible use of AI' (see Annex 7). AI was used to analyse documents, in particular CPDs. Annex 7 outlines how AI was used and includes some reflections on its use including lesson learned and key limitations, that will be useful in informing other evaluations.
SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)		#REF!	Comments on Rating
Question 11.	Do the findings clearly and adequately address all evaluation questions and sub-questions?		

	Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions	Yes	The findings (Section 4) are clearly presented. They are structured according to the four main evaluation questions and it is evident that the sub-questions are also addressed, often as key findings within the main evaluation question. The start of each main question is followed by a summary 'overall response' that directly answers the question. These are very well summarised and also help orient the reader to the more granular findings. The main findings for each evaluation question are presented in a text box form followed by supporting evidence.
	ii Explicit use of the evaluator's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	As mentioned above in 7i, this evaluation is formative to assess organisational readiness and strategic position.
Question 12. Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?			
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. The data sources are provided as footnotes on each page of the findings section. It presents the key areas outlined in the analytical framework i.e. the extent to which the accelerators and strategic shifts have 'supported enhanced programming of global, regional and country levels'. This is evident in the findings for EQ1 and EQ2, in particular. Triangulation is demonstrated through the inclusion of both primary and secondary sources, with references provided in footnotes on nearly every page within the findings section. Evaluators could consider incorporating an assessment of the evidence strength used in the analysis. However, this is not a requirement under the evaluation criteria and therefore does not affect the scoring. This suggestion is intended to enhance the transparency and credibility of the presented evidence.
	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	As mentioned in Q11i above, the findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented. Each key finding is summarised in a text box, which is followed by supporting evidence. The findings are often nuanced and include both positive and negative evidence. There is evidence that some of the indicators and assessment criteria from the evaluation framework have been applied.
	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	Although this is not an output/outcome/impact evaluation, the report examines the extent to which 'enablers' facilitated the implementation of the accelerators and strategic. This is covered under EQ3 (p34-41) with the key enablers assessed, as per the sub-EQ and analytical framework, include knowledge management, strategic communication, business model and human resources. Other enablers are also assessed such as 'innovative partnerships' (see finding 15).
Question 13. Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?			
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's planning, monitoring, and reporting system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Not Rated	While this is not a programmatic evaluation, it assesses 'data and evidence', which is one of the six accelerators, for supporting enhanced programming at global, regional and country level. This is seen, in particular, in the findings section related to EQ1 (see para 56 and 63 as examples). There is also some reference to the integrated results and resources framework (IRRF), although limited, in the findings section (see para 62 as an example).
SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)			
Question 14. Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluator?		#REF!	Comments on Rating
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	The conclusions are clearly formulated and present an unbiased summative statements, which are backed with supporting evidence. What is very helpful is the introductory text to the conclusion section, which explains how the conclusions were developed. It also describes the level they are aimed at i.e. focusing on 'issues that are relevant at a high strategic level, rather than on details of UNFPA operationalization of the Strategic Plan 2022-2025'. There are five conclusions in total and the evaluators have added the main findings linked with each conclusion. While they are not presented according to evaluation questions, the conclusions respond to the evaluation questions.
	ii Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	As mentioned above in 14i, the conclusions are well substantiated and are derived from findings. The evaluators have included specific findings related to each conclusion. The conclusion are not a mere summary of the findings, as relevant to each evaluation question, but they take a step back to look across all the findings. In so doing, they offer a deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.
Question 15. Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]			
	i Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	Not Rated	There is no separate section on lessons provided in this evaluation report. It is not stated as a requirement in the ToRs (see Annex 5 of the ToR under 'Outline of Final Report')
	ii Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluator as well as any areas of improvement.	Not Rated	There is no separate section on lessons provided in this evaluation report. It is not stated as a requirement in the ToRs (see Annex 5 of the ToR under 'Outline of Final Report')
SECTION G: EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)			
Question 16. Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?		#REF!	Comments on Rating
	i Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The evaluation report combines the conclusion and recommendation section together, in that recommendations follow individual conclusions made. This structure makes sense as the recommendations logically follow the conclusion and it avoids duplicating information if presented separately. It also increases the line of sight between the recommendations and conclusion. In addition, references to key findings are provided in the conclusion. The recommendations are clearly formulated.
	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	Each recommendation includes a series of suggested actions. The targeted responsible units (lead and additional units) are identified against each suggested actions. Given that this is an evaluation of a Strategic Plan spanning several levels, this makes sense. The deadlines are also identified in a corresponding column.
	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 for developing recommendations is described on page 45. It mentions discussions with the evaluation reference group to co-develop recommendations. It also takes into account discussions with senior management of UNFPA.
	iv Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Partially	The recommendations and suggested actions are clearly articulated. While there is no priority rating, target dates/deadlines are provided, which indicate a level of prioritisation. However, it does not specifically mention importance, urgency and potential impact. This may be helpful to include, particularly where there are 'dependencies' i.e. one supporting action affects the delivery of another. Moreover, the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook requires prioritisation to be made explicit (low/medium/high).
SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)			
Question 17. Does the evaluation report include all required information?		#REF!	Comments on Rating
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluation and title of evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluator, 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.	Partially	The opening pages include the name of the evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, names of evaluators and the organisation commissioning the evaluation. The report includes a table of contents including tables, figures and boxes. It also includes the table of contents for the Annexes, which are in a separate document. A list of acronyms is provided. What is missing in the opening pages is the location and date of the report. Evaluators are encouraged to include these details in order to fully meet the criterion. However, it is worth noting that this report is not the final graphically designed report, which would include a standard cover page with the year of the report.
	ii Annexes include, if not in body of report: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology (e.g. inception report), case study reports.	Partially	The Annexes include the Terms of Reference, Evaluation Matrix, Persons interviewed, Document reviewed, and Ethical and Responsible use of Artificial Intelligence. The Annexes also include a list of the participants of the Evaluation Reference Groups and Management Group, an elaboration on Strategic Planning in UNFPA and further detail on the methodology. The list of site visits is included in Annex 4, under 'detailed methodology'. The theory of change is not included as this is not a theory-based evaluation. However, the analytical framework is provided and described in the body of the report. The data collection instruments are not included, although interview questions are provided in the Annex of the Inception Report. Although not a requirement for this criterion, evaluators are encouraged to include the stakeholder mapping provided in the Annex of the Inception Report in the Annex of the main report as well as the sampling criteria for the deep dives.
Question 18. Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?			
	i The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report has a logical structure and is easy to identify and navigate. It provides clear titles and sub-titles. It also includes numbered paragraphs, which is helpful for referencing. Overall, it is well formatted.
	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>	Yes	The structure is in accordance with UNFPA guidelines with the context, background and methodology preceding the findings, which are followed by the conclusion and recommendations. It is also 52 pages in length excluding the executive summary, which is well within the maximum pages.
Question 19. Is the report well presented?			
	i Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for the intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is very well written and easy to understand. There are some minor typing errors and formatting issues noted but they were few and did not detract from the quality of the evaluation. Some examples include the sign-posting to Annex that were not in the Annex of the Evaluation Report but the Inception Report (such as references to sampling and evaluability assessment). There was a spelling error noted on p64 of the Annex and font inconsistency on p8 of the evaluation report. However, these are fairly minor as the report is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors. For this reason, the criterion has been met.
	ii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is sufficient use of visual aids such as figures, tables and boxes to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
SECTION I: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)			
Question 20. Are cross cutting issues - in particular, human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB - integrated in the core elements of the evaluation (e.g. evaluation design, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations)?		#REF!	Comments on Rating

	<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluation design focused on internal stakeholders i.e. mainly UNFPA staff at global, regional and country level. It did not involve the participation of rights holders as its focus is primarily on assessing the organisation's readiness and strategic positioning to accelerate progress towards achievement of the three transformative results. It did, however, interview a wide range of stakeholders (Annex 8) including UNFPA HQ, regional stakeholders, external stakeholders and 12 country studies.</p>
	<p>Evaluation questions address cross cutting issues, such as human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB, social and environmental standards as appropriate.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluation questions addressed cross cutting issues, and the evaluation assessed accelerators such as human-rights based approach, gender transformative approaches, 'leaving no one behind', and resilience and adaptation.</p>

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).	Yes	Data is disaggregated by gender for key informant interviews (see Table 4 on p.10). There is also some disaggregation based on secondary sources, primarily by gender and adolescents and youth. As the evaluation is formative and is not intended to assess an intervention's results, but more the organisation's readiness and strategic positioning, this is less relevant.
v	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.	No	An intersectional lens is not mentioned in relation to the 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	The findings, conclusions and recommendations address cross-cutting areas such as equality, vulnerability in areas such as HIV, adolescence and ageing. The findings section also address leave no one behind.
vi	Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Not Rated	The inclusion of young people in the evaluation team is not mentioned in the Report. However, this is not requested in the ToRs.
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? <i>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below</i>	#REF!	Comments on Rating
i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Fully integrated	GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis as this is reflected in the indicators (i.e. 'areas of investigation') for at least the first three sub-questions, as reflected in the evaluation matrix. While the objective does not explicitly state GEEW in the objective, the objective is to assess organisational readiness to achieve the 3TRs, which are focused on gender considerations. In addition, the evaluation questions look at accelerators, of which 'human rights-based and gender-transformative approaches' is one. Gender and social norms was also identified as one of the five subjects for a deep dive.
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	The evaluation employs a mixed-methods approach. It uses a diverse range of data sources, primary and secondary to enhance accuracy and credibility. The gender composition of key informants is provided. However, the sampling strategy is not provided. This would be helpful as it could demonstrate how gender considerations were taken into account. Interview protocols were not provided to understand how consent was obtained. This is also not explained in the main report.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The findings section discuss countries where human rights and gender equality was regressing. The findings include data analysis that disaggregates data, where applicable. The evaluation report also provides specific suggested actions under recommendations that address GEEW issues.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>i GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>

<p>List of SDGs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
--

<p>Three transformative results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ending unmet need for family planning 2. Ending preventable maternal deaths 3. Ending gender-based violence and harmful practices
<p>Six outputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>Six accelerators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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