

UNFPA Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid

Version: May 2024

REPORT RATING SUMMARY		
Overall Rating	100%	Excellent
●●●●●	Excellent	5
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory	4
●●●○●	Satisfactory	3
●●○●●	Fair	2
●○○○○	Unsatisfactory	1

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	
Region	
Country	
Year of report	
Business Unit/programme country <i>(managing evaluation)</i>	
Date of assessment review <i>(dd/mmm/yyyy)</i>	
Name of assessment review firm	
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Primary SDG(s) covered <i>(list provided below)</i>	
UNFPA Strategic Plan areas covered <i>(lists provided below)</i>	
Three transformative results	
Six outputs	
Six accelerators	
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	
Humanitarian evaluation	
Evaluation evaluand <i>(e.g. country programme/intervention/policy/thematic area)</i>	
Evaluation type <i>(e.g. formative, summative, developmental)</i>	
Geographic scope <i>(e.g. global, regional, national)</i>	
<p>EQA Summary: <i>The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (strengths and weaknesses), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight good practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation. The rater should also highlight how cross-cutting issues were addressed in the report. Considerations of significant constraints (e.g. humanitarian crisis or political turmoil) should also be highlighted here.</i></p>	

<p>Suggestions for future evaluators: <i>The rater will identify key suggestions to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, examples will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.</i></p>	
---	--

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i	Is a clear, standalone document useful for informing decision making, (a minimum of 5 pages, up to a maximum of 7 pages).	Yes	
ii	Includes all necessary components of the evaluation report, including: (1) overview of the context and intervention, (2) evaluation purpose, objectives and intended users, 3) scope and evaluation methodology, (4) summary of most significant findings, (5) main conclusions and (6) key recommendations	Yes	
iii	Includes all significant information in a concise yet clear manner to understand the theme, intervention, programme, project and the evaluation.	Yes	
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	Is the evaluand (i.e. intervention/policy/thematic area etc. that is to be evaluated) and context of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Clear description of the evaluand (e.g. intervention), including: geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	

	ii	Clear description of the context of the evaluand (e.g. economic, social and political context, relevant aspects of UNFPA's institutional, normative and strategic framework, cross cutting issues such as gender equality and human rights, disability and LNOB dimensions) and how the context relates to the evaluand (e.g. key drivers and challenges that affect the implementation of the intervention/policy/thematic area)	Yes	
	iii	Linkages drawn between the evaluand and the ICPD benchmarks and SDGs relevant targets and indicators.	Yes	
Question 3. Are key stakeholders clearly identified and analysed?				
	i	Clear identification of key stakeholders which should include implementing partner(s), development partners, rights holders, and duty bearers among others; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map).	Yes	
	ii	Stakeholders are analysed to understand their specific rights, duties, needs, interests, concerns, and potential impact on the evaluand.	Yes	
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			100%	Comments on Rating
Question 4. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?				
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	
Question 5. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?				
	i	Clear and complete description of the objectives of the evaluation, including reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope (e.g. thematic, geographic, and temporal) of the evaluation, covering what will and will not be covered, as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political, humanitarian or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)			100%	Comments on Rating
Question 6. Are the selected evaluation questions and evaluation criteria appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation and is there clear justification for their use?				
<i>Note: UNFPA evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria such as: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (not necessarily applicable to all evaluations) and, for country programmes that include circumscribed and limited humanitarian and/or emergency interventions, the criteria of coverage and connectedness.</i>				
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	
	ii	Evaluation matrix clearly presents the evaluation criteria used as well as the corresponding evaluation questions, indicators, lines of inquiry, benchmarks, assumptions, source of data, methods for data collection and analysis, and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based, and conclusions drawn.	Yes	
Question 7. Is the theory of change, results chain, logical framework, or equivalent framework well-articulated?				
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	
	ii	Causal relationships between the various elements (e.g. outcomes, including the three or relevant Transformative Results, outputs) of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework are presented in narrative and/or graphic form).	Yes	
	iii	Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework, and if requested in the ToR, it is retrofitted/reconstructed by the evaluators.	Yes	
Question 8. Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?				
	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are clearly described, and are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, including the use of AI in the evaluation process if applicable.	Yes	
	ii	Data sources are all clearly described and are relevant and robust; these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR).	Yes	
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	

	iv	Methods allow for rigorous testing of the theory of change, results chain or logical framework (e.g methods help to understand the causal connections, if any, between outputs and expected outcomes (3TRs).	Yes	
	v	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including explainability and full disclosure of the use of AI in the evaluation process, if applicable.	Yes	
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation in its data collection and analysis, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	
Question 9.		Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or UNEG Ethical Principles.	Yes	
	ii	Clear description of ethical issues and considerations (e.g. respect for dignity and diversity, fair representation, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm) that may arise in the evaluation, safeguard mechanisms for respondents (e.g. parental consent forms for adolescents, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups; WHO standards of safe data collection on GBV) and ethical considerations in the use of AI as applicable (e.g. transparency of use, explainability, privacy, data protection, accuracy, human rights). If AI is used in the evaluation, there should be transparency and disclosure on the ethical and responsible use of AI in the report.	Yes	
Question 10.		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could include efforts to optimize the evaluation process (e.g., use of AI or new technology for data gathering, content analysis, outcome harvesting among others), or components introduced to enhance inclusion and participation in the evaluation processes (e.g. a youth steering committee), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Yes	
SECTION E:		EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 11.		Do the findings clearly and adequately address all evaluation questions and sub-questions?		
	i	Findings are presented clearly and provide sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all the evaluation's questions	Yes	
	ii	Explicit use of the evaluand's theory of change, results chain, logical framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	
Question 12.		Are evaluation findings derived from credible data sources as well as a rigorous data analysis?		
	i	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident using multiple data sources.	Yes	
	ii	Findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented, both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	
	iii	Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from outputs to high level results).	Yes	
Question 13.		Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i	Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's planning, monitoring, and reporting system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	
SECTION F:		EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS (weight 10%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 14.		Do the conclusions clearly present an unbiased overall assessment of the evaluand?		
	i	Conclusions are clearly formulated and present unbiased summative statements that respond to the evaluation questions.	Yes	
	ii	Conclusions are well substantiated and derived from findings and add deeper insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	
Question 15.		Are lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not referenced or requested in ToR]		

	i	Lessons learned are derived from the findings and are well substantiated with practical, illustrative examples.	Yes	
	ii	Lessons learned are clearly presented and provide actionable insights on the positive aspects of the evaluand as well as any areas of improvement.	Yes	
SECTION G:	EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		100%	Comments on Rating
Question 16.	Are recommendations well-grounded and articulated?			
	i	Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users. Specific guidance is provided for its implementation (e.g. actions, deadlines, responsible actors), as appropriate.	Yes	
	iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of key stakeholders (e.g. evaluation reference group members), including those who will be affected by the recommendations.	Yes	
	iv	Recommendations are clearly articulated and prioritized based on their importance, urgency, and potential impact.	Yes	
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		100%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all required information?			
	i	Opening pages include: Name of evaluation and/title of evaluation, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluand, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes); list of acronyms/abbreviations.	Yes	
	ii	Annexes include, if not in body of report: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of respondents, results chain/ToC/logical framework, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology (e.g. inception report), case study reports.	Yes	
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured and of reasonable length?			
	i	The report has a logical structure that is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles, well formatted).	Yes	
	ii	Structure and length accords to UNFPA guidelines for evaluation reports; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR. <i>Note: Maximum pages for the main report, excluding executive summary and annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations and 50 for other types of evaluations)</i>	Yes	
Question 19.	Is the report well presented?			
	i	Report is easy to understand (written in an accessible way for the intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	
	ii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	
SECTION I:	CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES (weight 10%)		100%	Comments on Rating
Question 20.	Are cross cutting issues - in particular, human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB - integrated in the core elements of the evaluation (e.g. evaluation design, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations)?			
	i	Evaluation's data collection methods designed to capture the voices/perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders including right holders, marginalized and vulnerable persons, young people, people with disabilities, migrants or refugee populations, indigenous communities, and other persons that are often left behind.	Yes	
	ii	Evaluation questions address cross cutting issues, such as human rights-based approach, gender equality, disability inclusion, LNOB, social and environmental standards as appropriate.	Yes	
	iii	Data is disaggregated by population groups (e.g. persons with disability, age, gender, etc.) where there are implications related to UNFPA's portfolio/interventions for these population groups; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	
	iv	Intersectional lens is applied in the data analysis, looking at various and multiple forms of exclusion and discrimination (and how they overlap with each other) and how this may impact the performance or results of the evaluand.	Yes	

	v	Findings, conclusions and recommendations, address cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, leave no-one behind, social and environmental as relevant.	Yes	
	vi	Inclusion of young people in the evaluation team and/or Reference Group [N/A if not requested in ToR]	Yes	
Question 21.		Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? <i>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below</i>	9	Comments on Rating
	i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Fully integrated	
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>i GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.</p> <p>a. 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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</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?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>

List of SDGs

1. No Poverty
2. Zero Hunger
3. Good Health and Well-being
4. Quality Education
5. Gender Equality
6. Clean Water and Sanitation
7. Affordable and Clean Energy
8. Decent Work and Economic Growth
9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
10. Reduced Inequality
11. Sustainable Cities and Communities
12. Responsible Consumption and Production
13. Climate Action
14. Life Below Water
15. Life on Land
16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
17. Partnerships for the Goals

Three transformative results

1. Ending unmet need for family planning
2. Ending preventable maternal deaths
3. Ending gender-based violence and harmful practices

Six outputs

1. Policy and accountability
2. Quality of care and services
3. Gender and social norms
4. Population change and data
5. Humanitarian action
6. Adolescents and youth

Six accelerators

1. Human rights-based and gender-transformative approaches
2. Innovation and digitalization
3. Partnerships, South-South and triangular cooperation, and financing
4. Data and evidence
5. Leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first
6. Resilience and adaptation, and complementarity among development, humanitarian and peace-responsive efforts