



Organizational unit:	Libya CO	Year of report:	2022
Title of evaluation report:	UNFPA Libya Country Programme Evaluation		
Overall quality of report:	Very good	Date of assessment:	1 September 2022
Overall comments:	<p>Overall, this is a high-quality evaluation that can be used by decision-makers with confidence. The evaluation is grounded in a strong methodological approach that draws on multiple methods and sources to gather a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. The methodology is well explained, although it is not entirely clear how many individuals were consulted nor is the sampling strategy for site visits adequately explained. The findings respond to all evaluation questions, drawing on a reliable data set that has been adequately triangulated. Similarly, the findings, conclusions and recommendations successfully integrate a gender equality and equity analysis. In addition, the methodology includes one question that addresses disability inclusion and also confirms that marginalized groups, including people living with disability (PWD), were to the extent possible consulted. However, the voices of PWDs do not come out clearly in the findings. The findings and conclusions adequately address issues of disability inclusion, but the evaluation does not offer recommendations to improve disability inclusion. Overall, the evaluation offers strong and forward-looking conclusions. Likewise, the recommendations are also of good quality, although more specific actions could have been proposed to further guide implementation. Finally, the report is well written but could have benefited from being edited to fix typos and punctuation errors.</p>		
Assessment Levels	Very Good strong, above average, best practice	Good satisfactory, respectable	Fair with some weaknesses, still acceptable
			Unsatisfactory weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria	Insert <i>assessment level</i> followed by main <i>comments</i> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)		
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
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)?	Partial	The report is structured in a logical way, with a clear differentiation made between findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Overall, the CPE is well written but some typos and punctuation errors are observed. This said, the evaluation is well formatted and makes good use of visual aids such as tables, graphs and figures. Finally, the evaluation uses rights-based terminology (e.g. duty bearers and rights holders) and anchors its analysis in a human rights-based framework.	
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)	Yes	At 69 pages (excluding the executive summary and annexes), the report is within length requirements for CPEs.	
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)?	Yes	The report contains all the required annexes, including: the ToRs, a bibliography, a list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix, data collection tools, and additional details on the methodology.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
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?	Yes	The executive summary reads as a standalone document and includes all of the required elements, including the purpose, objectives, scope and a description of the CP, the intended audience as well as the methodology, findings and recommendations.	
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	At 5 pages, the executive summary is concise and within length requirements.	
2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level: Good
<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?	Yes	In Chapter 2, the context of the evaluation is thoroughly defined, including development challenges, national strategies, description of issues related to sexual and reproductive health, adolescence and youth, gender equality and women's empowerment, demographic dynamics, and the role of external assistance.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	In the absence of a Theory of Change, the evaluation team reconstructed a very general one that shows the main results from the intervention logic (Figure 1). The ToC clearly depicts linkages between programme activities, outputs, and expected outcomes by having all boxes link to the ones above and beside them. The ToC also includes 'areas' of assumptions, although these are vague stating only that "Risks and Assumptions based on Social, Cultural, Technological, Financial, Political, economic and environmental factors".	

<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
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?	Yes	The evaluation framework is clearly described in the text and in an evaluation matrix found in annex (see Annex 5). The evaluation matrix is complete; it presents the evaluation questions (EQ), assumptions, as well as indicators, data sources and data collection methods. The evaluation matrix also outlines key findings per EQ.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The data collection tools used by the evaluation team are described and include document review, key informant interviews (KIs), and focus group discussions (FGDs). The rationale for their use is well 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)?	Partial	A comprehensive stakeholder map is included in Annex 7 and presents key stakeholder groups (i.e. government, NGOs, UN partners, academia, etc.) per outcome area. The stakeholder map includes vulnerable groups, including IDPs/returnees, persons with disabilities, women at reproductive age and newborns, etc. The methodology specifies that the consultation process ensured the participation of respondents from multiple groups and socio-economic background. The consultation process is well described and included the validation of recommendations with UNFPA CO, IPs and ERG.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methodology drew on an analysis of the theory of change to assess contribution of CP outputs to the achievement of results. The data analysis process is clearly described and includes contribution analysis, content analysis, trend analysis, and thematic content analysis. The process for quantitative data analysis is also outlined.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The report clearly describes methodological limitations, their effect on the evaluation, and mitigation strategies.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The evaluation's purposive sampling approach is clearly described. The selection of stakeholders draws on the stakeholder analysis and ensures a representation of key stakeholders across group and outcomes areas. The methodology also notes that consulted stakeholders were balanced per geographies. However, the methodology does not clearly outline the localities of field data collection and which criteria were used for field visit selection. Finally, Table 3 presents the number of interviews/FGDs conducted per group; however, it is unclear how many individuals were consulted per group and in total. This information can be obtained from the annexed list of stakeholders consulted but it is a key element of the methodology and should be highlighted in the main report.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Partial	The evaluation team conducted FGDs with women only to collection sex-disaggregated data as well as with both women and men. In addition, the methodology specifies that vulnerable groups, based on age, disability, IDP, etc. were included in the sample. It also confirms that a balance of women and men were consulted through the FGDs; however, the number of evaluation participants is not sex-disaggregated.	
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The methodology assesses GEWE as a cross-cutting issue and also includes a question dedicated to GEWE and human rights. The evaluation matrix includes a standalone evaluation question on GEWE, which is also embedded in other EQs, and some indicators are also designed to collect information on GEWE. The methodology also ensured the participation of a wide range of stakeholder groups in data collection, including beneficiaries and vulnerable groups. The methodology paid attention to cultural sensitivities and local consultants conducted data collection with beneficiaries in their local language.	
3. Reliability of Data			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The triangulation process is robust. The evaluation matrix shows that multiple data sources were used to triangulate data for each evaluation questions. Similarly, the findings present data from multiple sources, including UNFPA, IPs, government, UN agencies, donors, and beneficiaries.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluation makes effective use of quantitative data generated by the internal monitoring system. The evaluation also uses qualitative data generated through KIs and FGDs, with five data sources consulted through the former and one through the latter. Findings were validated by the ERG, ensuring their reliability.	
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	The report makes reference to the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators in the UN system and the Code of Conduct, established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). It identifies some ethical considerations (i.e. informed consent) though it does not make explicit reference to confidentiality. The ethical approach is sensitive to gender and cultural issues in that local consultants were hired to consult with beneficiaries in local language and their areas of residence. A female interviewer was also responsible for interviewing adolescent girls and women on sensitive issues such as GBV. However, given that adolescents were consulted, the methodology could have provided greater detail on special ethical protocols for conducting research with children.	

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings present a balanced picture of UNFPA's CP in Libya and the supporting evidence is robust. Data sources are consistently referenced and the views of different stakeholder groups are clearly presented, which makes it easy for the reader to understand where the evidence comes from.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The findings are well articulated and sufficiently explained.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are structured according to the evaluation criteria and questions, making it easy for the reader to understand how each question has been answered. A summarized finding statement and supporting narrative are presented for each EQ.	
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The effectiveness analysis makes use of the results framework and its indicators to show progress around the four areas of intervention, and uses FGD/interview data to explain how UNFPA outputs have contributed to the achievement of expected outcomes. The evaluation specifies that there has been no unintended results.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The findings are strong at presenting outcomes for different groups of stakeholders, including: youth, women and girls, migrants and IDPs. For example, the findings discuss how UNFPA's efforts have led to greater participation of youth in decision-making processes.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors enabling and hindering the achievement of results are clearly presented throughout the findings. For example, the finding explains how political instability and security have hindered programme implementation. Similarly, the findings discuss cultural and social norms and how these have hindered results achievement in reproductive health.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Findings elaborate on cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, human rights, equity and disability inclusion. This analysis is integrated throughout the findings and under a standalone EQ. For example, the findings note that UNFPA followed a rights-based perspective by supporting access to SRHR services for multiple groups, irrespective of the gender, age or race. The findings also present an interesting discussion of how social norms and beliefs have hindered gender equality results. Finally, the findings report some benefits to persons with disability, such as training opportunities, but concluded that there has been an overall lack of attention to this group.	
5. Conclusions			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	Each conclusion is numbered and linked explicitly to its corresponding finding(s).	
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?	Yes	The conclusions present the strengths and weaknesses of the CP in a balanced way. They present an analysis that go beyond the findings in that they discuss implications for the future. Cross-cutting issues of gender equality and equity are discussed. Disability inclusion is mentioned only very briefly as part of other vulnerable groups.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	Conclusions present the evaluators' unbiased judgement, drawing on evidence presented in the main report.	
6. Recommendations			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Recommendations are explicitly linked to their corresponding conclusion.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	Recommendations are targeted at either the UNFPA country office, headquarters or the regional office. However, these could have been targeted more specifically (e.g. at a specific division rather than a major office). Implications of the recommendations are discussed. However, in some instances, recommendations could have proposed more specific actions to guide their implementation. For example, Rec#1 proposes to focus on 'durable solutions' and the 'humanitarian-peace-development nexus' but could have provided more concrete actions to implement this.	
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?	Partial	Recommendations are impartial and address cross-cutting issues, namely equity and gender equality. Disability inclusion is not addressed; it would have been appropriate to have a recommendation to address the shortcomings identified in findings.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	Recommendations are prioritized as high or medium.	

7. Gender	0	Assessment Level:	Very good
	1		
	2		
	3 ^(*)		

To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) ^(*)

1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	<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) The evaluation objectives do not integrate GEWE issues but an assessment of cross-cutting issues (including GEWE) is explicitly mentioned as part of the thematic scope. (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) The evaluation does not include a standalone criterion on GEWE, but GEWE is fully mainstreamed into other criteria. (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) The evaluation includes a main question on the extent to which "UNFPA successfully integrated gender and human rights perspectives in the design, implementation and monitoring of the country programme" and GEWE considerations are also mainstreamed across other EQs. (3)</p> <p>d. 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?(Score: 0-3) The methodology does not discuss the availability of data to measure gender equality results (0)</p>
--	--

2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	<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) The data collection tools also captured gender issues as well as disaggregated data per types of vulnerabilities (e.g. age, persons with disabilities, etc.). GEWE considerations are adequately integrated in the evaluation framework and indicators. (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) The evaluation ensured the collection of qualitative sex-disaggregated data through the conduct of FGDs with women/girls beneficiaries. The evaluation consulted with a balance of women and men, but evaluation participants are not sex-disaggregated. (1)</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) A range of data collection methods (document review, FGDs, KIs) were used and multiple stakeholder groups (government, UN partners, NGOs, donors, direct beneficiaries, etc.) were consulted. However, even though the methodology confirms that people living with disability were consulted, their voices do not come out strongly in the findings. (2)</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) The evaluation used a purposeful sampling method to ensure broad inclusion of different stakeholder groups, including those from different socio-economic background. The methodology also confirms the inclusion of marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities as well as youth and adolescents. (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) Ethical safeguards and their application are partially described, including issues of informed consent and respect for local cultures.</p>
--	--

3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<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) The context includes a strong gender analysis with sex-disaggregated statistics by sector. In addition, it includes an intersectional analysis based on age, migration status, etc. (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) The findings present an insightful gender analysis. The evaluation also presents the nuanced perspective of different groups of stakeholders. However, quantitative data is not systematically disaggregated. (2)</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation mentions that there has been no unintended results in general, but unintended results (or lack thereof) on gender equality are not explicitly mentioned. (2)</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) The evaluation proposes specific recommendations address GEWE. (3)</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).

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels ^(*)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)	7			
2. Design and methodology (13)		13		
3. Reliability of data (11)	11			
4. Analysis and findings (40)	40			

5. Conclusions (11)	11			
6. Recommendations (11)		11		
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	76	24		
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very good			
The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.				
Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)				
The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
If yes, please explain:				