



<b>Organizational unit:</b>	Thailand CO	<b>Year of report:</b>	2021
<b>Title of evaluation report:</b>	Evaluation of the UNFPA Eleventh Country Programme of Assistance to the Royal Thai Government CPII (2017-2021)		
<b>Overall quality of report:</b>	Very good	<b>Date of assessment:</b>	14 June 2021

**Overall comments:** This is a thorough evaluation of the UNFPA Eleventh Country Programme of Assistance to the Royal Thai Government CPII (2017-2021). It covers three programmatic areas: Adolescent and Youth Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (AYSRHR); Population and Development (PD), and South-South Cooperation (SSC), with gender equality (GE) integrated in all programmatic areas. The evaluation intended to assess achievements of UNFPA support and progress towards the expected outputs and outcomes set forth in the results framework of the CP and provide an assessment of the role played by the UNFPA CO in the coordination mechanisms of the UNCT while drawing key lessons and providing recommendations the next programming cycle, Common Country Assessment (CCA), and UNSDCF. The evaluation uses the OECD/DAC key criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability in addition to assessing coordination. It is a very strong evaluation despite it being carried out under covid restrictions. In terms of presentation, the summary, as well as the report, follow the permitted page limit. The Background section comprehensively describes development challenges with regards to Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Population Dynamics, Gender Equality, and GBV. The evaluation uses a standard mixed methods approach to collect qualitative and quantitative data. Findings are well presented and substantiated by qualitative as well as quantitative data, however, it would have been useful to discuss their reliability. Conclusions and recommendations are well presented and appear useful. Gender has been covered well in the background, findings, and recommendations, however, it would be useful to highlight gender as being a key consideration in the evaluation's design by having it explicitly included in the assignment's objectives and/or scope. The evaluation has adequately integrated disability inclusion in the report. The 'Relevance' criteria particularly focuses on marginalized and vulnerable groups including people with disabilities, however, it would have been helpful to describe in the Methodology section any efforts to encourage people with disabilities to participate in the evaluation process.

**Assessment Levels**

<b>Very Good</b> (blue box)	strong, above average, best practice	<b>Good</b> (green box)	satisfactory, respectable	<b>Fair</b> (yellow box)	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> (red box)	weak, does not meet minimal quality standards
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	--	---------------------------------	---

Quality Assessment Criteria		Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)	
<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<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>	Yes	The report is clearly structured with distinctions between each section. The language is appropriate, and although there are a few spelling and grammatical issues they do not affect the readability of the report.	
<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)</b>	Yes	At 65 pages, the report is reasonable in length.	
<b>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>	Yes	The annexes include all required elements.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
<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>	Yes	The summary presents all required sections.	
<b>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</b>	Yes	At 5 pages, summary is within the permitted limit.	

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</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?	Yes	The evaluation report comprehensively describes the country background in terms of development challenges related to SRH rights, GBV, population dynamics, youth, and gender equality. In addition, the background provides an overview of national strategies and the role of external assistance in the context of Thailand.	
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>	Yes	The report notes that the evaluators reviewed the TOC to understand the logical linkages and the objectives behind the interventions.	
<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>	Yes	The report body makes reference to the evaluation matrix provided in Annex 5 which contains criteria, evaluation questions, assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information, and methods and tools for data collection.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools for data collection are described (i.e. document review, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, un-structured interviews, and direct observations) and appropriate. When distance was an issue, evaluators also conducted online interviews using audio and video conferencing platforms.	
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)?	Yes	The evaluation report notes that the stakeholder mapping exercise was conducted during the design phase to identify both UNFPA direct and indirect partners (Annex 3). The evaluators also note that key stakeholders provided input to the design of the evaluation, validated the findings, and contributed towards finalization of recommendations.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	Evaluators have adequately described analysis techniques for qualitative as well as quantitative data.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	Limitations related to use of purposive sampling strategy and remote working are described including how these challenges were mitigated.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	Evaluators note that sample selection is purposive and not representative of all the interventions in the province, but was mitigated as the stakeholder selection covered all activities/interventions.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Partial	The methodology describes that, whenever possible, the evaluation sought to utilize data disaggregated by age, sex, vulnerable groups including the poor, women, young mothers, children, unemployed youth, elderly, people living with HIV, victims of GBV, LGBTI, people with disabilities, youth with disabilities, and unemployed youth. There was some evident effort to do this - for example, the annexes provide a total list of evaluation participants disaggregated by type and gender, and the methodology section ends by stating that "the evaluation integrated and focused on inclusion of disability in the data collection analysis and in recommendations". However, the findings don't reflect that the ambition of the evaluation to utilize this range of disaggregated data was fully achieved.	
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 design enabled these issues to be addressed. For example, feedback from youth representatives is reflected in Finding 7.	

<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
<b>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</b>	Yes	The evaluation team notes that data quality was maintained by triangulating the data sources and methods of collection and analysis. In addition, a workshop was held with CO staff and a larger stakeholder groups and their feedback was integrated in the report.	
<b>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</b>	Partial	The evaluation report describes qualitative as well as quantitative data sources used, however, it would have been helpful to discuss their reliability.	
<b>3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</b>	Partial	Under the methodology section, evaluators note that the evaluation follows UNEG guidelines and standards, as well as UNFPA's Handbook on "How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation at UNFPA". In addition, informed consent, confidentiality and gender representation were addressed in data collection. However ethical considerations could have been further explained, for example by including efforts to maximize participation of all participants in focus group discussions and to encourage people with disabilities to participate.	
<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
<b>1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?</b>	Yes	The evaluation findings presented in the report are substantiated by sources of evidence in the text, footnotes and the annexes.	
<b>2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?</b>	Yes	The evaluators have clearly described the interpretations by providing qualitative as well as quantitative data.	
<b>3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?</b>	Yes	The relevant evaluation(s) questions are show at the beginning of the discussion for each criteria. The subsequent analysis if then presented by findings number.	
<b>4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Yes	It is noted that the evaluators reviewed the TOC to understand the logical linkages and the objectives behind the interventions, however, it is also stated that it was not possible to measure how much the contribution was to the outcomes. In the findings section, causal connections are described wherever they are observed. In addition, the evaluators have noted unintended outcomes under section 4.6.3.	
<b>5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?</b>	Yes	This was done to some extent - for example, the evaluators note that the CP considered the needs of most marginalized groups but could have gone further in addressing those discriminated against based on their identity.	
<b>6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?</b>	Yes	The evaluators describe facilitating and hindering factors affecting achievements. In addition, analysis of local contextual factors is also presented. For example it is noted that "pregnant adolescents often get married to 'save face', while arranged child marriage remains the norm in ethnic minority groups. Childbearing out of wedlock is not permissible under conventional Thai norms. A pre-marital sexual relationship leading to an unplanned pregnancy is considered a significant "loss of face". Therefore, pregnant young women are married to a partner to 'save face' or to avoid legal complications"	
<b>7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?</b>	Yes	The evaluation findings and recommendations cover marginalized and vulnerable groups including people with disabilities.	
<b>5. Conclusions</b>			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
<b>1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?</b>	Yes	The conclusions are clearly derived from the evaluation findings and refer to the corresponding EQs and criteria.	
<b>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?</b>	Partial	The conclusions are useful, go beyond the findings and cover gender and vulnerability issues such as GBV, LGBTI and migrant workers. However, conclusions do not specifically cover disability, which is an issue highlighted in the evaluation questions.	
<b>3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?</b>	Yes	The conclusions are based on the findings and do not reflect bias.	

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations refer to the conclusions on which they are based.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The recommendations are categorized by 'strategic level' and 'programmatic' and are directed towards responsible entities. They also provide a detailed set of operational steps (labelled as Action Plans). However, they do not describe financial implications as it is noted that information on available resources for the next CP was not available.	
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	Recommendations are useful, impartial, and cover cross cutting issues including gender, disability, and human rights.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The recommendations are prioritized.	
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
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 objectives and scope do not indicate whether the CP as a whole will be assessed for gender responsiveness. = 0</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 have a standalone criterion on gender or human rights, but these issues are mainstreamed. = 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) Gender is covered under 'EQ6: To what extent have interventions supported by UNFPA contributed to strengthened policy and regulatory frameworks to advance gender equality and SRHR of young people, including those from marginalized communities, and to address emerging population issues?'. = 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 evaluation matrix provided in the annex has some indicators which collect data on gender. = 3</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) Methodology section notes that the evaluation used approaches that were gender and human rights-based. In addition, it is described that evaluation design assesses how the CPII advances the rights of targeted populations, particularly women and individuals who are marginalized, and support them to claim their rights. However, it would have been helpful to discuss more about how gender disaggregated data was collected. = 2</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 adopted standard mixed-methods approach to collect data which is appropriate to evaluate GEEW considerations = 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) Evaluation respondents included a diverse range of stakeholders including implementing partners, government officials, civil society, programme participants, youth representatives as well as donors. = 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) Rightsholders, including representatives of youth are among the respondents, however it would have been helpful to highlight whether vulnerable groups such as people living with HIV, victims of GBV, LGBTI, people with disabilities were interviewed. = 2</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 considerations are adequately described including informed consent, integrity and respect for confidentiality. = 3</p>	

<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p><b>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)</b> The country context section includes analysis on status of gender equality and gender based violence in the country. = 3</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation findings triangulate the sources of data and use quotes from key stakeholders including representatives of youth, however, it would have been helpful to highlight voices of different groups a bit more. = 2</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluators have described unintended effects of the intervention on HRGE. For example, it is noted that "Exposure of non-traditional IPs to development work, especially with youth, strengthened IPs capacity to deal with youth issues in remote areas and increased gender sensitivity in the process". = 3</p> <p><b>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)</b> The recommendations adequately cover GEEW issues. For example, recommendation # 4 particularly focuses on gender-based violence. = 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			
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>22</b>		
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Very good</b>			