

Annex 3: Corporate evaluations – Selectivity analysis sheets

OUTCOME 1 (SRH)

Table 1: Mid-term and final evaluation of the UNFPA Supplies Programme (2013-2020)

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 contributing to Outcome 1 of the UNFPA strategic plan. UNFPA Supplies 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 UNFPA Supplies efforts targets 46 target countries selected from among the world's 69 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. The main beneficiaries of the UNFPA Supplies Programme are teenage girls and poor women.		GPRHCS I (2007-2012): mid-term review in 2011. GPRHCS II (2013-2020): evaluability assessment in 2014.	
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 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 which could impair the achievement of the UNFPA Supplies objectives.		The evaluations will be led by UNFPA Evaluation Office with the support of member states that sit on the UNFPA Supplies Steering Committee (notably UK and The Netherlands).	
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
The UNFPA Supplies activities are expected to make an important contribution to UNFPA objectives in the areas of family planning and to maternal health. UNFPA Supplies (2013-2020) was developed and funded at around USD200 M per year and accounts for about half of UNFPA procurement of reproductive health commodities.		The UNFPA Supplies Programme was subject to an evaluability assessment in 2014, which provided useful information for an independent mid-term evaluation in 2017. The overall budget is \$512,000 for the mid-term evaluation (other resources) and an estimated \$600,000 for the final evaluation (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	Formal commitments to stakeholders Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)
<p>The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress in the implementation of UNFPA Supplies since 2013. The evaluation will support learning among key stakeholders to inform the implementation of the remainder of the programme. It will also inform the implementation of (i) other strategies such as the current UNFPA Family Planning Strategy <i>Choices not Chance</i> (2012-2020); and (ii) the design of the next phase (post 2020) of the UNFPA Supplies Programme. The mid-term evaluation will also support accountability of UNFPA through taking stock of the progress accomplished and results achieved under UNFPA Supplies.</p>	<p>The UNFPA Supplies Steering Committee has requested both the mid-term and the final evaluations.</p>
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?
<p>The areas of investigation of the mid-term and final evaluations will cover the programme’s five outputs, the management output, as well as a cross-cutting theme (the catalytic role of UNFPA Supplies) and will generate knowledge on what "works well" in the implementation of RH and FP supplies programmes within the overall context of UNFPA support to SRH and RH.</p>	<p>Champions: Director, Technical Division; Chief, Commodity Security Branch; Global coordinator</p> <p>Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mid-term evaluation: Final report will be ready by July 2018 - Final evaluation will be launched in mid- 2020 (preparatory phase) with a view to delivering the final report in mid- 2021.

Table 2: Mid-term Evaluation of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF - Phase 3: 2018-2021)

Relevance	Utility
<p>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>	<p>Periodicity Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?</p>

<p>The evaluation will assess issues contributing to Outcome 1 of the UNFPA strategic plan. The MHTF is designed to contribute to the UN Secretary General’s Global Strategy on Women’s and Children’s Health, the Maputo Plan of Action and the Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality in Africa (CARMMA). UNFPA’s Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) is a catalytic fund, aligned with country-led processes to address health system bottlenecks; promote innovations; strengthen partnership; and focus on scalable, high-impact interventions to improve and safeguard the health and well-being of women and girls. It supports evidence-based programming in 39 countries with the highest burden of maternal mortality and morbidity, taking an integrated approach that brings together the areas of: midwifery, obstetric fistula, emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC), maternal death surveillance and response (MDSR) and first-time young mothers (FTYMs). The Thematic Fund complements UNFPA Supplies; together, they work to enable women and girls to make fundamental decisions about their own bodies, attain the highest possible standard of sexual and reproductive health, and exercise their reproductive rights.</p>	<p>The MHTF Phase I (2008-2013) was subject to a mid-term evaluation in 2012.</p>
<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>	<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>
<p>The performance of the MHTF can be affected by humanitarian crises. In 2017, about ten of the 39 MHTF-supported countries faced a humanitarian crisis or fragile context. Finally, the performance of the MHTF is subject to varying national capacity levels both in ministries of health and UNFPA Country offices.</p>	<p>The evaluation will be led by the UNFPA EO with the support of member states that are members of the MHTF Steering Committee.</p>
<p>Significant investment Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?</p>	<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</p>

<p>The MHTF activities are expected to make an important contribution to UNFPA objectives in the area of maternal health. As a catalytic fund supporting evidence-based strategies in maternal health, the MHTF planned budget was US\$ 128 million over four years for Phase II (2014-2017). Phase III (2018-2021) is planned to strengthen integration between MHTF areas of work with other sexual and reproductive health components. It will require an estimated US\$ 150 million over four years (preliminary estimates) to support about 40 high-burden countries to accelerate progress in maternal health.</p>	<p>In 2011-12, the Evaluation Branch at UNFPA conducted the mid-term evaluation of the MHTF Phase I which provides useful information for the preparation of the mid-term evaluation of Phase III. Furthermore, MHTF Phase II has a defined theory of change and result indicator framework, analyzed in MHTF Annual report 2016.</p> <p>Estimated budget: to be determined based upon the approval and funding of MHTF Phase III (other resources).</p>
<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>	<p>Formal commitments to stakeholders Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)</p>
<p>The evaluation will support learning among key stakeholders to inform the implementation of the remainder of the programme as well as: (i) other strategies such as the UNFPA Midwifery programme strategy; and (ii) the design of the next phase (post 2021) of the MHTF. The mid-term evaluation will also support accountability of UNFPA by taking stock of the progress accomplished and results achieved under MHTF.</p>	<p>The mid-term evaluation has been requested by Technical Division, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, in agreement with the MHTF Steering Committee.</p>
<p>Knowledge gap Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?</p>	<p>Potential Is there a UNFPA “champion”? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?</p>

<p>The mid-term evaluation will cover the programme’s five intervention areas, the management output, as well as a cross-cutting theme (the catalytic role of MHTF) and will generate knowledge on what "works well" in the implementation of maternal health programmes within the overall context of UNFPA support in SRH and RR. The mid-term evaluation will also generate knowledge on some of the innovations supported by MHTF.</p>	<p>Champions include the Director, Technical Division and the Chief, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch.</p> <p>Timeline: the Mid-term evaluation will be launched in mid- 2019 (preparatory phase) with a view to delivering the final report in mid-2020.</p>
--	--

Table 3: Evaluation of UNFPA support to HIV Prevention

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 Outcomes 1 and 2 of the UNFPA strategic plan. UNFPA support in the area of HIV is designed to contribute to the prevention of sexual transmission of HIV and strengthen integration of SRH and RR and HIV at the policy, systems and service delivery levels. The bulk of UNFPA HIV efforts targets 33 countries designated “UNAIDS Fast Track Countries” which account for a majority of the HIV burden in low and middle income countries. Strategic and targeted work also occurs within additional countries (up to 35 additional) where there are significant levels of new infections among key populations or where the epidemic is growing. The main beneficiaries of UNFPA interventions are adolescents and youth, young women and key populations.		UNFPA interventions in the area of HIV have been evaluated within the framework of a number of corporate evaluations dedicated to Maternal health (incl. the MHTF) in 2012; UNFPA support to family planning in 2016; or the H4+ joint programme Canada-Sida in 2017; UNFPA Supplies programme in 2018. However, UNFPA support in all its dimensions (mainstreamed vs dedicated interventions) has not been the subject of a specific thematic evaluation yet.
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?
	Recent cuts in funding has drastically reduced HIV dedicated staff at all levels of the organization. Additionally, some degree of capacity building is needed to strengthen the integrated approach to SRH to have a strong HIV component.		The evaluations will be led by UNFPA EO with the support of member states, UNAIDS Secretariat and cosponsors (e.g., UN Joint Teams on HIV/AIDS at country level) and civil society partners.

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
UNFPA activities in the area of HIV prevention are expected to make an important contribution to and benefit from UNFPA objectives in the areas of SRH and RR, adolescents and youth, gender, and data that run across the Strategic Plan 2018-2021. Such interventions are funded in part through the UNAIDS Unified Budget Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) and is more highly integrated in both UNFPA core and other non-core resources (including HIV dedicated funds and proportions of integrated funds). The average contributions for dedicated and mainstreamed HIV interventions have ranged between USD 30-50 million annually under the period of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017.		As indicated (see section on Periodicity), some UNFPA interventions in the area of HIV have been evaluated within the context of other corporate evaluations as well as within the project evaluation on SRH/HIV linkages in ESA. Those evaluations addressed the integration of HIV prevention within the continuum of care. Annual reporting within the UNAIDS Joint Programme Monitoring System (JPMS) provides inputs in terms of delivery on UBRAF commitments. Estimated budget for 2021 is \$248,900 to be complemented by additional resources in 2022 (as the evaluation continues to be implemented).	
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 evaluation presents a learning opportunity, generating information necessary to identify the factors required for the success of interventions and to determine feasibility of replication or scaling-up, for instance in the areas of: SRHR/HIV Linkages; youth engagement and leadership; CONDOMIZE including ‘twinned’ and testing campaigns; key population implementation tools.		The evaluation is considered valuable by the Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, Technical Division.	
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?
The evaluation will inform the implementation of the strategy aiming at integrating HIV within the continuum of care. It will also highlight the implications of a mainstreaming/ integration strategy in terms of the focus (or lack thereof) placed on HIV programming and implementation, including resources allocation		Champions in the Director , Technical Division and the Chiefs of the Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch and the Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch. Timeline: to be launched mid-2021 (preparatory phase) with a view to delivering the final report in mid- 2022.	

OUTCOME 2 (EMPOWERING YOUTH)

Table 4: Formative Evaluation of UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme Child Marriage

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?
Child marriage is a strategic issue affecting youth and adolescents (specifically targeted under outcome 2 of the UNFPA strategic plan). UNFPA and UNICEF have launched a joint child marriage global programme in 2016. An evaluability assessment of the programme was undertaken in 2017 by the evaluation offices of UNFPA and UNICEF. The evaluation of the programme will be formative in nature and will be key for learning from programme implementation and to assess level of progress towards achievement of expected results. Child marriage is a priority in several regions including Africa, Arab States, Latin America, and in Asia.		To date, there has not been an evaluation of the Joint Programme - this will be the first.	
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 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.		Yes, the evaluation will be conducted jointly with UNICEF.	
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
From 2016-2019 the expected expenditure by the global programme is 17 million USD, a significant investment.		An evaluability assessment was undertaken in 2017. The global programme will set aside funds for the conduct of the evaluation, with the estimated amount managed by UNFPA EO at \$253,115 (half of the amount, with the other half managed by UNICEF).	
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 evaluation will provide a learning opportunity to understand what has worked well or not during programme implementation and what could be improved.		Yes, the Steering Committee has requested this as key stage of the global programme.	

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?
The evaluation will fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to child marriage since no evaluation 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.		Director - Technical Division and chief of Sexual & Reproductive Health Branch and Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch. Results of the exercise will inform the next phase of the programme and UNFPA interventions in the area of child marriage.	

OUTCOME 3 (GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT)

Table 5: Evaluation of UNFPA Support to the Prevention, Response to and Elimination of Gender-Based Violence and Harmful Practices, including in Humanitarian Settings

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 be covering interventions contributing to: Outcome 3 (output 9, 10) of the 2014-2017 UNFPA Strategic Plan and will explore intersecting links with other outcomes (including outcome 4 of the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and outcome 5 (output 13 and 14) of the Strategic Plan midterm review 2012 - 2013. This is priority area of work across all regions in which UNFPA works.		This is the first global thematic evaluation on GBV and harmful practices, however a project evaluation of the GBV information system was conducted in 2014.	
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 capacity of UNFPA regional and country offices to implement interventions in this area could pose a risk (if capacity is lacking) to the achievement of the objectives. A lack of sufficient evidence for decision-making by senior management due to a lack of data on this subject could also pose a risk.		This evaluation presents a potential opportunity for a joint evaluation with another UN agency or donor with a mandate/portfolio of work that focus on GBV and harmful practices.	

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
UNFPA has implemented interventions on GBV in all regions in which it works and across several strategic plans. GBV is one of the key components of country programmes.		No evaluability study has been conducted, but there have been country programme evaluations covering this issue so there should be sufficient data available to conduct an evaluation. Estimated budget for the exercise is \$621,000 (institutional budget) with the EO expected to have the resources to conduct this evaluation.	
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 evaluation will 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.		The evaluation is considered valuable by the Chief of the Gender, Human Rights, and Culture Branch and the Chief of the Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch.	
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?
This is the first global thematic evaluation conducted by UNFPA on gender based violence and harmful practices and will contribute important evidence on GBV and harmful practices, building on evidence generated from the evaluation of Phase I of the JP on FGM as well as information generated from country programme evaluations (CPEs).		Director - Technical Division, Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch and Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch is a champion of the work on GBV, though there are not critical decision points driving the timing of the evaluation.	

Table 6: Joint Evaluations of UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation (Phase I+II in 2018 and Phase III in 2020)

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?
There will be two evaluations: the evaluation of Phase I and Phase II kicked off in 2017 and will continue through 2018, while the evaluation (a formative one) of Phase III will be launched in 2020. The evaluation of Phase I and II will be covering interventions contributing to: outcome 3, output 10 and exploring interlinkages with outcome 1 and 4 of the current Strategic Plan (2014-2017); outcome 5, output 13 and exploring interlinkages with outcome 6 of the previous Strategic Plan midterm review 2012 - 2013. Priority regions: Africa and Arab States	The Joint Evaluation of the first phase of the UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation /cutting: accelerating change – 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 global programme is a complex initiative that has been implemented by UNFPA and UNICEF jointly since 2008, since the launch of phase I. The capacity of UNFPA country offices to continue to implement the global programme - with its specific strategies for addressing FGM - could entail a risk affecting the achievement of the objectives of the global programme. Limited data availability on effectiveness also poses a risk of not having sufficient evidence for decision-making.	Yes, this will be a joint evaluation with UNICEF.
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
FGM is a key area of increasing investment from donors; it also an area of joint work with other agencies.	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. A scoping exercise will provide the methodological approach to the evaluation. Resources will be mobilized from the Joint Programme, with an expected \$350,000 managed by UNFPA for the evaluation of Phase I and Phase II and \$375,000 managed by UNFPA estimated for the formative evaluation of Phase III.
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)

<p>The evaluation will 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.</p>	<p>Members of the Steering Committee of the joint programme have requested the evaluation, including the EU, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom.</p>
<p>Knowledge gap Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?</p>	<p>Potential Is there a UNFPA “champion”? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?</p>
<p>This is the first global thematic evaluation conducted by UNFPA on gender based violence and harmful practices and will contribute important evidence on GBV and harmful practices, building on evidence generated from the evaluation of Phase I of the JP on FGM as well as information generated from country programme evaluations (CPEs).</p>	<p>Director - Technical Division, the chief of the Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch and the UNFPA/UNICEF coordinator of the Joint Programme are champions of this area of work. Timing will coincide to inform the implementation of the 3rd phase of the joint programme.</p>

Table 7: Evaluation of UNFPA Support to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

Relevance		Utility	
<p>Strategic relevance of the subject</p>	<p>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>	<p>Periodicity</p>	<p>Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?</p>
<p>The evaluation covers issues of corporate strategic significance, with interventions falling under Outcome 3 of the current UNFPA strategic plan 2018-2021 (and mainstreamed across all other outcomes) as well as previous UNFPA strategic plans (including UNFPA SP 2014-2017 and mid term review of SP 2012-2013). The achievement of gender equality and women’s empowerment, through a human rights based approach, is central to UNFPA’s mandate and corporate strategy and aligns with the ICPD and SDGs. It is a priority in all regions in which UNFPA works.</p>		<p>The Evaluation Office has not conducted any evaluation on gender equality. However a midterm evaluation on gender equality occurred in 2010 managed by Technical Division.</p>	
<p>Risk associated with the subject</p>	<p>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>	<p>Potential for joint evaluation</p>	<p>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>

<p>The ability of UNFPA country offices to implement interventions – including due to a lack of capacity and funding, could pose a potential risk to the achievement of results. A dearth of up to date/learning on the performance of UNFPA in supporting the achievement of gender equality and women’s empowerment could also pose a challenge to evidence based decision-making on relevant programming and policies.</p>	<p>After careful consideration, UNFPA EO has decided to focus on internal organizational learning (as the advancement of gender equality and women’s empowerment is uniquely important to the achievement of the outcomes stated in the UNFPA SP), building on previous joint evaluations on gender and gender related issues. As such, this will not be a joint evaluation.</p>
<p>Significant investment Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?</p>	<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</p>
<p>Yes, UNFPA has continually (across multiple strategic plans and regions) implemented interventions on gender equality and women’s empowerment.</p>	<p>There have been previous evaluations/ reviews focusing on this area, suggesting that there will be data available to conduct an evaluation. Estimated budget: \$624,200 (institutional budget).</p>
<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>	<p>Formal commitments to stakeholders Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)</p>
<p>The evaluation will provide an important learning opportunity, including information on the factors that contribute to the relevant, effective, sustainable and efficient support to GEWE and help determine the feasibility of replication or scaling-up of interventions.</p>	<p>The evaluation is considered valuable by the Chief, Gender, Human Rights, and Culture Branch.</p>
<p>Knowledge gap Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?</p>	<p>Potential Is there a UNFPA “champion”? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?</p>
<p>The evaluation will contribute further evidence on UNFPA support to gender equality and the empowerment of women – goals central to UNFPA’s mandate and to the accelerated implementation of the ICPD and the SDGs. The evaluation would draw on and expand upon previous evaluations (including the thematic evaluation of GBV and harmful practices, as well as the joint evaluation on joint gender programming).</p>	<p>The Chief of the Gender, Human Rights & Culture Branch is a champion of gender equality and women’s empowerment. Though there is not a critical decision point driving the timing of this evaluation, the results of the evaluation will feed into the implementation of an overall strategy on gender equality, currently being developed by the Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch, as well as the mid-term review of the strategic plan 2018-2021.</p>

OUTCOME 4 (POPULATION DATA)

Table 8: Evaluation of UNFPA Support to the use of population data in humanitarian preparedness and response

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?
UNFPA is increasingly involved in the response to humanitarian crises with a deepened strategic focus in the 2018-2021 Strategic Plan. This is a strategic issue not only for UNFPA but also within the implementation of the 2030 agenda. Planned for 2020, this evaluation will focus specifically on the use of data in the preparedness and response in humanitarian crises. The geographical scope of the evaluation will correspond to identified humanitarian settings, and will not be focused on a specific region. The evaluation will cover interventions contributing to outcome 4 of the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and 2018-2021 Strategic Plan, as well as across other outcomes/outputs, and will also include interventions that fall within the proposed forthcoming programme within the population and development branch on data and humanitarian crises.		This specific subject has never been evaluated at UNFPA, though the census & use of data for policy making evaluation was finalized in early 2016 (which considered use in humanitarian contexts, though not as a focus). An Independent System Wide Evaluation (ISWE) on the support of the UN system to national statistical capacity was undertaken in 2017.	
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 capacity (or lack thereof) of UNFPA country offices to strengthening national capacity to use data for humanitarian preparedness and response represents a potential risk affecting the achievement of the objectives. A lack of data on the topic to be evaluated poses a risk as well for evidence based decision-making.		Given the specific nature of the of the mandate of UNFPA (at the intersection of population data and humanitarian), the opportunities for coordination with similar evaluations by other partners are rather limited. Moreover, the UNFPA Evaluation Office was a member of the evaluation management group of the ISWE on statistical capacity.	
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
Given the growing number of humanitarian crises around the world, humanitarian interventions represent an increasing share of the overall portfolio of activities of UNFPA. Moreover, opportunities opened by working with and supporting work on big data is a key area of increasing investment within UNFPA and by its partners.		Yes. This evaluation will build on the results and lessons from two evaluations: namely on the census and data use and on the ISWE on statistical capacity. Estimated budget: \$564,2000 (institutional budget).	

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)
Building on the census & use of data for policy making evaluation (conducted in 2014), the evaluation will provide a learning opportunity and the information necessary to identify the factors required for the successful implementation of UNFPA strategies and plans vis a vis data use in humanitarian preparedness and response.	The evaluation is considered valuable by the Director of the Population and Development Branch
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?
The evaluation will generate essential information on the relevance and performance of UNFPA interventions on data use in humanitarian settings, building on the previous census and data use evaluation (2014).	Champions of this area of work include the Chief of the Population and Development Branch, the Director of Technical Division, and the Director of Data for Development Project.

HUMANITARIAN

Table 9: Evaluation of UNFPA Response to Syria Crisis

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?
Given UNFPA’s increasing involvement in the response to humanitarian crisis in Syria, the evaluation is of high corporate strategic significance. The evaluation (an existing exercise that started in 2017 and that will be finalized in 2018) will cover all UNFPA humanitarian interventions targeting populations affected by the conflict in Syria, as well as neighbouring countries (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey), including cross-border operations.	In 2015, a joint evaluation of Implementation of 2005 IASC Guidelines for Gender- based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Settings in the Syria Crisis response was conducted, however an evaluation on UNFPA’s contributions specifically across all areas of its interventions in the response has not been conducted.

<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>	<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>
<p>The ongoing humanitarian crisis and sensitive political context in Syria present a potentially high risk for the non-achievement of results.</p>	<p>While there are opportunities to evaluate jointly in the context of Syria crisis response, this evaluation will look specifically at UNFPA's contributions in the response, which correspond directly to the mandate of UNFPA, and so a joint evaluation in this case may not be beneficial.</p>
<p>Significant investment Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?</p>	<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</p>
<p>Yes, UNFPA has increased its involvement in the humanitarian crisis in Syria over time and UNFPA's work in Syria (and cross-border) is significant within UNFPA's overarching portfolio of work within humanitarian contexts.</p>	<p>No evaluability study has been conducted. However, the budget foreseen for the evaluation will allow for field missions in each of the countries concerned and the collection of primary data which should be sufficient to draw sound findings, recommendations and lessons learned.</p> <p>Estimated budget overall: USD 288,000 (institutional budget) and USD 240,000 (other resources).</p>
<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>	<p>Formal commitments to stakeholders Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)</p>
<p>Looking at UNFPA past and current Syrian humanitarian crisis response, the evaluation will help identify success factors and lessons learned of UNFPA's contribution to the response, including innovations (if any), with a view to replicate for future humanitarian responses both in the sub-region and elsewhere. The Syria regional response hub (based in Amman) will be the object of a case study within the framework of the evaluation, and lessons learned from the case study may help to determine the potential for replication of such a mechanism in other regions.</p>	<p>The decision to launch the evaluation was formally presented to the UNFPA Executive Board at the annual session 2017. The humanitarian and fragile contexts branch believe this to be a valuable evaluation.</p>

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?
The evaluation will generate essential information (at the global, regional, and country level) on the contributions of UNFPA to the Syria crisis response, including its contribution to the Whole of Syria approach for interventions inside Syria and provision of services for Syrian refugees in neighbouring countries.	Champions of this area of work include the Director of Programme Division and the Chief of the Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch.

Table 10: System-wide Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation

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?
As a member of the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation steering group, the UNFPA EO foresees to take part in the management group of two inter-agency humanitarian evaluations (IAHEs) over the period 2018-2021. The growing importance of the UNFPA engagement in humanitarian settings, as reflected in the UNFPA Strategic Plan, 2018-2021, confirms the strategic significance of such exercises. Depending on the nature of the IAHE, all geographical regions may be concerned.		UNFPA has not yet participated in the management group of an IAHE.	
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?
Currently the scope of the evaluation (geographical and thematic) has not been decided, however, humanitarian contexts in general pose a risk to the non-achievement of results. Additionally, a potential lack of evidence on this area may pose a risk to evidence based decision-making by management.		IAHEs are, by essence, joint evaluations, precisely focusing on coordination and collective added value in humanitarian assistance. They are meant to avoid duplication.	
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

Humanitarian assistance represents a growing share of the portfolio of activities of UNFPA and the focus on humanitarian contexts is reaffirmed and deepened in the forthcoming UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021.	IAHEs are often preceded by a feasibility or a scoping exercise, meant to ensure the evaluability of the programme or theme under evaluation. The budget for the IAHEs is established on an ad hoc basis by the members of the IAHE steering group, though the expected expenditure from UNFPA EO will be \$50,000 for each of the two planned (one in 2018 and one beginning in 2020)
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)
This evaluation will generate useful learning for UNFPA and the UN system as a whole and explore the factors contributing to effective humanitarian programming, including an understanding of the drivers for successful replication or scale up in similarly situated contexts.	There is a formal commitment from the IAHE group to carry out the evaluation with the aim of providing evidence to inform decision-making at the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC).
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?
IAHEs will help to inform the organization on issues of coordination with other UN agencies in a humanitarian response, and, more particularly, on the leadership of UNFPA of UNFPA in the Area of Responsibility on Gender-Based Violence (GBV), within the Global Protection Cluster.	UNFPA Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch is a champion of this area of work.

Table 11: Evaluation of the capacity of UNFPA to respond to humanitarian crises

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?
	UNFPA is increasingly involved in the response to humanitarian crises, and this evaluation (to be launched in 2018) will cover interventions contributing to all the outcomes of the Strategic Plan, 2018-2021. The geographical scope of the evaluation will correspond to identified humanitarian settings, and will not be focused on a specific region.		This subject has never been evaluated at UNFPA.
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?

Humanitarian contexts in general pose a risk to the non-achievement of results. Additionally, a lack of evidence on “what works” vis a vis SRH and other areas in which UNFPA works in humanitarian contexts may pose a risk to evidence based decision making by management.	Given the specific nature of the of the mandate of UNFPA, the risk of duplication and/or opportunities for coordination with similar evaluations by other partners are rather limited.
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
Given the growing number of humanitarian crises around the world, humanitarian interventions represent an increasing share of the overall portfolio of activities of UNFPA.	The evaluability of interventions will have to be carefully considered during the preparatory phase of the evaluation, as well as during the inception phase. Estimated budget USD 483,601 (institutional budget).
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)
One of the main objectives of the evaluation will be to identify success factors of UNFPA humanitarian interventions, with a view to replicating them in comparable situations/settings.	The evaluation is considered valuable by the Chief, Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch.
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?
The evaluation will generate essential information on the relevance and performance of UNFPA interventions in humanitarian settings.	Champions of this area of work include the Director of Programme Division and the Chief of the Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts Branch.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Table 12: Evaluation of Results Based Management Approaches

Relevance	Utility
-----------	---------

<p>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>	<p>Periodicity Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?</p>
<p>RBM is understood at UNFPA as ‘implementing development assistance and managing the organization in a way that focuses on the sequence of desired results and uses evidence on results to inform decision-making in respect to design, resourcing and delivery of programmes and activities, as well as for accountability and reporting’. It was first introduced in UNFPA in 2000. QCPR underscores the importance of results-based management, as an essential element of accountability that can, inter alia, contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. QCPR requests individual entities in the UN system to continue to strengthen results-based management, focusing on long-term development outcomes, developing common methodologies for planning and reporting on results, improving integrated results and resources frameworks, and enhancing a results culture.</p> <p>This evaluation will assess RBM approaches at all levels of UNFPA support to learn about RBM implementation within UNFPA particularly in the areas of strategic planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting on results.</p>	<p>It will be the first time that RBM will be subject to an evaluation at UNFPA.</p>
<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>	<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>
<p>RBM is key for the achievement of results expected from UNFPA. This is a complex institutional exercise that will require obtaining diverse data at all levels of the organization.</p>	<p>The evaluation covers specifically the RBM system of UNFPA. It provides no opportunity for a joint evaluation.</p>
<p>Significant investment Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?</p>	<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</p>
<p>The RBM system underpins the achievement of results of the overall portfolio of activities of UNFPA.</p>	<p>The RBM is a clearly identified evaluation object. There should not be any feasibility issue with this institutional evaluation. Resources would need to be mobilized in the next institutional budget to be approved from 2018. Estimated budget is \$451,499 (institutional budget).</p>
<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>	<p>Formal commitments to stakeholders Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)</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.	The evaluation is considered valuable by the the Director, Programme Division.
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?
The evaluation is not meant to provide information on specific UNFPA mandate areas, however, it will contribute knowledge to improve efficiency and effectiveness specifically	The Director of Programme Division is a champion of this area of work. The exercise will inform the implementation of the new strategic plan and therefore comes at an important point before the MTR of the current plan.

Table 13: Evaluation of the Architecture Supporting the Operationalisation of the Strategic Plan, 2018-2021

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?
This evaluation (planned for 2020) is meant to contribute to organizational effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluation is meant to provide an assessment of the overall architecture of the strategic plan, thus covering all regions.		An evaluation of the architecture of the previous strategic plan was conducted in 2017.	
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?
Findings of the evaluation will inform the subsequent strategic plan arrangements.		The architecture of the strategic plan is specific to UNFPA. There is no potential for joint evaluation.	
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
The evaluation will not consider the activities of UNFPA per se, but rather the strategies, systems and processes which allow for their implementation.		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 is \$403,300 (institutional budget).	

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 evaluation should help to identify success factors as well as conditions for the replicability or scaling up of UNFPA interventions with a view to achieving the results put forward in the results framework associated with the Strategic Plan.		While stakeholder are not formally requesting the evaluation, the Director, Programme Division considers the evaluation valuable.	
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?
The evaluation is meant to inform on the organisational effectiveness and efficiency of UNFPA.		The Director of Programme Division is a champion of this area of work.	

Table 14: Evaluation of Contribution to UN Coherence

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 to be conducted in 2020 will assess UNFPA contribution to UN coherence. QCPR (A/RES/71/243) calls for the United Nations development system to enhance its efforts, in a flexible, timely, coherent, coordinated and integrated manner, and to pursue full alignment of operational activities for development at the country level with national development plans and strategies to strengthen national ownership and leadership. QCPR stresses that improvement of coordination and coherence at all levels should be undertaken in a manner that recognizes UN agencies’ respective mandates and roles and enhances the effective utilization of their resources and their unique expertise. The evaluation will assess UNFPA contribution to coherence in terms of funding, planning, implementation and delivery of support, monitoring, evaluation, coordination, and the functioning of the UN system		This aspect of UNFPA support has not been evaluated before.	
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?

Assessing contribution to coherence will entail undertaking an exercise of a broad scope and different data will be necessary to analyze the different areas of coherence.	Given that the evaluation will focus on assessing UNFPA contribution to coherence it will not be a joint exercise. Stakeholders from other agencies will be consulted during this exercise.
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
UNFPA is mandated to follow the direction charted by QCPR and enhance coherence at all levels for improved relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.	No evaluability assessment has been conducted, but existing data is expected to be sufficient. Estimated budget: USD 551,300
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 exercise will identify what has worked and what needs to improve for a strong contribution to coherence. Limited data availability may also pose a risk of not having sufficient evidence.	Exercise will contribute to learning on the contribution of UNFPA to UN coherence and will thus be valuable across the organizations. Additionally, the evaluation is considered valuable by the Director, Programme Division.
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?
The evaluation will help to understand how UNFPA has contributed to coherence and how it can better do so under the new strategic plan and within the framework of Agenda 2030.	Programme division is a champion, as well as several other departments within UNFPA , as the issue of coherence is relevant across the organization.

SYNTHESIS / META ANALYSIS

Table 15: Synthesis of Country Programme Evaluations: Lessons Learned Relevance

Relevance	Utility
-----------	---------

<p>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>	<p>Periodicity Has the subject of evaluation ever been evaluated and, if so, how recently?</p>
<p>The CPE synthesis is an in-depth review of the evaluations of UNFPA country programmes, which are key modalities in the operationalization of UNFPA's Strategic Plan, covering all outcomes of the Plan as relevant to the local context. The synthesis of country programme evaluations may cover all geographic regions, depending on the CPEs covered in the scope of the synthesis.</p>	<p>To date, the CPE synthesis has been conducted every two years (with the second synthesis conducted in 2016) and the aim is to continue to undertake synthesis regularly.</p>
<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>	<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>
<p>The capacity of UNFPA country offices to implement their country programmes could pose a risk (if capacity is lacking) to the achievement of the objectives. A lack of sufficient evidence for decision-making by senior management due to a lack of data on this subject could also pose a risk.</p>	<p>Given that the focus will be UNFPA country programme evaluations, it will not be a joint exercise.</p>
<p>Significant investment Is the subject considered significant in relation to the portfolio of activities of UNFPA?</p>	<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</p>
<p>UNFPA country programmes, which are key modalities in the operationalization of UNFPA's Strategic Plan, cover all outcomes of the Plan as relevant to the local context. The CPE synthesis qualitatively analyzes the findings and recommendations presented in CPEs to draw out lessons learned vis a vis UNFPA strategic plan outcome areas (and other areas of organizational importance). The synthesis may cover all geographic regions, depending on the evaluations planned in the period of review. As such, the synthesis covers (though to varying degrees), the full range of UNFA support in a variety of support settings and represents a potentially significant contribution to strengthening and improving programming across UNFPA's portfolio of support.</p>	<p>Yes, there is a robust body of CPEs across regions, with continuously improving quality, lending itself to the production of a sound synthesis. Estimated budget: USD 39,300 for synthesis of 2016-2017 CPEs; USD 39,300 for the synthesis of 2018-2019 CPEs.</p>
<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>	<p>Formal commitments to stakeholders Are stakeholders requesting the evaluation (for example, through donor requirements in co-financing arrangements)</p>

<p>Yes, the main focus of the synthesis is to identify lessons learned that can be used to improve programming and reflect on the conditions needed for the scaling up and replication of interventions.</p>	<p>Though no formal request has been made, the exercise will contribute to learning on the across UNFPA SP outcome areas (and other areas of organizational significance) and thus valuable across organizations.</p>
<p>Knowledge gap Will the evaluation help to fill a vital knowledge gap in relation to the mandate of UNFPA?</p>	<p>Potential Is there a UNFPA “champion”? Are there critical decision points within UNFPA which would drive the timing of the evaluations?</p>
<p>The synthesis will further contribute to the knowledge base with the view to aim to inform and guide UNFPA strategies, programmes and operational systems, including the forthcoming UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021, future Country Programme Documents and Country Programme Action Plans.</p>	<p>The synthesis aims to contribute to evidence based programming and organizational decision-making, including in the design of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021 and its subsequent mid-term review, as well as the formulation and implementation of country programme documents.</p>