					NET!	
Organizational unit:	ASRO		Year	of report:	2020	
Title of evaluation report:	Regional Program Evaluation (RPE) 2018-2021 Regional Interventions Action Plan (RIAP)					
Overall quality of report:	Very good		Date of as	ssessment:	24 July 2021	
Overall comments:	This is a very good report prepared under difficult conditions thanks to COVID-19. It had a very thorough evaluation matrix and co findings. Issues of gender and disability, as well as of youth, were well discussed in the evaluation which had a good human rights foct transpulsted information for recommendations. The evaluation's main weaknesses were that the consultation process was not well-than what is generally considered manageable. The evaluation focused well on how to respond to the new challenges and evolving PWD within the CP in several places in the findings, and these issues were carried through to the conclusions and recommendations.	is. In additi described, t nvironmen	ion to KIIs, the methodology included a surve here was little discussion of unintended result	ey and country case studie ts, and the set of recomm	es that helped to provide endations was more extensi	
Assessment Levels	Very strong, above average, best Good practice Good satisfactory, respectable	Fair	with some weaknesses, still Unsati	isfactory weak, does standards	not meet minimal quality	
Quality Assessme	ent Criteria	Insert as:	sessment level followed by main comments. (us	se 'shading' function to gi	ve cells corresponding colour	
1. Structure and	Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Good	
To ensure the report	is comprehensive and user-friendly	raruai				
appropriate for th	ructured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language he intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made (findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Partial	The structure was logical and there are only distinction between report sections could h font was used for section and sub-section h	ave been more clear if a		
thematic evaluations	,	Yes	The report, not including the executive sum			
tools used (e.g. inter	ontain – at a minimum – the ToRs: a bibliography: a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection view guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys}!	Yes	The annexes contain all of the desired mate	erial.		
	summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of		All of the elements are present. The summa			
interventions; iii)	intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	Partial	would be more useful for decision-makers i listed one after another in paragraph form, could more clearly connect them.			
5. Is the executive s	ummary reasonably concise (e.g., with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The summary is five pages long.			
2. Design and Me	thodology	Yes No		Assessment Level:	Very good	
To ensure that the ev	raluation is put within its context	Partial				
I. Is the developmen	nt and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	There is a thorough description of the cont	text, with constraints ana	yzed clearly.	
2. Does the evalu	ation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	The evaluators revised the theory of change to make it more consistent with international norms. However, one element, outputs, were described as "strengthen/enhance capacity" which is a passive concept difficult to measure. Instead, the outputs should have been expressed in a more specific way.			
3. Is the evaluatio	design and methodology In framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the Ons, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	Yes	There is a full evaluation matrix that is desc	ribed in the text and sho	wn in an annex.	
· ·	data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	There is a complete description of the tools effect of COVID-19 is noted and analyzed.	s and the rationale for th	eir selection is described. The	
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)?		Partial	There is a narrative-style stakeholemap in the annex (although it appears drawn from the Inception Report as it begins with a note that it will be updated). It includes representation from marginalized groups, although not specifically PWD. There is an evaluation reference group. While it is stated that there was consultation on the recommendations, there is no description of the process.			
6. Are the methods	for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	There is a detailed presentation of analysis the PRECEDE-PROCEED model (PPM) to a			
7. Are methodologic issues?	cal limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described! Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such	Yes	There is a clear section on methodological addressed.	limitations and a descript	ion of how these were	
8. Is the sampling str	rategy described?	Yes	The strategy is mostly purposive, but the selection of case studies was described clearly.			
9. Does the method	ology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Data were disaggregated by gender as well	as, where relevant, disabi	lity.	
10. Is the design and human rights)?	I methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and	Yes	The design of the methodology dealt with cross-cutting issues, especially in terms of gender.			
3. Reliability of Da	ata	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Very good	
To ensure quality of d	lata and robust data collection processes					
	tion triangulate data collected as appropriate? tion clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Triangulation was used consistently. There was a use of quantitative data from the	he document reviews and	of qualitative data from	
	that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	interviews and focus groups. The ethical standards applied were describe namely anonymity in the report was clearly	ed in the methodology se	ction, and the main issue,	
		Yes	collection protocols also show that ethical i		sections of the tata	

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No	Assessment Level:	Good
To ensure sound analysis and credible findings	Partial		
I. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	There were many findings, organized by evaluation question and by subject : finding was based on evidence that was presented.	area. In each case, the
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis was described in each case, including where there were issues with	h the evidence.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?		The main structure was the four types of programmes (SRH, Youth, Gende	er and Population Data)
	Yes	and within each of these, the evaluation questions.	
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?		In terms of effectiveness, cause-effect is shown. There were no instances di	escribed of unintended
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any difficenced outcomes highlighted.	Partial	outcomes, even though unintended rightsholders were noted in the stakeho	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The focus particularly on vulnerable groups was clear.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors were always invoked in explaining results.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?		There is a section on cross-cutting issues, but many, including disability and	gender are found
	Yes	throughout the analysis as relevant.	8, a. c
5. Conclusions	Yes		
	No	Assessment Level:	Very good
To assess the validity of conclusions	Partial		
I. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The evaluators make a clear link between findings and conclusions.	
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the	res	The conclusions build on the findings but are wider, in part because they dra	aw on different findings.
programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability,	Yes	and the second s	
disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?			
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias.	
6. Recommendations	Yes		
	No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations	Partial		
I. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	They follow the conclusions and are linked.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and	Yes	The intended users are clear and each has operational aspects.	
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?	Yes	They address the cross-cutting issues, including disability.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?		There are 18 recommendations and all are given high priority although diffe	rent timeframes are
		given (short, medium and longterm). To help ensure they are manageable to	address, it is good
	Partial	practice to have fewer overall recommendations, and to have different level timeframes also adds a level of complexity to management processes.	ls of priority. The three
	•		
7. Gender			
7. Gender	0	Assessment Level:	Vary good
	2 3 (**)	Assessment Level.	Very good
To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)	13()		
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?		 a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in oth 	
		(Score: 0-3) GEEW was not specifically highlighted in scope or objectives.	. Score=0
		 Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights incleased evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criterion. 	
		There was a standalone criterion. Score=3	,
		c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regard integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) There were the control of the evaluation?	
	2	questions on gender. Score=3	
		d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was a implementation period on specific result indicators to measure programmers.	
		rights and gender equality results ?(Score: 0-3) The evaluation asse	
		information on gender available and had specific indicators. Score=3	
2 Is a gooder responsive methodology used including gooder responsive methods and tools and data applying techniques?			the methodology
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?			
		 a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen 	der considerations
		including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) G	der considerations Gender was discussed in
		including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalua gender-responsive. Score=2	der considerations Sender was discussed in ation processes were
		including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 6-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalu- gender-responsive. Score-2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap	der considerations sender was discussed in ation processes were proach, appropriate
		including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalua gender-responsive. Score=2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing botd qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score)	der considerations dender was discussed in ation processes were aproach, appropriate th quantitative and
		including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 6-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalua gender-responsive. Score ²² b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score	der considerations bender was discussed in ation processes were approach, appropriate th quantitative and ore: 0-3) There was a
	3	including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 6-3). Git the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evaluagender-responsive. Score=2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing bot qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Scomized-method approach. Score=3 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (Livavillation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score)	der considerations idender was discussed in ation processes were approach, appropriate th quantitative and ore: 0-3) There was a e. triangulation,
	3	including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evaluagender-responsive. Score=2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing bot qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Scomwed-method approach. Score=3 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i. validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Scondocument analysis and many interviews. Score=3	inder considerations conder was discussed in tition processes were proach, appropriate th quantitative and orne: 0-3) There was a e. triangulation, re: 0-3) There was
	3	including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 6-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalua gender-responsive. Score=2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing bott qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score and the score of the	inder considerations fender was discussed in totion processes were the proach, appropriate the quantitative and ore: 0-3) There was a e. triangulation, re: 0-3) There was versity of ulnerable, where
	3	including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalual gender-responsive. Score=2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap cualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score) mixed-method approach. Score=3 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score) document analysis and many interviews. Score=3 d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the div	inder considerations fender was discussed in totion processes were the proach, appropriate the quantitative and ore: 0-3) There was a e. triangulation, re: 0-3) There was versity of ulnerable, where
	3	including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evaluation method by the sex of t	inder considerations include rounding and sourcess were uproach, appropriate h quantitative and orce 0-3) There was a e. triangulation, rec: 0-3) There was versity of underable, where olders, were engaged. and were all
	3	including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gen and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 6-3) G the methodology but there could have been more clarity on how the evalua gender-responsive. Score: 2 b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods ap to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing bot qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Scomized-method approach. Score: 3 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (Livavilation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Scododoument analysis and many interviews. Score: 3 d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the distakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most via appropriate? (Score: 0-3) the range of stakeholders, including rights he (Score: 3)	inder considerations include rounding and sourcess were uproach, appropriate h quantitative and orce 0-3) There was a e. triangulation, rec: 0-3) There was versity of underable, where olders, were engaged, and were all

3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	a	a. Does the evalua	tion have a backgro	und section that in	cludes an intersectional
	a	analysis of the spec	ific social groups af	fected by the issue	or spell out the relevant
	l l	normative instrum	ents or policies rela	ted to human righ	ts and gender equality?
		(Score: 0-3) The ba	ckground for gender,	which is complex give	n differences in countries,
	i	includes the analysis.	Score=3		
	t	b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates			
	the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data,				
		where applicable? (Score: 0-3) The issues of differences by vulnerability that were not taken into account in policies and programmes is noted. Score=3			vulnerability that were not taken
	c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equa				n rights and gender equality
		described? (Score: 0-3) There is only a very limited discussion of unanticipated effects			
		d. Does the evalua	tion report provide	specific recommer	dations addressing GEEW
	i	issues, and prioriti	es for action to imp	rove GEEW or the	intervention or future
	i	initiatives in this ar	rea? (Score: 0-3) Th	nere are a solid numb	er of recommendations on
	8	gender. Score=3			
(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.					
(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted. (**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali	lity Assessment				
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali	lity Assessment			ment Levels (*)	
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).	lity Assessment	V ery good	Assess Good	ment Levels (*)	Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali	lity Assessment	Very good			Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali	lity Assessment	Very good			Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	lity Assessment	Very good	Good		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)	lity Assessment		Good		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7) 2. Design and methodology (13)	lity Assessment	13	Good		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quality Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7) 2. Design and methodology (13) 3. Reliability of data (11)	lity Assessment	13	Good 7		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 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)	lity Assessment	13	Good 7		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quali Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 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)	lity Assessment	13	Good 7		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 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) 6. Recommendations (11)	lity Assessment	13 11	Good 7		Unsatisfactory
(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3). Overall Evaluation Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) 1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7) 2. Design and methodology (13) 3. Reliability of data (1) 4. Analysis and findings (40) 5. Conclusions (11) 6. Recommendations (1) 7. Integration of gender (7)	lity Assessment	13 11 11 11 7	7 40		Unsatisfactory