

Annex 3: Corporate evaluations – Selectivity analysis sheets for major thematic, institutional and programme evaluations

Table 1: Programme evaluation - mid-term and final evaluation of GPRHCS II (Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security, 2013-2020)

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
The evaluation will assess issues that contribute to Outcome 1 of the UNFPA strategic plan. GPRHCS II is designed to contribute to the UN Secretary General’s Global Strategy on Women’s and Children’s Health, the goal of the London Summit on Family Planning (FP2020), the UN Commission on Life-Saving Commodities for Women and Children and in Africa, the Maputo Plan of Action and the Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality in Africa (CARMMA). The bulk of GPRHCS II efforts targets 46 target countries selected from the 69 world’s poorest countries (GNI per capita of \$2,500 or less) with a need for support based on: low contraceptive prevalence rate, high unmet need for family planning, high adolescent birth rate and high maternal mortality ratio.	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
The evaluability assessment of the GPRHCS II (2014) stresses the considerable variance in the capacity of UNFPA country offices in the 46 priority countries as the most serious risk; this could impair the achievement of the GPRHCS II objectives.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
The GPRHCS activities are expected to make an important contribution to UNFPA objectives in the areas of family planning and to maternal health. GPRHCS II (2013-2020) was developed and funded at around USD200 M per year and accounts for about half of UNFPA procurement of reproductive health commodities.	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
The evaluation will look at national stewardship and coordination for scale-up with focus on reaching the poor and adolescents. GPRHCS II is the second phase of a programme that was implemented from 2008 to 2012.	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
It is expected that the evaluation will generate knowledge on what "works well" in the implementation of RHCS and FP programmes.	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
The GPRHCS I (2007-2012) - mid-term review - 2011. The GPRHCS II (2013-2020) evaluability assessment - 2014. Mid-term evaluation - 2017.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
The evaluations should be led by UNFPA EO with the support of member states.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
The GPRHCS II (2013-2020) was subject to an evaluability assessment in 2014 which provided useful information for an independent mid-term evaluation in 2017. Estimated budget: \$513,000 for the mid-term evaluation (other resources) and \$653,000 for the final evaluation (other resources).	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
The evaluations are requested by the GPRHCS Steering Committee.	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA “champion”? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Director - Technical Division and Commodity Security Branch.	
Deadlines need to be further discussed with the GPRHCS management team and the Steering Committee so as to ensure that the evaluations provide results in a timely manner.	

Table 2: Programme evaluation - end line evaluation of the H4+ joint programmes - Canada and Sweden (SIDA)

Relevance		Utility	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?	Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
The evaluation will assess issues that contribute to Outcome 1 of the UNFPA Strategic Plan. The goal of H4+ is to accelerate global progress in Sexual Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (SRMNCH) particularly through accelerating progress toward achieving the Millennium Development Goals 4 and 5. In 2010, the Secretary General spearheaded a global movement known as Every Woman, Every Child (EWEC) and the H4+ became the technical arm to implement EWEC. UNFPA is the coordination agency of H4+ at the global level. The 11 Canada/SIDA joint programme countries (Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, Zambia and Zimbabwe, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia) are part of this group of 58 countries that made a formal commitment to the H4+ initiative, and fall within a larger group of 75 "countdown countries" which together account for approximately 95% of all global maternal and child deaths.		Mid-term review in 2013.	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?	Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
The end-of line evaluation will cover the two H4+ joint programmes financed by Canada and Sweden (SIDA).		The H4+ partnership will undergo a joint evaluation led by UNFPA Evaluation Office with UNICEF EO and Canada DFATD Evaluation Division.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?	Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
H4+ received support through a five year (2011-2016) USD 50 million grant from Canada initiatives in five African countries. SIDA supports an additional 6 country through a USD 52 million grant (2013-16).		The H4+ interventions in the Canada and SIDA supported countries started in 2012 and 2013 respectively. Sufficient time has now elapsed for results to have materialized. All countries have a common M&E framework; data collection and analysis is regularly performed by the H4+ country teams. While funding has been secured by the H4+ joint programmes, the allocated timeframe (the final report is expected by December 2016) may prove too short to conduct a high-quality evaluation: careful scoping is required. Estimated budget: \$783,000 (other resources).	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?	Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
The extent to which the programme has helped to identify innovative approaches, and have successfully promoted their scale up and replication. The H4+ is the first joint programme involving six agencies of the UN system (UNFPA, UNICEF, WHO, the World Bank, UNAIDS and UN WOMEN) with specific funding for joint planning and implementation.		The end-line evaluation is requested by the Canada government and Sweden SIDA.	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?	Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Effective models for scale up. This evaluation will help position the H4+ in the post-2015 environment.		Director - Technical Division, Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH) Branch, and the Global Coordinator of H4+ in the SRH Branch. SIDA and Canada expect that findings will inform decisions related to continued funding for H4+.	

Table 3: Thematic evaluation - gender-based violence including in humanitarian settings

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?

The evaluation will be covering interventions contributing to: outcome 3, output 9, 10 and exploring interlinkages with outcome 4 of the current Strategic Plan; outcome 5, output 13 and 14 of the Strategic Plan midterm review 2012 - 2013.

A priority in all regions of UNFPA intervention.

Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
---	---

The capacity of UNFPA regional and country offices to implement interventions could entail a risk affecting the achievement of the objectives. Data availability can also pose a risk of not having sufficient evidence for decision-making by senior management.

Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
-------------------------------	--

UNFPA has implemented interventions on GBV in all regions under several strategic plans. GBV is one of the key components of country programme documents.

Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
---	--

The evaluation would provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of interventions and to determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up.

No.

Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
----------------------	---

The evaluation would contribute further inputs in those areas building on the FGM evaluation plus the CPEs.

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?

No thematic evaluation however a project evaluation of the GBV information system was conducted in 2014.

Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
---------------------------------------	--

It could present an opportunity for a joint evaluation with another UN agency or donor.

Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
--	--

No evaluability study has been conducted, but there have been previous country programme evaluations covering this issue so there should be sufficient data available to conduct an evaluation.

Estimated budget: \$621,000 (institutional budget).

Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
---	---

No.

Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
------------------	---

Director - Technical Division, Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch and Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch.

No.

Table 4: Institutional evaluation - strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
<p>As recognized by the Executive Board (in its decision 2013/31), global and regional interventions (GRI) play a key role in the achievement of results expected from UNFPA. GRI underpin all outcomes of the Strategic Plan and also contribute to organizational effectiveness and efficiency.</p> <p>The evaluation is meant to provide an assessment of the overall strategic framework for UNFPA GRI. It will therefore cover all regions.</p>	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
Findings of the evaluation will inform the subsequent strategic plan arrangements.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
The ceiling authorized by the Executive Board for GRI for 2014-2017 amounts to USD 275 million.	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
<p>Lessons learned from the evaluation with regard to specific global and/or regional interventions could indeed lead to the identification of success factors and conditions for their replication and/or scaling up.</p> <p>This is not an evaluation of a specific pilot and/or innovative initiative.</p>	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
The evaluation is primarily meant to assess the operational effectiveness and efficiency of the Fund through its GRI. However, lessons learned from the evaluation could potentially help fill an important (if not vital) gap in relation to one or several mandate areas of UNFPA.	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
The strategic framework for GRI 2014-2017 has been adopted in June 2014. This will be the first evaluation of the framework.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
The strategic framework for global and regional interventions is specific to UNFPA. There is no potential for joint evaluation.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
No evaluability study has been conducted. The preparation phase of the evaluation, and in particular the determination of the scope and the evaluation questions will be key with a view to ensure a good quality (hence useful) evaluation. Estimated budget: \$493,000 (regular resources).	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
In its decision 2014/16, the Executive Board "Endorses the proposal of UNFPA to conduct in 2016 an independent evaluation of the global and regional interventions, to be commissioned by the independent Evaluation Office of UNFPA."	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?

Director - Programme Division.

No.

Table 5: Thematic evaluation - comprehensive sexuality education programmes

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
Comprehensive sexuality education is a strategic issue affecting youth and adolescents (specifically targeted under outcome 2, output 7, of the UNFPA strategic plan). The subject has been of strategic importance for UNFPA under the past 2 strategic plans. Comprehensive sexuality education is a priority in all regions of UNFPA intervention.	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
The capacity of UNFPA country offices to implement comprehensive sexuality education could entail a risk affecting the achievement of the objectives of the global programme. Data availability can also pose a risk of not having sufficient evidence for decision-making.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
UNFPA has implemented comprehensive sexuality education initiatives in all regions under several strategic plans (SP 2008-2011; MTR 2012-2013 and SP 20114-2017).	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
The evaluation would provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and to determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up. There have been pilot interventions in some programme countries.	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
The evaluation would fill a knowledge gap since there has not been a recent comprehensive evaluation or review on the subject.	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
Reviews have been conducted by Technical Division.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
Opportunity for a joint evaluation with other UN agencies and donors.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
There have been previous reviews so there should be sufficient data available to conduct an evaluation. Estimated budget: \$275,000 (institutional budget).	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
No.	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Director - Technical Division and Sexual & Reproductive Health Branch.	
No.	

Table 6: Programme evaluation - joint programme evaluation of female genital mutilation joint programme second phase

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?

The evaluation will be covering interventions contributing to: outcome 3, output 10 and exploring interlinkages with outcome 1 and 4 of the current Strategic Plan; outcome 5, output 13 and exploring interlinkages outcome 6 of the Strategic Plan midterm review 2012 - 2013.

A priority mostly in Africa, Arab States, Columbia in Latin America and in some countries in Asia.

Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
---	---

The end-of line evaluation of the UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on FGM will cover the two phases of the programme financed by a group of donors. The evaluation is requested by the donors in order to inform the future of their support to FGM on the post 2017.

Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
-------------------------------	--

FGM is a key area of increasing investment from donors; it also an area of joint work with other agencies.

Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
---	--

The evaluation would provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of interventions and to determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up beyond the Africa region.

It is an innovative initiative as it uses a mix of complementary strategies - social norms and collective behaviour change paired with cultural sensitive approaches.

Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
----------------------	---

The evaluation would contribute further inputs in those areas building on the evaluation of the first phase of the programme.

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?

Joint Evaluation of the first phase of the UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation /cutting: accelerating change – 2013.

Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
---------------------------------------	--

Opportunity for a joint evaluation with UNICEF.

Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
--	---

The evaluation of the first phase of the joint programme will provide a base line together with the results monitoring system that was put in place following the recommendations of the evaluation.

Resources will be mobilized from the Joint Programme + UNICEF Evaluation Office. Estimated budget: \$451,000 (other resources) plus resources from UNICEF.

Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
---	---

Donors including Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom, members of the Steering Committee of the joint programme have requested the evaluation of the second phase of the joint programme (building on the results of the evaluation of the first phase).

Potential	Is there a UNFPA “champion”? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
------------------	---

Director - Technical Division and Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch and the UNFPA/UNICEF coordinator of the Joint Programme.

To inform decisions related to the future of the joint programme.

Table 7: Thematic evaluation - sexual and reproductive health services in humanitarian settings

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
UNFPA is more and more involved in the response to humanitarian crises, and this evaluation (to be conducted in 2018, with an evaluability study in 2016) should cover interventions contributing to outcome 1 of the Strategic Plan in general, and under this outcome, to output 5, more particularly.	
The geographical scope of the evaluation will correspond to identified humanitarian settings, and will not be focused on a specific region.	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
The evaluability study planned for 2016 should help identify potential risks associated with scaling up results in the field of SRH services in humanitarian settings.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
Given the growing number of humanitarian crises around the world, SRH interventions in humanitarian settings represent an increasing share of the overall portfolio of activities of UNFPA.	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
One of the main objectives of the evaluation (yet to be precisely defined) should certainly be to identify success factors of UNFPA humanitarian interventions, with a view to replicating them in comparable situations/settings.	
SRH in humanitarian settings are not necessarily innovative by nature. However, both the evaluability study and the evaluation should help identify (successful) innovative initiatives that could be replicated or scaled up.	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
The evaluation should generate essential information on the relevance and performance of UNFPA SRH interventions in humanitarian settings.	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
This subject has never been evaluated at UNFPA, hence the need for an evaluability assessment prior to conducting the evaluation.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
Given the specific nature of the interventions covered (sexual and reproductive health services), which correspond to the core of the mandate of UNFPA, the risk of duplication and/or opportunities for coordination with similar evaluations by other partners are rather limited.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
The purpose of the evaluability study planned in 2016 is to ensure that all conditions are gathered to ensure the feasibility and usefulness of the evaluation.	
Resources would need to be mobilized in the next institutional budget to be approved from 2018. Estimated budget USD 669,000 (institutional budget).	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
This evaluation does not correspond to a formal commitment to stakeholders.	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Director - Programme Division and Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch.	
Critical decision points may be determined within the framework of the evaluability study.	

Table 8: Programme evaluation - child marriage programmes

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
<p>Child marriage is a strategic issue affecting youth and adolescents (specifically targeted under outcome 2, outputs 6 and 8, of the UNFPA strategic plan). UNFPA and UNICEF are launching a child marriage global programme in 2015. The evaluation of the programme will be key, to assess progress towards achievement of expected results.</p> <p>Child marriage is a priority in several regions including Africa, Arab States, Latin America, and in Asia.</p>	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
<p>The global programme is a complex initiative that will be implemented by UNFPA and UNICEF. All stages of the initiative are joint in principle and therefore require close coordination and work between both agencies. The capacity of UNFPA country offices to implement the global programme could entail a risk affecting the achievement of the objectives of the global programme. Limited data availability may also pose a risk of not having sufficient evidence for decision-making.</p>	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
<p>There will be significant investment on the subject under the global programme. The subject has increased its significance under the new strategic plan (addressed specifically under output 8).</p>	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
<p>The evaluation would provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of interventions and to determine the feasibility for replication or scaling-up.</p> <p>The global programme is an innovative initiative.</p>	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
<p>The evaluation would fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to child marriage since no evaluation or review has been conducted on the subject. The global programme will invest considerable funds and an assessment of progress towards results will be key for accountability and learning purposes.</p>	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
No.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
Yes, with UNICEF.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
<p>An evaluability assessment will be undertaken in 2016.</p> <p>The global programme will set aside funds for the conduct of the evaluability assessment and for the evaluation. Estimated budget: \$628,000 (other resources).</p>	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)?
Yes, as a key stage of the global programme.	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Director - Technical Division, Sexual & Reproductive Health Branch and Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch.	

The timing of the evaluability assessment is important (at the beginning of the initiative) and the evaluation will be conducted close to the end of the first phase of the programme to provide inputs for a second phase of the global programme or other interventions in the area of child marriage.

Table 9: Thematic evaluation - gender equality, women's and girls' empowerment, and reproductive rights

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
It is a strategic issue affecting under the current strategic plan (specifically targeted under outcome 3, outputs 9, 10, 11) and previous strategic plans (2008-2011 and MTR). A priority in all regions of UNFPA intervention.	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
The capacity of UNFPA country offices to implement interventions could entail a risk affecting the achievement of the objectives. Data availability can also pose a risk of not having sufficient evidence for decision-making.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
UNFPA has implemented interventions in all regions under several strategic plans.	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
The evaluation would provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of interventions and to determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up.	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?

The evaluation would contribute further inputs in those areas.

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
There has been a midterm evaluation on gender equality in 2010 managed by Technical Division and a joint evaluation on joint gender programming.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
After careful consideration UNFPAs decision is to focus on internal organizational learning building on previous joint evaluations on gender and gender related issues.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
There have been previous evaluations/ reviews so there should be sufficient data available to conduct an evaluation. Resources would need to be mobilized in the next institutional budget to be approved from 2018. Estimated budget: \$612,000 (institutional budget).	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
No.	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Director - Technical Division and Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch.	
No.	

Table 10: Thematic evaluation - strengthening national capacity for using data to monitor and evaluate national policies and programmes in population dynamics, sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, HIV, adolescents and youth and gender equality

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
It is a strategic issue for the post 2015 agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals; it is also relevant under the current and previous strategic plans. The evaluation will be mostly covering interventions contributing to: outcome 4, output 12, 13, 14 and 15 of the current Strategic Plan; outcome 7, output 17 and 18 of the Strategic Plan midterm review 2012 - 2013. A priority in all regions of UNFPA intervention.	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
The capacity of UNFPA country offices to strengthening national capacity for using data to monitor and evaluate national policies could entail a risk affecting the achievement of the objectives of the global programme. Data availability can also pose a risk of not having sufficient evidence for decision-making.	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
The data revolution and opportunities presented by big data in particular is a key area of increasing investment from UNFPA and its partners.	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
Building on the census & use of data for policy making evaluation, the present evaluation would provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of the strategy in place and its interventions. No.	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
The evaluation would contribute further inputs in those areas building on the previous census data evaluation.	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
The census & use of data for policy making evaluation will be finalized early 2016. A system wide independent evaluation (ISWE) on the support of the UN system to statistics capacity is currently on going. Both evaluations will inform this evaluation.	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
The UNFPA Evaluation Office is a member of the evaluation management group of the ISWE on statistics capacity. In order to build on this learning it is planned to focus on an internal evaluation to deepen learning in UNFPA mandate areas.	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
Yes. This evaluation will build on the results and lessons from the census evaluation and on the ISWE on statistics capacity. Resources would need to be mobilized in the next institutional budget to be approved from 2018. Estimated budget: \$587,000 (institutional budget).	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
No.	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?
Director - Technical Division, Population and Development Branch and the Director of Data for Development Project.	
No.	

Table 11: Institutional evaluation - results based management

Relevance	
Strategic relevance of the subject	Does the evaluation cover issues of corporate strategic significance that contribute to the achievement of the strategic plan? Is the subject of the evaluation a priority for UNFPA in a specific geographical region?
<p>This evaluation will cover operational effectiveness and efficiency outputs of the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The result based management system of UNFPA will be evaluated both at global and regional levels.</p>	
Risk associated with the subject	Are there political, economic, funding, structural or organizational factors that present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results or for which further evidence is needed for decision-making by management?
<p>RBM is key for the achievement of results expected from UNFPA. In particular, the definition of sound results frameworks in country programme documents appears to be a crucial factor for the successful implementation.</p>	
Significant investment	Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?
<p>The RBM system underpins the achievement of results of the overall portfolio of activities of UNFPA.</p>	
Potential for replication and scaling-up	Would an evaluation provide the information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of an intervention and determine the feasibility of its replication or scaling-up? Is the intervention a pilot and/or an innovative initiative?
<p>The evaluation is not meant to assess the performance of specific interventions. What will be assessed is the ability of the current RBM system to ensure that interventions are correctly designed, monitored and evaluated, in line with current global good practice. The evaluation covers the overall RBM system and not a specific intervention and/or set of interventions.</p>	
Knowledge gap	Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?
<p>The evaluation is not meant to provide information on specific UNFPA mandate areas, however, it should contribute knowledge to improve efficiency and effectiveness specifically.</p>	

Utility	
Periodicity	Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?
<p>It will be the first time that RBM will be subject to an evaluation at UNFPA.</p>	
Potential for joint evaluation	Does the evaluation present an opportunity to evaluate jointly with other partners (United Nations country teams, national Governments, donors, etc.) to avoid duplication and promote coordination?
<p>The evaluation covers specifically the RBM system of UNFPA. It provides no opportunity for a joint evaluation.</p>	
Feasibility for implementing the evaluation	Is the evaluability of the intervention sufficient to conduct an in-depth study that can provide sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned? Does the commissioning office have the resources available to conduct or manage a high-quality evaluation within the time period indicated?
<p>The RBM is a clearly identified evaluation object. There should not be any feasibility issue with this institutional evaluation.</p> <p>Resources would need to be mobilized in the next institutional budget to be approved from 2018. Estimated budget: USD 485,000 (institutional budget).</p>	
Formal commitments to stakeholders	Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
<p>No.</p>	
Potential	Is there a UNFPA "champion"? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations
<p>Director - Programme Division.</p> <p>No.</p>	