

# UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY		
<b>Overall Rating</b>	91%	Highly Satisfactory
●●●●●	Excellent	5
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory	4
●●●○●	Satisfactory	3
●●○●●	Fair	2
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory	1

REPORT DETAILS	
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	UNFPA Ethiopia Country Programme Evaluation (2020-2025)
<b>Region</b>	ESA
<b>Country</b>	Ethiopia
<b>Year of report</b>	2024
<b>Business Unit/programme country (managing evaluation)</b>	UNFPA Ethiopia CO
<b>Date of assessment review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	November 6, 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, 10, 16
<b>UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered (lists provided below)</b>	
Three transformative results	Ending preventable maternal deaths, ending unmet need for FP, ending GBV and harmful practices.
Six outputs	Policy and accountability Quality of care and services Gender and social norms Population change and data Humanitarian action Adolescents and youth
Six accelerators	Human rights-based and gender-transformative approaches; Innovation and digitalization Partnerships, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing Data and evidence Leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and peace responsive efforts
<b>Organizational effectiveness and efficiency</b>	Yes
<b>Humanitarian evaluation</b>	No
<b>Evaluation evaluand (e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)</b>	Country Programme
<b>Evaluation type (e.g. formative, summative, developmental)</b>	Summative and formative
<b>Geographic scope (e.g. global, regional, national)</b>	National
<b>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.</b>	

This important CPE is clear and comprehensive, and overall should provide a sound foundation for learning, and decision making, and the development of the 10th Ethiopia CPE. Key points of this evaluation include:

- A thorough background section, with dedicated sections relating to priority areas for example gender and social inclusion, population demographics. There is a clear description of the country programme, geographically, temporally and financially, as well as key implementing partners.
- Methods and data collection is clearly set out, with tools included at Annex 4. However, this section would benefit from more detailed discussion of ethics in data collection and safeguarding in particular. The methods of analysis could be more clearly described, perhaps indicating a deliberate feminist / gender transformative approach to data collection and analysis.
- A summarised stakeholder map would also be useful to include in this final report (ideally as an annex, appreciating this was in the design report), along with an analysis of the rights, needs, wants and impact of different groups of stakeholders.
- The evaluation matrix is detailed, clear and thorough and includes indicators, assumptions, data sources broken down by criteria, question and sub question.
- The reconstructed theory of change is clearly presented, and utilised and referred back to throughout the findings, conclusions and recommendations. There is also a useful table at Annex 6 that outlines CP performance and results broken down by strategic output.
- Findings are well written and logically structured, they are however very long on tracts of narrative text and would benefit from visual aids to represent some of the data.
- A strong element of this evaluation is that it includes a section of unintended outcomes after each question, which is a good example for future evaluations.
- Conclusions follow on well from findings, are complete and add additional value by creating links across the difference CP aspects from strategic to programming.
- Recommendations are clear and comprehensive, with timelines, responsibilities and prioritization, as well as being utilization focused.
- GEEW issues are very well addressed in this report and there is a depth of knowledge about wider social inclusion issues (such as disability inclusion). However, intersectional analysis and differential assessment of results by different groups is hampered by the lack of disaggregated data.
- The evaluation also went beyond the requirements of the UNFPA evaluation handbook as it usefully includes a lessons learned section.

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

While overall this was a highly satisfactory evaluation, key suggestions to improve this evaluation, and inform learning for future evaluations, are outlined below:

- While ethical considerations are noted, they would benefit from a contextualised description in the report, and in particular if the aspect of safeguarding and do no harm in the conduct of this evaluation were directly addressed.
- The methodology section could provide more detail on the geographic sampling strategy, as well as KII and FGD sampling strategy, and a breakdown of social stratifications, such as age, gender, socioeconomic status for rightsholders who were interviewed.
- The methodology section and the methods of analysis could have been more clearly described - this would have strengthened the report, it may also have been appropriate to outline how a feminist approach could have been explicitly included given the nature of this report.
- The context and methodology sections could be improved if more details were included on stakeholders, particularly rightsholders, and if a stakeholder map was included. It is noted that there was a draft table of stakeholders in the design report, but this was not included in the final report, when a shortened/ summarised version would have been useful to include. An analysis the rights, needs, wants and impact of different groups of stakeholders would also be useful to include to better understand situated perspectives.
- While intersectionality was referenced in the methodology and accounted for in the data collection tools, this did not carry through to the findings section. This may have related to the lack of disaggregated data available to differentiate between and across groups, and individuals, and it is noted this is part of the recommendations in this report.
- The findings section would have benefitted from greater use of data visualisation to summarise and represent complex information.
- The recommendations section could provide clarity on how participation in the evaluation were encouraged for all stakeholders, and if rightsholders were represented on the ERG (including youth membership), and if so were they involved in the co-design of recommendations, or only in data collection.

### SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 1.</b>	<b>Can the executive summary inform decision-making?</b>		
	i Is a clear, standalone document useful for informing decision making, (a minimum of 5 pages, up to a maximum of 7 pages).	Yes	The executive summary is 6 pages long and serves well as a standalone document, which can serve to inform decisions making processes.
	ii Includes all necessary components of the evaluation report, including: (1) overview of the context and intervention, (2) evaluation purpose, objectives and intended users, 3) scope and evaluation methodology, (4) summary of most significant findings, (5) main conclusions and (6) key recommendations	Yes	The executive summary includes all necessary components, including overview, purpose and objectives, scope and methodology, summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.
	iii Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Yes	All significant information is included in a concise and clear manner.
<b>SECTION B:</b>	<b>BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 2.</b>	<b>Is the evaluand (i.e. intervention/policy/thematic area etc. that is to be evaluated) and context of the evaluation clearly described?</b>		
	i Clear description of the evaluand (e.g. intervention), including: geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	There is the clear description of the evaluand - which is all of UNFPA activities/ interventions in Ethiopia. The geographic areas that UNFPA operate in are discussed narratively, and also included as a map of UNFPA intervention sites (2023) in the opening pages of the report (as expected and outlined in the UNFPA evaluation handbook 2024).  The evaluation outlines achievements of the 8th CPE, before going to discuss the interventions of under the current (and 9th) country programme - the subject of this evaluation. The implementation period is clear (2020-2025), and implementation status is ongoing (but in its last year). It is outlined that UNFPA implements programmes directly, as well as working with partners. Key partners include multiple Government Ministries, as well as NGOs, and wider community based, faith based and academic organisations who also operate as implementing partners.  Financial information is provided in Table 4, which breaks down spend per strategic plan output from 2020-2024. The narrative of budget utilization, also outlined in Table 6 and Figure 5 are useful inclusions.
	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	Given this is a CPE the context of the evaluation is the entire country context of Ethiopia, with specific reference to UNFPA strategic plan outputs. The economic, social and political country contexts are well explained, with recent, and ongoing issues such as conflict, climate shocks and macroeconomic challenges. The section on health and demographics provides more specific background and is an excellent inclusion (section 2.1.2)  There is explicit reference to national strategies, and to UNFPA normative and strategic frameworks, situated in an overarching framework of UN and other external assistance to Ethiopia. There is specific reference to the UNFPA global Strategic Plan, and the learnings and findings from the evaluation of the previous CPE.  Section 2.2.3 provides specific reference to gender and social inclusions issues, and there is reference not only to leaving no-one behind, but reaching the most vulnerable first. Challenges relating to gender equality are well noted, and specific challenges relating to propriety areas such as GBV, FGM, and child marriage are clearly described.
	iii Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	There are linkages drawn between SDGs 3, 5, 10 and 16, and specific targets noted within that. There is reference to ICPD benchmarks, and how that has informed the UNFPA strategic plan, along with other international frameworks and benchmarks.
<b>Question 3.</b>	<b>Are key stakeholders clearly identified and analysed?</b>		

	i Clear identification of key stakeholders which should include implementing partner(s), development partners, rights holders, and duty bearers among others; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map).	Yes	There is a clear narrative description of UNFPA partners, including of Government Ministries who are implementing partners, along with NGOs and others. The wider role of the UNCT is also described. Rightsholders are noted as a key stakeholders, along with the organisations who represent them.  This section could be improved if a stakeholder map were provided (perhaps summarised from the design report).  Additionally the different roles of stakeholders, and linkages between them could be described in more detail, particularly highlighting the different groups of rightsholders (though is noted this this is a not a requirement of UNFPA evaluations)
	ii Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Partially	While stakeholders are discussed in the opening sections of the report, there is not an analysis of their specific rights, duties, needs concerns and potential impact on the evaluation/ objects of the evaluation.
<b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 4. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>			
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly described - it is to evaluate the 9th Country Programme, and it is needed at this point in time to inform the design and development of the next country programme. Its intended use is therefore clear, along with intended users, with key users noted as being UNFPA, the Government of Ethiopia, the UNCT, and crucially rightsholders, who are primarily women and girls. How the findings will be disseminated to rightsholders, and how they will use them would be interesting to include.
<b>Question 5. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>			
	i Clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, including reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, with no changes from 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	There is a clear description of the scope of the evaluation. Given this is a CPE the thematic focus is broad and based on UNFPA strategic plan, this is appropriate and the evaluation questions are developed based on these, and are clear and realistic. Temporal focus is clearly outlined as being from 2020-2024.  Geographically the scope is national i.e. all regions of Ethiopia where UNFPA interventions occur. However, while the scope is national (as outlined in the ToR), field visits were limited to areas that were accessible taking into account conflict affected areas and recent drought. Regions which were not visited were covered virtually, which is appropriate, and realistic.
<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>		<b>86%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>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?</b>			
<i>Note: UNFPA evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria such as: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (not necessarily applicable to all evaluations) and, for country programmes that include circumscribed and limited humanitarian and/or emergency interventions, the criteria of coverage and connectedness.</i>			
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	Evaluation questions and sub questions are derived from the objectives of the ToR, and are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. OECD DAC and additional humanitarian criteria are specified and questions are aligned with them.
	ii Evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, indicators, lines of inquiry, benchmarks, assumptions, source of data, methods for data collection and analysis, and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.	Yes	The evaluation matrix in Annex 1 clearly presents each evaluation question and sub question, along with evaluation criteria. It includes assumptions made about each question, appropriate and multiple indicators, along with data sources, methods of data collection, and initial outline of data collected, from which analysis can be drawn and conclusions based.
<b>Question 7. Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?</b>			
	i Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	There is a clear description of the country programme interventions, their situated context and intended results. The ToC in its entirety is being tested by this country programme evaluation.
	ii Causal relationships between the various elements (e.g. outcomes, including the three or relevant Transformative Results, outputs) of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework are presented in narrative and/or graphic form).	Yes	Causal relations are clearly outlined in the reconstructed ToC, which flows from national/ country priorities to UNSCT, to UNFPA strategic plan outputs, to county programme activities. This is presented graphically and in narrative form. The graphical presentation (figure 4) is clear and concise and allows for an understating of the logical flow of UNPFA interventions. It also outlines risks and assumptions.
	iii Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework, and if requested in the ToR, it is retrofitted/reconstructed by the evaluators.	Yes	There is a comprehensive analysis of the existing ToC (as requested in the ToR), and this was reconstructed to strengthen the logical flow, and indicate linkages more clearly. It is also well noted that it includes humanitarian objects as per to the 2022 strategic plan, which were not included in the original development of the 9th CPE.
<b>Question 8. Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>			

	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are clearly described, and are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, including the use of AI in the evaluation process if applicable.	Yes	Evaluation design and methods are clearly described, relevant and robust to meet the evaluations purpose, objectives and scope. The theory based design and reworking of the ToC is both needed and appropriate, the methodology is designed to assess contribution towards strategic objectives, development and humanitarian needs. As such a theory based and non experimental design is appropriate, however, it may also have been appropriate to explicitly indicate that a feminist approach was being taken, given the nature of this evaluation.  Mixed methods were applied to capture both qualitative and quantitative evidence. AI was not utilised in analysis, only in preparation of the final report.
	ii	Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR).	Yes	Data sources are well described and robust, qualitative data collection includes KIIs and FGDs, along with in-depth document review to gather quantitative data. Site visits were also undertaken to enable direct observation and provide a more nuanced understanding.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	A sampling strategy is provided, indicating that purposeful and convenience sampling were utilised. Both are appropriate and ensure that evidence was collected from the most relevant stakeholders, and crucially that key rightsholders were actively included. The sampling frame is usefully summarised in Table 2, which outlines the diversity of views which includes multiple government ministries and agencies, other UN agencies and donors, NGOs and civil society organisations, beneficiaries. rightsholders. Geographic sites visited are also listed.  This section could be improved if more detail were provided on the geographic sampling strategy, as well as KII and FGD sampling strategy, and if a breakdown were included of social stratifications, such as age, gender and socioeconomic status of the rightsholders who were interviewed/ part of FGDs.
	iv	Methods allow for rigorous testing of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework (e.g. methods help to understand the causal connections, if any, between outputs and expected outcomes (3TRs).	Yes	Methods are robust and allow for rigorous testing of the logical framework and causal connections to be identified.
	v	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including explainability and full disclosure of the use of AI in the evaluation process, if applicable.	Yes	Data validation is well described, including the use of triangulation of multiple sources of data and points of evidence. Content and contribution analysis were outlined as the primary methods of analysis used, which are appropriate and relevant, though as noted previously, explicitly outlining how a GEEW/ feminist approach could be applied here would fit well. AI was not noted as being used in the analysis phase, only in the final proofreading and finalising of the report.
	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).	Yes	There is a clear and complete description of the evaluation limitations and mitigation measures. This included the limitations of remote data collection, and an overreliance on qualitative methods, as well as outdated and non disaggregated quantitative data. Mitigations included the use of triangulation, identifying documentary evidence from multiple sources, and disaggregating interview and focus group discussion data, though it is clear some of the data limitations cannot be mitigated against.
<b>Question 9.</b>		<b>Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:</b>		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Partially	There is explicit reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators, however, this would benefit from being contextualised for this particular evaluation.
	ii	Clear description of ethical issues and considerations (e.g. respect for dignity and diversity, fair representation, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm) that may arise in the evaluation, safeguard mechanisms for respondents (e.g. parental consent forms for adolescents, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups; WHO standards of safe data collection on GBV) and ethical considerations in the use of AI as applicable (e.g., transparency of use, explainability, privacy, data protection, accuracy, human rights). If AI is used in the evaluation, there should be transparency and disclosure on the ethical and responsible use of AI in the report.	Partially	There is reference to ethical issues and considerations, but not a detailed outline of those issues, particularly for vulnerable people. This section could be improved if there was explicit reference to avoidance of harm in the process of data collection, and of safeguarding practices employed in the conduct of the evaluation.  AI was used in the final stages of producing this report, and it noted this was conducted ethically, and transparently.
<b>Question 10.</b>		<b>Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?</b>		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could include efforts to optimize the evaluation process (e.g., use of AI or new technology for data gathering, content analysis, outcome harvesting among others), or components introduced to enhance inclusion and participation in the evaluation processes (e.g. a youth steering committee), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Partially	The evaluation notes that innovative practice was applied in the conduct of the evaluation, but does provide a detailed explanation of what this was. It is noted that AI was used for proofreading and improving readability of the evaluation final report.
<b>SECTION E:</b>		<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 11.</b>		<b>Do the findings clearly and adequately address all evaluation questions and sub-questions?</b>		

	i Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions	Yes	Findings are presented clearly and logically, systematically addressing the evaluation questions and sub questions, broken down by criteria. They provide sufficient levels of evidence to address each question, providing an overarching summary, as well as detailed narrative analysis. While earlier sections of the report made good use of graphs figures and tables, the findings are primarily narrative in nature and would benefit from the use of data visualisations to aid in understanding, and brevity.
	ii Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	There is explicit use of the ToC throughout the findings sections, with reference to indicators and benchmarks. This is accompanied by Annex 6, which sets out in tabular format an overall assessment of progress of the 9th CP, with output level indicators.
<b>Question 12.</b>	<b>Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?</b>		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative data well, with frequent reference to interviews and focus groups. There is also good use of documentary evidence and triangulation is evident from 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	Findings are clearly supported by evidence, and both positive and negative findings are presented, for example the successes of strengthening access to GBV services are outlined in a humanitarian setting, along with the strong role UNFPA played in multisectoral humanitarian coordination under the 9th CP (pp51), indicating positive results in relation to effectiveness. However, the evaluation also notes some challenges, for example relating to raising monitoring and evaluation report data from activity to output level, and in accessing disaggregated data.  A strong element of this evaluation is that it includes a section of unintended outcomes after each question, which is a good example for future evaluations.  There is reference to benchmarks such as SDGs, ICPD, Strategic outputs, and other standards/ indicators outlined in the evaluation matrix, and contextualised in addressing questions throughout the findings section.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from outputs to high level results).	Yes	Causal factors are clearly outlined, at the contextual, organizational and managerial levels, for example the challenges posed by COVID 19, and working in conflict affected areas, as well as staffing levels in different functions.  While the findings analyses the ToC / logic model results in a narrative fashion this is accompanied by the table of data (Annex 6) which illustrates performance of the 9th CP against output indicators and includes baseline data, targets and progress against targets, along with comments against each output. This could perhaps have been included in the body of the report as it succinctly summarises key information about outputs and progress towards results.
<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	Section 4.4.3 of the findings explicitly addresses the adequacy of the UNFPA CO monitoring, and the role of the M&E unit. Key findings are clearly outlined, with important points raised about the challenges of gathering and analysing disaggregated data and inclusion related data, and its importance to understanding the complete picture of UNFPA work in Ethiopia.  There is specific reference to the use of M&E data in planning processes, and in developing results and resources frameworks, as well as supporting alignment with country and partner priorities.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 14.</b>	<b>Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluand?</b>		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased statements that accurately summarise the findings, and respond to the evaluation questions. Conclusion are set out by strategic and programmatic conclusions, with the relevant criteria to which they relate clearly noted, as many conclusions relate to multiple criteria, and this linkage across the strategic and programmatic of the CP is well noted and appreciated in a CPE.
	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, they add deeper insight, and linkages between and across different aspects of UNFPA's programme of work in Ethiopia. The are well linked and referenced to accompanying recommendations.
<b>Question 15.</b>	<b>Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]</b>		
	i Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples. As lessons learned are beyond the requirements of the UNFPS evaluation guidance this questions has not been rated, and this should be case for all future EQAs.	Not Rated	Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are substantiated with illustrative examples. However as lessons learned are beyond the requirements of the UNFPS evaluation guidance this questions has not been rated.

	ii Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluand as well as any areas of improvement. As lessons learned are beyond the requirements of the UNFPS evaluation guidance this questions has not been rated, and this should be case for all future EQAs.	Not Rated	There are 10 lessons, and some are written more in line with a finding than a lesson, for example Lesson VII noted that extended stays in safe house for GBV survivors impacts on resources and targets - if there is a lesson here it should be worded differently such as "staying longer in safe houses is shown to have a positive impact on beneficiaries". As such some of the lessons would benefit from a rewrite to make them more focused on learning, less on findings, this would make the lessons more actionable/ utility focused.  However, this feedback is provided for information only as lessons learned are beyond the requirements of the UNFPA evaluation guidance this question has not therefore been rated.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 16:</b>	<b>Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?</b>		
	i Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from findings and conclusions. Like the conclusions they are broken down by strategic and programmatic recommendations, which is an appropriate and sensible approach for a CPE to take.
	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 users (primarily the CO) and guidance is provided for implementation. The rationale for each recommendation is provided and linked back to conclusions and findings, followed by a section on operational implications for each recommendation. Responsible actors, actions and prioritization is provided.
	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 the recommendations is described and includes the involvement of key stakeholders. It is stated that the recommendations were codesigned with the ERG, and a CPE recommendations workshop, which also included UNFPA CO staff.  However, it remains unclear if rightsholders were involved in the ERG - the table listing ERG members in the opening pages of the report indicate only organisational representation/ membership of the ERG, however the report notes that there was youth representation in the ERG, and a participatory approach was utilised. This would benefit from clarification.
	iv Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Partially	The recommendations are clearly articulated and well-prioritised. However, they are too broadly directed at the CO and RO. The report would benefit from more precise targeting, such as identifying the specific thematic unit or team within the CO responsible for implementation.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17:</b>	<b>Does the evaluation report include all required information?</b>		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluation and/title of evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluand, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes)-; list of acronyms/abbreviations.	Yes	The opening pages contain all relevant information expected of a UNFPA evaluation.
	ii Annexes include, if not in body of report: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology (e.g. inception report), case study reports.	Yes	Annexes are included in the body of the report and include the evaluation matrix, ToR, data collection instruments, and other expected and relevant annexes for a UNFPA evaluation.
<b>Question 18:</b>	<b>Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?</b>		
	i The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, well formatted).	Yes	The structure of the evaluation follows the guidance in the UNFPA evaluation handbook (2024) and the report is easy to navigate. The report also has clear titles, numbered sections and is well formatted. The evaluation also goes beyond the requirements of the UNFPA evaluation handbook as it usefully includes a lessons learned section.
	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 report length is 82 pages, but this includes the executive summary, so it is closer to the expected 70 for a CPE than the page numbering would imply (though still 4/5 pages over in length).  The structure is in line with UNFPA guidelines for an evaluation report.
<b>Question 19:</b>	<b>Is the report well presented?</b>		
	i Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for the intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is written in an accessible format, with clear and concise writing style, it is well formatted and free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
	ii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Partially	There is frequent use of visual aids to aid in the narrative description up to (but not including) the findings section, these are used to good effect and include maps, tables and figures. They are clearly presented labelled and referenced in the text. However, there is a lack of visual aids in the findings sections, which would benefit from tables, figures or graphs to break up quite long tracts of narrative analysis, and support understanding of complex data.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>

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)?		
	i Evaluation's data collection methods designed to capture the voices/perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders including right holders, marginalized and vulnerable persons, young people, people with disabilities, migrants or refugee populations, indigenous communities, and other persons that are often left behind.	Partially	The data collection methods are designed to capture diverse voices and perspectives of stakeholders, rightsholders which included women of reproductive age, adolescents and those accessing youth based services.  While people with disabilities were mentioned, in multiple places and ways, throughout the evaluation there was no specific method, or approach noted to capture their voices, nor those of other vulnerable groups such as LGBTQ, migrants etc.
	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 addressed cross cutting issues well, with a strong focus on gender quality. Overall social inclusion was well addressed in the evaluation questions.
	iii Data is disaggregated by population groups (e.g. persons with disability, age, gender, etc.) where there are implications related to UNFPA's portfolio/interventions for these population groups; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Partially	Where possible data was disaggregated by gender, and it noted that there were challenges with documentary evidence and programme/ country M&E data, and those of partners not always disaggregated, particularly historically. This was noted as a limitation of the evaluation.  The list of people interviewed is broken down by gender, but not by any other characteristics, and this section could be improved if all interviews were broken down by multiple characteristics and population groups to enable differential assessment of results across different groups.
	iv Intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis, looking at various and multiple forms of exclusion and discrimination (and how they overlap with each other) and how this may impact the performance or results of the evaluand.	Partially	There is some evidence of an intersectionality being taken into account, and data collection tools (Annex 4) outline intersectionality and multiple vulnerabilities as an area to be aware of in KIs and FGDs. However, this does not carry through equally into the findings and conclusions, this is likely related to the lack of disaggregated data, which makes it challenging to identify characteristics of people and groups, however in the data collected directly by the evaluation team this could have been addressed.
	v Findings, conclusions and recommendations, address cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no one behind, social and environmental as relevant.	Yes	Findings, conclusions and recommendations address cross cutting issues well, equality is discussed throughout, as is vulnerability, with a particular focus on reaching the most vulnerable, particularly in relation to criteria relating to humanitarian action. Disability inclusion is included, and social and cultural factors are discussed, particularly in relation to harmful cultural practices, and a whole of society approach to combating issues such as GBV and FGM.
	vi Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Not Rated	The report notes on page 10 that young people were included in the ERG, however it is not clear from the list of participants in the ERG who they were (or if there was an ERG sub group?). This would benefit from clarification. However, this feedback is provided for information only as the inclusion of young people was not requested in the ToR, as such the question has not been rated.
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?  <i>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below</i>	7	<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	The scope of analysis takes gender into account well, and there are evaluation questions and sub questions while will ensure that GEEW data is collected.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	There is a interesting paragraph in the findings section (pp 41) on how the 9th CP adopted a gender transformative approach, however the methodology itself did not explicitly state it would take a gender transformative approach to this evaluation. Methods do however, allow for the collection of gender disaggregated data, as do the data collection tools. The analysis stated it would seek to use disaggregated data, wherever possible. This section could have been improved if a more explicit gender focus, and a gender responsive analysis process/ feminist methodological approach to data collection and analysis had been explicitly outlined.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	Findings reflect a great deal of gendered analysis, with some touching on gender transformative approaches. It would be helpful in the narrative to indicate more clearly who was being interviewed (how many women in relation to different findings and conclusions for example). Overall the findings, conclusions and recommendations do reflect a gender analysis but could have provided more contextualised evidence and analysis that not only analysed questions that related to gender, but intentionally took a gender transformative/ explicitly feminist approach.

## SWAP Rating Guidance

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

### List of SDGs

1. No Poverty
2. Zero Hunger
3. Good Health and Well-being
4. Quality Education
5. Gender Equality
6. Clean Water and Sanitation
7. Affordable and Clean Energy
8. Decent Work and Economic Growth
9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
10. Reduced Inequality
11. Sustainable Cities and Communities
12. Responsible Consumption and Production
13. Climate Action
14. Life Below Water
15. Life on Land
16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
17. Partnerships for the Goals

### Three transformative results

1. Ending unmet need for family planning
2. Ending preventable maternal deaths
3. Ending gender-based violence and harmful practices

### Six outputs

1. Policy and accountability
2. Quality of care and services
3. Gender and social norms
4. Population change and data
5. Humanitarian action
6. Adolescents and youth

### Six accelerators

1. Human rights-based and gender-transformative approaches
2. Innovation and digitalization
3. Partnerships, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing
4. Data and evidence
5. Leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first
6. Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and peace-responsive efforts