

## Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Programme, 2022-2025

### Formative Evaluation

### Terms of Reference

#### A. Introduction

1. Evaluation at the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) serves three main purposes: (a) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources; (b) support evidence-based decision-making; (c) contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to accelerate implementation of the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) and to SDGs.
2. To do this, the UNFPA evaluation function and evaluations conducted for UNFPA need to adhere to independence and impartiality, intentionality and quality (including the principle that all evaluations should meet the minimum quality standards and criteria defined by the Evaluation Office), Transparency and Ethics.
3. The Eastern Europe and Central Asia regional office will conduct a formative evaluation of its 2022-2025 regional programme, referred to as Regional Programme Evaluation hereafter, to draw lessons from the current programme implementation, inform decision-making and also catalyze discussions on the design of the next regional programme development. This evaluation is planned as part of the UNFPA quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan.<sup>1</sup>
4. The primary intended users of the evaluation are (i) UNFPA EECA regional office management; (ii) UNFPA EECA Regional Office; (iii) UNFPA headquarters, particularly the UNFPA Policy and Strategy Division, Technical Division, Evaluation Office; (iv) Country offices in the EECA region, and (v) other UN agencies and the wider group of stakeholders.
5. The evaluation manager prepared these terms of reference for the Eastern Europe and Central Asia RPE by being guided and in conjunction with the overall [Terms of Reference - Formative Evaluation of the Strategic Plan 2022-2025](#).
6. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation in conformity with UNEG norms and standards as articulated in terms of reference, under the management of the Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office (EECARO) and guidance from the evaluation reference group (see Annex 1).
7. Efforts will be taken to bring innovation in conducting regional programme evaluation, and decided to apply the first-of-its-kind joint evaluation approach to ensure better coordination, complementary and synergy with the 2022-2025 UNFPA Strategic Plan evaluation (SP evaluation). The selected team of evaluators for the Regional Programme Evaluation will be part of and act as one Evaluation team of the SP and Regional Programme evaluations.

#### B. Background

8. Despite progress towards the three transformative results and implementation of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), challenges for those left furthest behind and societies in general in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA) region remain. The diverse countries and territories of the region have made progress in securing the rights of people to

---

<sup>1</sup> [UNFPA Quadrennial Budgeted Evaluation Plan 2022-2025](#).

universal access to sexual and reproductive health in recent years, which has led to a sustained reduction in maternal mortality, new legal frameworks and positive steps towards building the necessary systems for reproductive rights and gender equality. However, the challenges related to the unfinished ICPD agenda persist. These relate to national concerns around (a) demographic change, particularly low fertility, ageing populations and outmigration; (b) the relatively high unmet need for family planning; (c) the uneven access to information, education and services that ensure sexual and reproductive health for all; (d) a growing conservatism and pushback against women's rights, which reinforces traditional and harmful gender norms and increases discrimination; (e) the limited progress towards ending gender-based violence and harmful practices; and (f) gaps in fulfilling the potential of all young people. The recent increase in conflict and political turbulence as well as the COVID-19 pandemic have further pushed back progress and raised new uncertainties for people in the region, especially those left furthest behind. 1. Among the particular challenges to achieving the full implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action are the need to (a) build demographic resilience in the region; (b) increase the capacities of Governments to predict demographic shifts and to understand better their implications for individuals, families, communities, municipalities and nations; and (c) develop policy responses based on evidence and human rights. The Eastern Europe, Western Balkans and Caucasus subregions are in the final stages of a demographic transition, with low fertility and ageing as key characteristics. Proportionally, higher percentages of young people characterize the Central Asian countries. Both clusters experience strong migration flows, though these tend to have different directions: in the first cluster, it is primarily oriented toward the European Union, while in the second one, the main destination country is the Russian Federation. Concerns about low fertility or ageing populations – coupled with outmigration, which have been leading to population declines – have resulted in a certain 'demographic anxiety' that is felt in many countries of the region. In some countries, this has led to the formulation of policies – aimed at limiting women's access to sexual and reproductive rights. At the same time, in this political context, the space for progressive civil society is shrinking rapidly across Europe, where civil society organizations have traditionally been instrumental in mobilizing political support for gender equality and sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights.

9. Despite being classified as middle-income countries with the assumed concomitant characteristics, many countries in the region are lagging in terms of the maturity of their population data systems for well-informed policymaking, which is based on reliable and transparent evidence.
10. Challenges also exist concerning achieving sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights for all, with uneven access to and use of modern contraception and the unmet need for family planning, particularly among people with disabilities, young people, marginalized groups and those living in fragile settings. In six EECA countries, the unmet need for modern contraception is over 40 per cent, while the levels of modern contraception use in some countries are comparable to those of the least developed countries.
11. While most EECA countries have made impressive gains in terms of maternal mortality, the lifetime risk of maternal death is still high, particularly in Central Asia and the South Caucasus. Cervical cancer incidence and mortality rates in the region are ten times higher than in the European Union: more than 16,000 deaths and 32,000 new cases registered annually in these countries could be prevented if effective prevention programmes were in place.
12. While the number of new infections of HIV has declined globally by 38 per cent since 2010, the infections in the region have increased by 49 per cent, leading to a total of 2 million people living with HIV. Number of AIDS-related deaths in EECA also continues to rise (increase by 46% since 2010) Only in 2022 there were 160,000 new HIV infections and 48,000 new AIDS-related deaths in the region. While the overall HIV prevalence rate among the general population is 1.2%, it is significantly higher among key populations that, together with their sexual partners, account for 95% of all new HIV infections in the region: 7.2% among people

who inject drugs, 4.3% among gay men and other men who have sex with men, 2% among sex workers, and 1.7% among transgender people.

Coverage of HIV prevention and treatment services in the region remains insufficient: only 62% of people living with HIV know their status, and only 51% of people living with HIV have access to antiretroviral therapy.

The region is also experiencing manifesting stigma and discrimination towards people living with HIV, key populations and LGBTI. From 60 to more than 80% of the general population across the region indicate discriminatory attitudes towards people living with HIV.

Existing punitive laws and policies targeting people living with HIV and people from almost all key populations continue to be barriers to effective AIDS response in the region. All countries in the region criminalize HIV transmission, with 2 countries - criminalizing same-sex relationships. Recent legislative changes in a number of countries in the region, including those that restrict human rights and civic space, have further jeopardized the provision of essential HIV services.<sup>2</sup>

13. The 53 million young people in the region represent an enormous potential for the region. However, many see their hopes and dreams adversely affected by an education system that does not match the needs of labour markets and face youth unemployment. Overall in the region, 12.8 per cent of males and 17.1 per cent of females are not in employment, education or training. While there are signs of improvement, many young people in the region do not have full access to comprehensive sexuality education or access to youth-friendly health services – and the situation is worse for marginalized young people.
14. Adolescent fertility rates range from 9 per 1,000 in Bosnia and Herzegovina to 57 per 1,000 in Tajikistan; there are large variations also between different youth groups; and many young women and girls become pregnant unplanned, many of whom resort to abortion. HIV is a growing problem, with only 28.3 per cent of youth aged 15-25 years in the region correctly identifying ways to prevent HIV and rejecting major misconceptions about HIV transmission<sup>3</sup>. In light of these developments, a significant number of young people leave their countries to look for opportunities elsewhere.
15. Young people were dramatically affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. School closures, disruptions to formal and informal work, fractured social networks and diminished access to services will continue to negatively affect young people long after the pandemic is brought under control. Mental health has emerged as a specific concern; during the pandemic but also in general, young people feel a loss of control as they are often marginalized from participating in decision-making processes affecting their lives.
16. Adverse political and social norms undermine reproductive rights and continue to result in discrimination against women and girls, with a widespread persistence in violence and harmful practices, such as child marriage, gender-biased sex selection and, in some communities, female genital mutilation. In 2019, 70 per cent of women experienced some form of violence in their lifetime, with 31 per cent experiencing physical or sexual violence in Eastern Europe. The COVID-19 pandemic curfews and “lockdown” measures have, unfortunately, led to an increase in gender-based violence (GBV) and undermined existing GBV response efforts. The adoption of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (known as the Istanbul

---

<sup>2</sup> 2023 UNAIDS Global AIDS Update: The Path that ends AIDS: [https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media\\_asset/2023-unaid-global-aids-update\\_en.pdf](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2023-unaid-global-aids-update_en.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Global AIDS Monitoring 2023: <https://aidsinfo.unaids.org/>. Data available for 9 countries of the EECA region

Convention) and other internationally agreed instruments, such as ICPD, are driving commitments to end GBV.

17. While some countries have legal frameworks and policies to protect the rights and safety of key populations, discrimination, exclusion and violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity persist. Hate speech against key populations has been on the rise in the region and a rise in premeditated and brutal attacks on key populations people have been reported, including in Central Asia. Stigma and discrimination towards key populations at risk of HIV (gay men and other men who have sex with men, sex workers, transgender people, people who inject drugs and prisoners) and people living with HIV manifest in the region, with more than 70 per cent of the population expressing discriminatory attitudes. All countries in the region criminalize HIV transmission and nearly all criminalize HIV exposure and non-disclosure of HIV status, with some countries criminalizing men who have sex with men and sex workers.
18. Over the last four years, the number of people affected by natural disasters and conflicts in the EECA region has drastically increased. Development efforts in a number of countries in the region are affected by emergencies or protracted crises, whether they are natural disasters or man-made conflicts. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected all 250 million people living in the region, with a particularly high mortality rate among older people and the most vulnerable. As of mid-2021, eight countries in the EECA region are ranked among those most at risk in the world – with an INFORM Risk Index<sup>[1]</sup> that is either high (Azerbaijan and Armenia) or medium (Turkey, Ukraine, Tajikistan, Georgia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kyrgyzstan) – particularly considering (a) higher exposure to natural and man-made disasters; (b) greater socioeconomic vulnerability of the most vulnerable groups; and (c) greater lack of coping mechanisms.
19. The regional programme contributes to the six strategic plan outputs and is designed to be a catalyst for accelerating the achievement of the three transformative results in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region. The overall vision of the Eastern Europe and Central Asia regional programme is to amplify UNFPA results in the region through regional advocacy, knowledge management and state-of-the-art technical assistance.
20. Based on the specific role of the regional office to enable country-level results, the regional programme supports country efforts to give greater priority to those left furthest behind to achieve their sexual and reproductive health and rights. The programme's priorities address the deeper social, political, economic gaps and the social and gender norms and attitudes that act as barriers to achieving sexual and reproductive health (SRH) and reproductive rights for all. The regional programme maximizes the potential of the EECA region while considering the megatrends across the region. To that end, the programme builds resilience, strengthens sustainability and harnesses digitalization across all outputs. The programme also leverages broad-based partnerships and links research and innovation to policy and programming.
21. The regional programme works with a full spectrum of partners, including all United Nations agencies and programmes, long-standing partners such as the European Union, traditional as well as new and emerging non-traditional donors and international financial institutions to help countries mobilize knowledge and funding in support of this ambitious agenda. The impact of programming will be scaled up through partnerships that deliver specific results and engage civil society organizations, with special attention given to those led by marginalized groups. In addition, the programme continues its engagement with academic networks, parliamentarians, local authorities, inter-agency forums, youth and feminist organizations, social influencers and advocates of change, and the private sector. The partnerships provide opportunities to combine resources and find innovative solutions, leverage the unique competencies of partners, and achieve “win-win” outcomes while tackling multisectoral challenges. South-South and triangular cooperation is integrated across all thematic areas; also, additional opportunities will be found to leverage such forms of cooperation towards achieving the three transformative results and

advancing gender equality and youth engagement, as well as South-South and triangular cooperation in humanitarian contexts.

22. Leveraging the successes of engagement in regional partnership platforms and mechanisms, including through issue-based coalitions, the regional office continues accelerating joint action toward achieving the ICPD Programme of Action and the SDGs through the United Nations development system reform efforts. The programme complements country-level work by creating an enabling policy environment, influencing regional frameworks and processes and providing joined-up technical expertise and tools that add value across the region.
23. Considering the heterogeneity of the countries in the region in terms of exposure to hazards, the vulnerability of people and the coping capacity of the different Governments and national and local actors, the regional office mainstreams preparedness into its longer-term programming to strengthen the resilience of the institutions, communities and individuals, with a particular focus on the most vulnerable groups as well as countries most at risk for humanitarian crises (based on the INFORM index). Additionally, the design of emergency responses in the region will help save lives while building back better, empowering individuals and strengthening services.
24. Lessons learned from the experience of responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and the developmental evaluation of the previous programme have been incorporated into the current regional programme. These include further strengthening policy and programming with a priority on the hardest-to-reach vulnerable groups; strengthening advocacy to mobilize political support for the ICPD agenda and address the pushback on SRHR and gender equality; developing more agility in programming to tackle emerging priorities; and continued regional office dynamism and innovation, as appreciated by all country offices.
25. The regional office aims to strengthen national capacities and systems through technical, policy and programme support and quality assurance to country offices, and it acts as a convener and advocates at the regional level to accelerate change for transformative results at the country level.
26. The Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office continues strengthening its collaboration with other regional offices, building inter alia on work with Asia and the Pacific Regional Office on gender-biased sex selection and population change; and with the Arab States Regional Office on youth peace and security, and contraception. It will also work with other regional offices on knowledge sharing related to digital training platforms on SRH; in particular, it will provide the regional offices with access to the online training platform it supports on virtual contraceptive consultation for further roll-out beyond the EECA region.

### **C. Purpose, objectives and scope**

27. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide evidence input (the basis for decisions to be made) to support UNFPA's learning related to what works (and what does not) to accelerate progress towards achievement of the transformative results in the region and inform the design of the next regional programme.
28. This formative evaluation is a milestone within an 'evaluative evidence package,' and it comes as a critical moment to accompany and inform the development of the new regional programme in the context of Agenda 2030 and address the needs and priorities of leaving no one behind.
29. The 'evaluative evidence package' comprises several thematic and institutional centralized evaluations implemented under the last two Quadrennial Budgeted Evaluation Plans, a few regional projects' evaluations and this formative evaluation.
30. The objective of this evaluation is to 1) assess Regional Programme approaches and components, explore options and new directions based on rigorous inquiry; 2) provide UNFPA managers with the means to learn from experience and to inform the development of the new Regional



Programme; 3) provide feedback into the current cycle programme implementation and inform other corporate processes that are taking place in the organization throughout the evaluation period.

31. The operationalization and use of new elements introduced in the 2022-2025 Strategic Plan will be part of the regional programme evaluation – namely, the six accelerators for change - and the strategic shifts that were proposed during the RP MTR, including flexibility and agility in programming, financing, innovation and partnerships.
32. The evaluation scope will include all outputs and accelerators of the current Regional Programme 2022-2025, with special attention to key challenges/priority areas identified during the mid-term review of the current RP.
33. Among key priority areas for Eastern Europe and Central Asia region are supporting countries in **demographic resilience** to understand, anticipate, and respond to demographic change, with a special focus on **population ageing, outmigration and low fertility**; improving understanding of and capacity to **transform gender and social norms in the region**; promoting **positive masculinities and gender equality**; **integrating sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights and HIV**, particularly within universal health coverage, and regional and national policies, plans and accountability frameworks; and strengthening **humanitarian preparedness and response** and operationalization of the **Humanitarian, Peace and Development (HDP) nexus**, will be closely assessed.
34. The evaluation will focus on the current regional programme period from 2022 until the end of data collection in 2024. A forward-looking perspective will be maintained so that the evaluation results will benefit the remainder of the Regional Programme and the development of the subsequent one.

#### **D. Evaluation questions**

35. The evaluation will address the following key questions, which will address evaluation criteria such as relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency within the framework of a formative evaluation. The questions related to the strategic shifts will be prioritized and reduced during the inception phase following discussions with key stakeholders and considering the strategic shifts in the regional programme identified through the MTR, including highlighted key challenges.

Evaluation questions	Evaluation Criteria			
	Relevance	Coherence	Effectiveness	Efficiency
<i>Forward-looking perspective</i>				
1. To what extent should the regional office reconceptualize the next RP given the state of current progress of the regional programme and 3TRs acceleration in the region?	X			
<i>Accelerators</i>				
2. To what extent have accelerators been used by the regional programme, and been relevant to achieving the 3TRs and ICPD PoA in the region? What have been the enabling and inhibiting factors?	x		X	
<i>Strategic Shifts</i>				
3. To what extent are the effects of megatrends, particularly ageing, outmigration and low fertility, being focused by the RP?		X		
4. To what extent is RP focusing on “populations left behind” and emphasizing “reaching those furthest behind first”, including in humanitarian situations?	X		X	
5. To what extent has RP scaled up the provision of high-quality, comprehensive sexual and reproductive health information and services in the region and multisectoral response to GBV in the region?			X	
6. To what extent has RP expanded humanitarian preparedness and response capacity and HPD nexus programming in the region?			X	
7. To what extent are the discriminatory social and gender norms and structural and power inequalities being addressed by the RP?			X	
8. To what extent has the RP’s focus shifted from funding to funding and financing to achieve the ICPD agenda in the region?				X
<i>Enablers</i>				
9. To what extent has strategic communication facilitated the acceleration and strategic shifts foreseen in the RP?			X	
10. To what extent RP partnerships expanded and diversified to accelerate progress on 3TRs and ICPD PoA in the region?	X		X	

36. The evaluation questions will be finalized during the inception phase. The regional evidence gathered will serve both the evidence repository for the whole corporate evaluation as well as for the specific Eastern Europe and Central Asia regional report.

## **E. Methodological approach**

37. The evaluation will be theory-based with aspects of an adaptive/developmental approach. The use of mixed-methods will ensure that a broad range of data – both quantitative and qualitative – are examined. The evaluation will carry out the following data collection, at a minimum (see section G. Evaluation Process for more information):
- Desk review of key documents related to the current RP, including project reports;
  - Desk review of strategic, corporate and programmatic documents;
  - Review of the Regional MTR survey data, and evidence from audits, if available;
  - Synthesis of evaluative evidence from corporate, regional and country evaluations;
  - Missions to selected country offices;
  - Interviews with UNFPA key informants across global, regional and country levels, including regional programme stakeholders;
  - Interviews with regional UN agencies;
  - Deep-dive analyses on priority challenges for the regional programme and/or areas where the existing evaluative evidence base is particularly weak (see Annex 2).
38. Aspects of an adaptive, developmental approach will be applied in this evaluation, including an appreciation of complexity, systems thinking, timely feedback and co-creation. Consultation with key stakeholders will enable the identification of key topics for learning, which may be explored in individual analytical papers presented and discussed with key stakeholders during the data collection phase and added to the evidence base for analysis.
39. In order to assess the relevance and effectiveness of strategic shifts and accelerators of the regional programme, country-level data collection will focus on those Country Offices that developed and approved Country Programme Documents following the approval of the current SP (see Annex 3). This data will be used to inform a discussion with the evaluation team and the Regional Office on the cross-section of countries best suited to a country mission or desk review to reflect the regional context and priorities.
40. “Deep dive” analyses will focus on 2 topics to be defined during the inception phase in consultation with key stakeholders to ensure that they address key challenges facing the region. The topics will be drawn from the priority. These “deep dives” will be carried out early in the data collection phase and shared with stakeholders as inputs to the development of the new Regional Programme, 2026-2029. Among the topics to be considered are those identified through the Regional Programme MTR process, as well as those where there is more limited evaluative evidence available, such as: integration of data on mega-trends with a special focus on demographic resilience, social norms, and strengthening humanitarian preparedness and response with the focus on Regional Humanitarian response to Ukrainian crisis in EU countries, partnerships and funding-financing. The two key priorities for the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region, such as demographic resilience and strengthening humanitarian preparedness and response will be the relevant deep-dive analyses of the Regional Programme evaluation.
41. Artificial Intelligence will be leveraged as much as possible and in accordance with UNFPA and UNEG rules and regulations to collect, analyze and store data. Additional data collection methods will be considered during the inception phase of the evaluation.
42. This evaluation will ensure that data from the mid-term review of the RP will be used as appropriate.

## **F. Evaluability Assessment**



43. This formative evaluation will benefit from aspects of the data collection carried out as part of the mid-term review of the SP and the RP. Results from a survey of country offices' perceptions of the current SP and the Regional Programme will be shared. In addition, the SP MTR includes assessments of regional programmes, which will also be requested from the SP Evaluation team for review and use by the regional programme evaluation team.
44. As the RP will only have been implemented for two years when data collection for this evaluation starts, there will be an increased emphasis on collecting primary source data in this evaluation. The secondary sources that will be reviewed include all documentation prepared by different teams/regional office/HQ divisions to aid implementation of the RP. Country Programme Documents developed following the approval of the Strategic Plan will be reviewed in the context of country missions and/or country desk reviews. Performance reports will be assessed not to measure results achieved but to identify evidence related to the strategic shifts articulated by the Regional Programme.

## **G. Evaluation Process**

45. The evaluation will be carried out in five phases and lead to the preparation and submission of the key deliverables, as described below.

### *Preparatory phase*

46. This phase will be led by the Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office Evaluation Manager in close collaboration with the Strategic Plan Evaluation Manager based in the UNFPA Evaluation Office. It will include: (i) an initial documentation review; (ii) scoping interviews with UNFPA key informants (iii) the drafting of evaluation terms of reference; (iv) the selection and hiring of the evaluation team; and, (v) the constitution of an evaluation reference group.

### *Inception phase*

47. The evaluation team will conduct a brief inception phase, in consultation with the evaluation manager, global evaluation team and the RPE reference group. This phase includes:
- a document review of all key documents available at UNFPA regional office and selected documents at HQ and country office levels;
  - adaptation of a methodological framework developed by the Strategic Plan evaluation team to the RPE;
  - a stakeholder mapping and analysis;
  - the development of a final list of evaluation questions and related evaluation matrix (see template in Annex 4) presenting assumptions, indicators, sources of information and methods and tools for the data collection;
  - the selection of 2-3 countries for country missions;
  - the development of a comprehensive data collection and analysis strategy and tools; and,
  - an updated and detailed timeline for the evaluation.
48. The expected deliverables from this phase are:
- ✓ Inputs to a draft global inception report [Annex 4] that informs the development of an inception note for the RPE specifying scope and methodology that fit for the regional context (scope, final stakeholder map, evaluation questions, sampling methodology, timeline, evaluation matrix, tools for data collection and analyses), using/adapting a structure set out in annex 4;

- ✓ a PowerPoint presentation structured around the key components of the inception note, for the inception evaluation reference group meeting.<sup>4</sup> The presentation should also include the learning from the inception phase.
- ✓ a final inception note.

### *Data collection phase*

49. During this phase, the evaluation team will:

- Conduct an in-depth document review;
- Conduct a systematic review of EECA region and regional office evaluations, including a possible synthesis of evidence;
- Conduct interviews with key internal and external informants (at HQ, regional and country levels);
- Carry out 2-3 country missions and a visit to the Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office;
- Complete “deep dive” analysis; and,
- Complete regional programme analysis.

50. The outputs of this phase are:

- ✓ Evidence tables compiling the data and information collected during the country missions;
- ✓ Powerpoint presentations from each of the country missions;
- ✓ 1 Powerpoint presentation from the regional visit that includes a content from the deep dive analyses;
- ✓ 1 Powerpoint presentation for an end-of-data-collection ERG meeting.

### *Reporting phase*

51. The evaluation team then proceeds with the drafting of the final report. The regional report will be quality-assured by the evaluation team, the SP evaluation manager and the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor.

52. This first draft final report will be submitted to the RPE evaluation manager for comments. The evaluation manager will assess the quality of the submitted draft report according to the EQAA grid {Annex 6}. If the quality of the draft report (form and substance) is satisfactory, the manager will circulate it to the RPE reference group members and the SP evaluation manager. In the event that the quality is unsatisfactory, the evaluators will be required to produce a new version of the draft report.

53. The second draft final report, and in particular the tentative conclusions and recommendations, will be virtually presented by the evaluation team to the ERG as well as other relevant stakeholders and circulated to the UNFPA Regional office staff.

54. The evaluation team will revise and finalize the report after receiving comments. When submitting the final draft report, the evaluation team will also provide a detailed matrix indicating how each comment was addressed. The final report will follow the structure set out in Annex 5.

55. The report is considered final once it is formally approved by the Director of the Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia in consultation with the evaluation manager and the reference group.

---

<sup>4</sup> The inception ERG meeting will be virtual.

## Dissemination phase

56. The evaluation team will assist the RPE evaluation manager in selected dissemination activities. In particular, they will prepare a PowerPoint presentation on key highlights of the evaluation report and an evaluation brief.

## H. Management and governance

57. The responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation will rest with the Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

58. *The evaluation manager/Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor.* The evaluation manager will have overall responsibility for the management of the evaluation process, including hiring and managing the (team of) external consultant(s). The evaluation manager is responsible for ensuring the quality and independence of the evaluation (in line with UNEG Norms, Standards and Ethical Guidelines). The main responsibilities of the evaluation manager are to:

- hire the external consultant(s) that will make up the evaluation team;
- serve as a secretariat for the reference group and convene review meetings with the evaluation team;
- supervise and guide the evaluation team all through the evaluation process;
- review, provide substantive comments and pre-approve the inception note, including the work plan, analytical framework and methodology;
- review and quality assure all evaluation outputs in general and on the draft and final evaluation reports in particular;
- pre-approve the final evaluation report of the regional programme, in coordination with the reference group; and,
- disseminate the evaluation results and contribute to learning and knowledge sharing at UNFPA.

59. There will be a close collaboration with the EO to enhance coordination across all RPEs to ensure a strong linkage to the global SPE.

60. *The Director of the Regional Office* will approve the selection of the Evaluation team, as well as the inception note and evaluation report.

61. *The evaluation reference group.* The evaluation will be followed closely by an evaluation reference group consisting of staff members of UNFPA and select external members. The internal reference group will play a key role in ensuring access to information and individuals, as well as reviewing and providing feedback and comments on the design and draft evaluation reports, play a key role in disseminating evidence and learning from the evaluation, contributing to disseminating the results of the evaluation as well as to the completion and follow-up of the management response.

## I. Evaluation Timeline

	Evaluation Phase	Timeline
0	Preparatory phase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Internal consultations</i></li> <li>● <i>Drafting of terms of reference</i></li> <li>● <i>Hiring consultants</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 2023</li> <li>○ November 2023</li> <li>○ November-December 2023</li> </ul>

1	<p>Inception phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Revised timeline</i></li> <li>● <i>Final inception note</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ mid-February 2024</li> </ul>
2	<p>Data collection phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● mission to selected countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ mid February – April 2024</li> </ul>
3	<p>Analysis and Synthesis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May 2024</li> </ul>
4	<p>Reporting and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Draft final report</i></li> <li>● <i>Final report</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May – June 2024</li> </ul>
5	<p>Management response and dissemination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Management response development</i></li> <li>● <i>Communication Plan</i></li> <li>● <i>Dissemination interventions</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ August 2024 - February 2025</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 1 – Proposed Reference Groups

<i>Name</i>	<i>Business Unit</i>	<i>Position</i>
<i>Giulia Vallese</i>	<i>UNFPA Eastern Europe and Central Asia RO</i>	<i>Deputy Regional Director/Chair</i>
<i>Jennet Appova</i>	<i>UNFPA Eastern Europe and Central Asia RO</i>	<i>Regional M&amp;E Adviser/Secretariat</i>
<i>Marie Toulemonde</i>	<i>Eastern Europe and Central Asia RO</i>	<i>Regional Specialist/Project Manager</i>
<i>Nigina Abaszade</i>	<i>Uzbekistan CO</i>	<i>Representative</i>
<i>Raimbek Sissemaliyev</i>	<i>Kazakhstan CO</i>	<i>Assistant Representative</i>
<i>Zeljko Blagojevic</i>	<i>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</i>	<i>P&amp;D Analyst/M&amp;E Focal Point</i>
<i>Vitaly Djuma</i>	<i>Eurasian Coalition on Health, Rights, Gender and Sexual Diversity</i>	<i>Executive Director</i>
<i>Emilie Peeters</i>	<i>ANSER</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>
<i>Andres Vikat</i>	<i>UNECE/Board member of CISPop project</i>	<i>Chief of the Social and Demographic Statistics Section/UNECE</i>
<i>Michael Herrmann</i>	<i>UNFPA Population and Development Branch/Technical Division</i>	<i>Adviser</i>
<i>Emmanuel Roussie</i>	<i>UNFPA Eastern Europe and Central Asia RO</i>	<i>Humanitarian Coordinator</i>
<i>Mohammed Ghafour</i>	<i>UN agency</i>	<i>UNHCR Regional Office/Protection Working Group</i>
<i>Rune Brandrup</i>	<i>UNFPA Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia</i>	<i>Regional Programme Coordinator</i>

## ANNEX 2 – Mapping Evaluative Evidence against Key Aspects of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2022-2025

<b>Evidence Gaps</b>		
<b>Core elements of the Strategic Plan 2022-2025</b>	<b>Related Evaluations</b>	<b>(Planned) Completion Date</b>
<b>Transformative Results</b>		
TR1 – By 2025, the reduction in the unmet need for family planning has accelerated	○ <i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNFPA Supplies Programme (2013-2020)</i>	2018
TR2 – By 2025, the reduction of preventable maternal deaths has accelerated	○ <i>Evaluation of the MNHTF – Phase III</i>	July 2022
TR3 – By 2025, the reduction in gender-based violence and harmful practices has accelerated.	○ <i>Evaluation of Phase III of the JP to Eliminate FGM</i> ○ <i>Evaluation of UNFPA support to gender equality and women's empowerment (2012-2020)</i> ○ <i>Joint Evaluation of UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage</i>	○ 2021 ○ 2021 ○ 2019
<b>Outputs</b>		

i. Policy and accountability		
ii. Quality of care and services	<i>Evaluation of the MNHTF – Phase III</i>	<i>July 2022</i>
iii. Gender and social norms	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA support to gender equality and women's empowerment (2012-2020)</i>	<i>2021</i>
iv. Population change and data	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA support to population dynamics and data</i>	<i>June 2023</i>
v. Humanitarian action	<i>Inter-agency humanitarian evaluation of the COVID-19 response</i>	<i>2022</i>
	<i>Evaluation of humanitarian capacities</i>	<i>tbd</i>
vi. Adolescents and youth	<i>Formative evaluation of UNFPA support to adolescents and youth</i>	<i>June 2023</i>
<b>Accelerators</b>		
i. Human rights-based and gender transformative approaches	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA's use of a human rights-based approach and support to "leave no one behind"</i>	<i>2025</i>
ii. Innovation and digitalization	<i>Evaluation of innovation</i>	<i>tbd</i>
iii. Partnerships, South-South and triangular cooperation and financing	<i>Formative evaluation of UNFPA approach to South-South and triangular cooperation</i>	<i>2020</i>
iv. Data and evidence	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA support to population dynamics and data</i>	<i>2023</i>
v. "Leaving no one behind" and "reaching the furthest behind first"	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA's use of a human rights-based approach and support to "leave no one behind"</i>	<i>2025</i>
vi. Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and peace- responsive efforts.	<i>Formative evaluation of the organizational resilience of UNFPA in light of its response to the COVID-19 pandemic</i>	<i>2023</i>
<b>Key Strategic Shifts</b>		
Increasing focus on the "populations left behind" and "reaching those furthest behind first"	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA's use of a human rights-based approach and support to "leave no one behind"</i>	<i>2025</i>
Scaling up the provision of high-quality comprehensive sexual and reproductive health information and services	<i>Evaluation of the MNHTF – Phase III</i>	<i>July 2022</i>
Expanding the humanitarian response capacity	<i>Formative evaluation of the organizational resilience of UNFPA in light of its response to the COVID-19 pandemic</i>	<i>2023</i>
	<i>Evaluation of humanitarian capacities</i>	<i>tbd</i>
Incorporating the multi-sectoral needs of women, adolescents and youth and addressing structural inequalities (inter-sectionality)	<i>Evaluation of UNFPA support to gender equality and women's empowerment (2012-2020)</i>	<i>2021</i>
Joint accountability in line with UN reforms, principles and practices	<i>Formative evaluation of the UNFPA engagement in the reform of the United Nations development system</i>	<i>2023</i>
<b>Organizational effectiveness and efficiency</b>		
Improved programming for results	<i>Developmental evaluation of results-based management at UNFPA</i>	<i>2019</i>
<b>Regional Evaluative Evidence</b>		



RP Output	Related evaluation	Completion date
Social Norms Change	<a href="#">Expanding Choices regional project: Gender-Responsive Family Policies for the Private Sector in the Western Balkans and Moldova</a>	2023
Social Norms Change	<a href="#">EU 4 Gender Equality joint regional project: Together against gender stereotypes and gender-based violence</a>	2023

Accelerators		
Population dynamics	Regional CISPop project “Better Data for Better Policies.”	expected completion March 2024
Humanitarian	<a href="#">After Action Review of Ukraine Response</a>	
Accelerators		
<b>LNOB</b>	<a href="#">Turkiye project “Increasing access of most vulnerable groups to protection services”</a>	2023

### ANNEX 3 – Criteria for Country Selection

The following criteria were applied to select countries:

- a good balance and representation of Tier II and Tier III countries
- equal representation of countries developed their CPDs before, during and after the 2022-2025 SP introduction
- equal representation of the country Clusters
- a good balance of countries with humanitarian or nexus-focused approach programmes
- consideration of countries to be covered by the SP evaluation

Country Programmes	Color Quadrant	Tier	CPD start	Humanitarian context	Focus on ageing/ low fertility/demres	Cluster
Albania	Pink	III	2022	no	Yes	Yes/Balkans
Moldova*	Pink	III	2023	yes	Yes	No
Uzbekistan	Pink	III	2021	no	yes	Yes/CA 1
Turkmenistan	Pink	II	2021	no	no	Yes/CA1
North Macedonia	Pink	III	2021	no	yes	Yes/Balkans
B&H*	Pink	III	2021	has some parts	yes	Yes/Balkans
Serbia	Pink	III	2021	no	yes	Yes/Balkans
Kazakhstan	Pink	III	2021	no	yes/ageing	Yes/CA1
Tajikistan	Orange	II	2023	Yes-cross border		Yes/CA2
Ukraine	Pink	III	2018 [extended till 2024]	Yes	Yes	No
Armenia	Pink	III	2021	yes	yes	No
Belarus	Pink	III	2021	yes, part of Ukraine response	no	No

\*countries recommended for the mission but the final countries will be decided during the Inception phase

Note: Kyrgyzstan and Turkiye covered under the SPE.

## Annex 4 – Outline of the Inception Note

Table of Contents  
List of Acronyms  
List of Tables (\*)  
List of Figures

### 1 Introduction

*Should include: objectives of the evaluation; scope of the evaluation; overview of the evaluation process; purpose of the inception report.*

### 2 Background and context

*Should include: a description of the context (e.g., key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors) as well as the main programmes and interventions constituting the UNFPA response. Information on any relevant reviews, assessments, audits and/or evaluations previously conducted should be mentioned.*

*This section should detail strategies or approaches to programming as well as discuss cross-cutting issues, including particularly issues relating to human rights and gender equality.*

### 3 Intervention logic

*Should include: an in-depth analysis of the intervention logic, i.e., assumptions, causality links and risks underlying UNFPA interventions.*

### 4 Methodology

*Should include: rationale for methodological choices, description of the methods and tools for data collection, analysis, as well as validation techniques. Detailed information on the instruments for data collection and analysis such as: interview protocols per type of informant; protocol for focus groups; structure and lines of enquiries for the case studies; etc. Description of how the data should be cross-checked and limitations of the exercise and strategies to mitigate them.*

### 5 Proposed Evaluation Questions

*Should include: a set of evaluation questions with explanatory comments (rationale; coverage of the issues raised in the ToR); detailed approach to answering the evaluation questions (including assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information and associated data collection methods and tools) in the form of an evaluation matrix.*

### 6 Next Steps

*Should include: a detailed work plan for the next phases/stages of the evaluation, including detailed plans for the field visits, including the list of interventions for in-depth analysis in the field (explanation of the value added for the visits); team composition for the cases studies including distribution of tasks; logistics for the field phase; the contractor's approach to ensure quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables.*

### 7 Annexes

*Should include: portfolio of relevant interventions; evaluation matrix; stakeholder map; interview and focus group protocols; detailed structure of the country case study briefing notes and evidence tables; bibliography; list of persons met; terms of reference*

*(\*) Tables, graphs and diagrams should be numbered and have a title.*

## Annex 5 – Outline of the Final Report

Number of pages: 20-40 pages with the annexes

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

List of Tables (\*)

List of Figures

**Executive Summary:** 3-5 pages: objectives, short summary of the methodology and key conclusions and recommendations

### 1 Introduction

*Should include:* purpose of the evaluation; description of shifts made in the current Regional Programme 2022-2025

### 2 Methodology

*Should include:* overview of the evaluation process; methods and tools used for data collection and analysis; evaluation questions and assumptions to be assessed; limitations to data collection; approach to triangulation and validation

### 3 Findings

*Should include for each response to evaluation question:* evaluation criteria covered; summary of the response; detailed response.

### 4 Conclusions

*Should include for each conclusion:* summary; origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on); detailed conclusion.

### 5 Recommendations

*Should include for each recommendation:* summary; priority level (very high/high/medium); target (business unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed); origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on); operational implications. Recommendations must be: linked to the conclusions; clustered, prioritized; accompanied by timing for implementation; useful and operational.

**Annexes** shall be confined to a separate volume.

*Should include:* country ppts; evidence tables; evaluation matrix; portfolio of interventions; methodological instruments used (survey, focus groups, interviews etc.); bibliography; list of people interviewed; terms of reference; regional programme evaluation reports.

*(\*) Tables, Graphs, diagrams, maps etc. presented in the final evaluation report must also be provided to the Evaluation Office in their original version (in Excel, PowerPoint or word files, etc.).*

The final version of the evaluation report shall be presented in a way that enables publication (professionally designed and copy edited) without need for any further editing (see section below). Please note that, for the final report, the evaluation team should share the files in Adobe Indesign CC software, with text presented in two columns with no hyphenation. Further details on the design will be provided by the UNFPA Regional Office in due course.

## Annex 6 – Code of conduct and norms for evaluation in the UN system

Evaluations of UNFPA-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous and evaluators must demonstrate personal and professional integrity. In particular:

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent**. The members of the evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject under evaluation, nor should they expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and should have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. The evaluators should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual informants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals** and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. At times, evaluations uncover **evidence of wrongdoing**. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. Evaluators should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to, and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the dignity and self-worth of all stakeholders.
5. Evaluators are responsible for the **clear, accurate and fair** written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations.

**A declaration of absence of conflict of interest must be signed by each member of the team and shall be annexed to the offer.** No team member should have participated in the preparation, programming or implementation of UNFPA interventions during the period under evaluation.

[ Please date, sign and write "Read and approved" ]

See **Code of conduct for evaluation in the United Nations System** at:

<http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG+Ethical+Guidelines>

See **Norms for evaluation in the United Nations System** at:

[http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\\_id=21](http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21)

## Annex 7 – UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Information on UNFPA’s Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid can be found [here](#). The template used is below:

Quality Assessment Criteria
<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>
<b>1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?</b>
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations, 70 for CPEs, 80 for thematic evaluations) <i>Note: YES - the report is within the indicated maximum page length. PARTIAL - the report exceeds the maximum page limit by 1- 5 pages. NO - the report exceeds the maximum page limit beyond 5 pages</i>
3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs, a bibliography, a list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix, methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides, focus group notes, outline of surveys)?
<b>4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?</b>
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 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 beyond 2 pages</i>
<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>
1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>
<b>3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?</b>
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?
5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)? <i>Remember: Please address all three aspects of this sub-criteria in the comment: 1) is a comprehensive stakeholder map included (in either the report itself or the annexes) 2) Is the overall stakeholder consultation process described and 3) within the consultation process were key stakeholders consulted on the</i>
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?
8. Is the sampling strategy described?
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data? <i>Remember: The default should be to disaggregate by sex. Whenever possible, this sub-criterion is also asking systematic disaggregation of data related to population groups (e.g. persons with disability) where there are implications related to UNFPA’s portfolio/interventions for these population groups</i>
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?
<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>
<b>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</b>
<b>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</b> <i>Remember: Please address both parts of this sub-criteria, namely do the evaluators identify the sources of the qualitative and quantitative data they used and do they discuss the reliability (or lack thereof) of both?</i>
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations? <i>Remember: Ensure that reviewers are assessing the sub-criteria is concerned with whether there is evidence in the report that evaluators’ approach to data collection was sensitive to ethical considerations (i.e. consent, confidentiality, etc.) and were not discriminatory against particular groups’ participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders, including persons with disability). We are also interested if evaluators noted limitations in this regard.</i>
<i>Note that mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to evidence that the data was actually collected with a sensitivity to ethics and discrimination; the reviewer should assess whether there is evidence in the report of the UNEG standards actually being implemented. If the UNEG documents/standards are referenced in the text, but the evaluators do not explain how/show evidence of the data being collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination, etc., this should be a "no".</i>



#### 4. Analysis and Findings

*To ensure sound analysis and credible findings*

**1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?**

2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?

3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?

**4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?**

*Remember: Please address both parts of the sub-criteria in the comment, namely: are the cause/effect links (between UNFPA contribution and outputs/contribution to results/outcomes) explained as well as the results and 2) are unintended outcomes discussed. On the latter, please note in the comment whether evaluators considered/looked for unintended outcomes and noted whether there were (or were not) any; or whether the report does not mention unintended outcomes.*

5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?

6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?

7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?

#### 5. Conclusions

*To assess the validity of conclusions*

1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?

**2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?**

3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluator's unbiased judgement?

#### 6. Recommendations

*To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations*

1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?

**2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?**

3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address as relevant, key cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?

4. Are the recommendations prioritized?

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:		
<b>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (**)</b>				
<p>1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in away that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?</p> <p><i>Remember: Ensure that the reviewer does not confuse the content of the country programme with the approach to the evaluation. This question is asking whether the evaluation criteria and questions are gender responsive and inclusion of GEEW dimensions in its scope of analysis (i.e. in the objectives for example) or the indicators the evaluation selects against which data will be collected so that the evaluation is able to assess whether the country programme is gender responsive.</i></p> <p><i>A general note on UNFPA programming: While there may be evidence of gender being referred to as a cornerstone of UNFPA programming - in the sense that most UNFPA programmes target women and girls - this does not necessarily mean that UNFPA's work is gender/human rights responsive. GEEW is about power and shifting resources, social norms, attitudes, laws and policies. One could work on comprehensive sexuality education, for example, in a way that further entrenches gendered norms or power dynamics (i.e. pathologizing LGBTQ communities or reifying gender binaries by assuring heteronormativity); this would not be GEEW sensitive. Another example: one could deliver sexual and reproductive health care that fails to adequately address the diverse health needs of women (i.e. women who are disabled, older women, LGBTQI women; conceptualizes women as mothers alone (meaning through the spectrum of reproductive rights only, excluding their sexual rights); and/or holding biases against contraceptive options again this would not be GEEW sensitive.</i></p>			<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicator to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results? (Score: 0-3)</p>	
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p> <p><i>Remember: Ensure that the reviewer does not confuse the content of the country programme with the approach to the evaluation. This sub-criteria is asking whether the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions (i.e. the evaluation itself) are gender responsive; in other words are the criteria interpreted/operationalized and evaluations questions developed in a way that is able to capture whether (or not) gender equality/human rights/the empowerment of women has been integrated into UNFPA's country programme support (in the design/planning, implementation and results)?</i></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? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</p>	
<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>			<p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3)</p>	
<p>(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.  (**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).</p>				
<b>Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment</b>				
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points)	Assessment Levels (**)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)				
2. Design and methodology (13)				
3. Reliability of data (11)				
4. Analysis and findings (40)				
5. Conclusions (11)				
6. Recommendations (11)				
7. Integration of gender (7)				
Total scoring points				