

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

National Consultant (Maternal Health and SRHR) for the Midterm Review of BERANI - Better Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights for all in Indonesia Programme	
Hiring Office:	UNFPA Indonesia CO; Monitoring & Evaluation unit
Purpose of consultancy:	To conduct a midterm review (MTR) of BERANI programme's (2018-2020) Maternal Health and SRHR component
Scope of work: (Description of services, activities, or outputs)	<p><u>INTRODUCTION</u></p> <p>UNFPA and UNICEF Indonesia are planning to conduct an independent programme midterm review (2018-2020) of the BERANI, Better Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights for All in Indonesia programme (2018-2022) as agreed in its project document. Programme midterm review serves three main purposes: (i) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources; (ii) support evidence-based decision-making; (iii) contribute important lessons learned to the formulation of the 2021-2022 work plans.</p> <p>UNFPA Indonesia together with the Government of Canada, the Government of Indonesia (GoI), and UNICEF, have been working since 2018 to improve sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) for women and young people in Indonesia, through a joint programme aimed at increasing the quality of skilled birth attendance (SBA) and thereby decreasing maternal mortality; increasing access to SRHR information and services to young people through comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) and a youth friendly services (UNALA); and decreasing harmful practices such as child marriage and female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) and gender based violence (GBV) through advocacy, evidence-generation, and capacity building.</p> <p>The programme is implemented through partnerships with strategic partners, such as national counterparts, including BAPPENAS, BKKBN, MOH and MOWECP; and partnerships with parliamentarians, faith-based organizations, the private sector, philanthropists, and youth and women's networks.</p> <p><u>OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE MIDTERM REVIEW</u></p> <p>Purposes:</p> <p>The MTR aims at assessing the progress of BERANI joint programme towards the achievement of results of the first half of the programme cycle in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Propose corrective action and strategic recommendations for the remaining one year of the five-year cycle across thematic outputs as well as in cross-cutting issues (management, coordination, strategic partnerships, knowledge management). 2. Be the basis for mid-term revisions of the Programme Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Matrix. 3. To assess the quality of the programme design through assessing the theory of change, bottleneck analysis and critical assumptions of the programme and its sub-programmes including the validity, quality and adequacy of the results and resources frameworks of the respective programmes and capturing all key intended and unintended contributions of the programmes.

Objectives of the MTR:

With the above stated purpose, the objectives of the MTR are:

- To review the programme design (including logic model/results framework), governance, and management measures, identifying the gaps, challenges, and opportunities, in the achievement of programme results/goals as well as in the engagement of national partners.
- To review progress in programme implementation, identifying status of mid-term results achieved in relation to outputs and outcomes.
- To propose corrective action in order to improve performance for the remaining one year of the programme cycle; this may include the revision of the planning framework and the revision of annual targets.

Intended audience:

The main audience and primary users of the midterm review report are the decision makers and programme managers in UNFPA and UNICEF Indonesia (CO), the Government of Canada, as well as counterparts in the Government of Indonesia (GOI), including the civil society, and the United Nations Resident Coordinator Office (UNRCO) in Indonesia.

Outputs:

The MTR team will produce the following deliverables:

1. An approved design report including (as a minimum):
 - a. A stakeholder map;
 - b. The MTR matrix (including the final list of evaluation questions and the corresponding judgement criteria and indicators); and
 - c. The overall evaluation design and methodology, with a detailed description of the data collection plan for the data collection phase.
 - d. The division of labor among the MTR team with a work plan indicating timeline for key milestones.
2. A debriefing presentation document in the format of PowerPoint synthesizing the main preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations of the data collection
3. A draft MTR report, potentially followed by a second draft
4. A power point presentation of the results of the evaluation for the in-country stakeholder workshop;
5. An approved final MTR report, with annexes, based on comments expressed during the in-country stakeholder workshop; and
6. An evaluation brief, a 2-3 page summary of the key evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

All deliverables will be in **English**.

SCOPE OF THE CONSULTANCY:

The consultant is expected to undertake the MTR as part of the MTR team and make recommendations that are valid and reliable, based on available data and evidence. It is expected that the consultant will conduct a participatory MTR that will involve programme implementers and target beneficiaries. Existing project documents and progress reports will be shared with the consultant to facilitate completion of the tasks.

	<p>The consultant (Maternal Health and SRHR) will be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Covering the SRHR component under the BERANI joint programme, namely maternal health, midwifery and family planning, including under humanitarian contexts; ● Developing the SRHR part of the design report including the MTR matrix; ● Collecting information, conducting desk reviews of relevant documents and interviews with key stakeholders in the respective area; and ● Draft the SRHR part of the 1st and 2nd drafts and the final MTR report that meets UN evaluation quality standards. <p><u>MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION</u></p> <p>The MTR team will consist of the MTR team leader and the MTR team members. The responsibilities of the consultant (Maternal Health and SRHR) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A national consultant will provide expertise in the areas of Maternal Health and Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR). S/he will take part in the data collection and analysis work during the design and data collection phases. S/he will be responsible for drafting key parts of the design report and of the draft final and final MTR reports, including (but not limited to) sections relating to her/his area of expertise. <p><u>Methodology:</u></p> <p>The MTR will utilize a mixed method approach, using qualitative and quantitative methods as necessary. The Logic Model used to design the BERANI joint programme will be reviewed and revised as necessary, based on stakeholder consultations to provide the basis for this MTR.</p> <p>The MTR will pay special attention to ensure equity, gender and human rights based approaches are embedded into the data collection and analysis. It will be also guided by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical guidelines for evaluation, as well as UNEG Norms and Standards.¹² The MTR will be transparent, inclusive and participatory as well as gender and human rights responsive. It will seek and utilize data disaggregated by age, gender, vulnerable groups, etc. to ensure findings are gender reflective and targeted.</p>
Duration and working schedule:	<p>The consultant on Maternal Health and SRHR will be 25 working days in length for the consultancy as part of the MTR team, and may take place from August to November 2021.</p> <p>The midterm review will unfold in five phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preparation phase This phase will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Drafting the MTR Terms of Reference; b. Approval of the ToR; c. Recruitment of a team of evaluators; d. Set up the Evaluation Reference Group; and

¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

² [UNEG Guidance on integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation](#)

	<p>e. Orientation of key national government counterparts to the MTR process.</p> <p>2. Design phase – (output: design report)</p> <p>This phase will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Desk review by the MTR team of all relevant documents available; b. Develop a stakeholder map ; c. Reconstruct the programme Logic Model/Results Framework; d. Develop the evaluation matrix; e. Develop a data collection and analysis strategy as well as a concrete work plan for the data collection and analysis, including division of labor; f. Specify limitations and challenges expected to conduct the MTR and any mitigation efforts to be taken to overcome these; g. Share with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) ERG for review, discussion and finalization h. Clearance of the design report by the GAC and UNFPA-UNICEF CO i. Approval of the design report. <p>3. Data Collection phase – (output: debriefing presentation on the preliminary results of the MTR and testing conclusions)</p> <p>The MTR team will collect data involving a series of individual and group interviews, focus group discussions and online surveys to answer the evaluation questions identified in the design phase.</p> <p>4. Reporting phase – (output: first draft final report).</p> <p>The MTR team will prepare a first draft of the MTR report. This first draft report will be submitted to the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) (in writing). The MTR Team will submit a second draft of the report addressing the comments made by the reference group.</p> <p>This second draft report will form the basis for an in-country dissemination workshop. The final report will be drafted taking into account comments received from the participants of the workshop.</p> <p>The Report will be cleared by the UNFPA-UNICEF and submitted with an Evaluation Quality Assessment (EQ) to the GAC for approval.</p> <p>5. Facilitation of use and dissemination phase</p> <p>This phase will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Publishing and dissemination of the final MTR report to key stakeholders b. Preparation of the management response to the recommendations; c. Periodic follow-up of the recommendations of the evaluation.
Place where services are to be delivered:	Home based.
Delivery dates and how work will be delivered	<p>All deliverables will be in <u>English</u> in an electronic file.</p> <p>Deadline and terms of Payment will be based on the delivery outputs, as follows:</p>

(e.g. electronic, hard copy etc.):	No	Items	Number of working days	Deadline and Terms of Payment		
	1	Upon completion of the data collection phase	10	End of September 2021 40% of total payment		
	2	Upon receipt of the approved final MTR report and MTR brief	15	End of November 2021 60% of total payment		
	TOTAL		25			
Monitoring and progress control, including reporting requirements, periodicity format and deadline:	<u>Breakdown of MTR phases (please see annex 1).</u>					
Supervisory arrangements:	The MTR Team and Team Leader will work under the overall guidance of the UNFPA Representative and day to day direct supervision by the Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst (a CO evaluation manager). UNFPA & UNICEF CO evaluation managers (Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst) will be assigned to interact on a day-to-day basis with the MTR team, and will ensure that all the necessary aspects of MTR programme review are well taken into account by the MTR team.					
Expected travel	Travel from home-based to Jakarta and other project locations (if it is deemed necessary in the agreed design report by the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)).					
Required expertise, qualifications and competencies, including language requirements:	<p>An Evaluator (Maternal Health and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR)) will be a national consultant, who fulfils the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Master's Degree in health sciences, including public health; ● At least 7 years of previous experience in conducting complex evaluations, especially in the field of development aid for UN agencies and/or other international organizations evaluations; ● Specialization and significant experience in the area of sexual reproductive health and rights; ● Familiarity with the humanitarian-development nexus is desirable; ● Excellent management skills and ability to work with multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural teams; ● Excellent analytical, communication and writing skills; and ● Fluency in <u>English</u> is required. 					
Inputs / services to be provided by UNFPA or implementing partner (e.g support services, office space,	<p>The background documents (including the detailed concept note)for the BERANI MTR will be the following:</p> <p>The below documents can be derived at the following link: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1M1jAsYEkdZH3DC78cUmTSjsGtb2bcxw?usp=sharing.</p>					

equipment), if applicable:	#	Title
	1	BERANI MTR Concept Note
	2	BERANI Programme Documents
	3	BERANI Annual Reports 2018, 2019 and 2020
	4	BERANI programme Knowledge products database 2018-2020
	5	Stakeholder Mapping Matrix
	6	UNFPA Evaluation Policy
ANNEXES		
Annex	Title	
1	Breakdown of MTR phases	
2	Programme Logic Model / Results Framework	
3	Template for the Design Report	
4	Template for Final MTR Report	
5	Template for Abstract of the Final MTR Report	
6	A template for the MTR matrix	
7	Management Response	
8	Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid (EQA)	
9	Ethical Code of Conduct for UNEG/ UNFPA Evaluation	

Annex 1: Breakdown of MTR phases:

The timelines for the BERANI Programme midterm review (MTR) are elucidated below:

Details of activities	June				July				August				September				October				November										
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4			
1. Preparatory Phase																															
Drafting of the MTR Terms of Reference	X	X	X	X																											
Constitution of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)			X	X																											
Feedback from ERG			X	X																											
Orientation of UNFPA main national partners to the MTR process				X																											
Approval of the ToR by ERG, UNFPA and UNICEF					X																										
Selection and recruitment of a team evaluators					X	X	X	X	X																						
Approval of the team by ERG, UNFPA and UNICEF								X	X																						
2. Design phase																															
Draft design report										X	X	X																			
Review and feedback from UNFPA-UNICEF CO, ERG												X																			
Final design report												X																			
3. Data collection phase													X	X	X	X	X	X													
4. Synthesis phase																															
1st draft report																			X	X	X										
Review and Comments																				X	X										
2nd draft/ final report																						X	X	X							
Stakeholder workshop (a half-day meeting)— <i>the exact date to be confirmed</i>																									X						
Final MTR report and MTR brief (and EQA by UNFPA-UNICEF)																									X	X					
5. Dissemination and follow-up phase																															

Annex 2. Programme Logic Model/ Results Framework

TABLE - Logic model						
ULTIMATE OUTCOME	1000 Improved the quality of lives of women and girls in Indonesia					
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES	1100 Improved quality of sexual and reproductive health services, including in the context of gender-based violence (GBV), at national and subnational levels + X					
IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES	1110 Increased capacity of health workers for quality sexual and reproductive health services to reduce maternal mortality at national and subnational levels + X					
	1120 Increased capacity of health service points to respond to GBV cases in two selected districts in Indonesia in strengthening the case recording and referral mechanism + X	1130 Increased capacity of private sector clinics in Yogyakarta and West Nusa Tenggara to provide youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health (SRH) information and services + X	1210 Increased capacity of duty-bearers to develop policies that protect SRHR at national and subnational levels + X	1220 Increased knowledge of rights-holders on sexual and reproductive health and rights + X		
OUTPUTS	1111 Technical assistance provided on the establishment of five (5) centers of excellence for midwifery education + X	1121 Technical assistance to Ministry of Health to strengthen the health sector institutional capacity and coordination in GBV + X	1131 Youth-friendly SRH information and services model (UNALA) established in private sector clinics in Yogyakarta + X	1211 Technical assistance provided to MNHCP on developing and implementing laws and policies to address the prevention of harmful practices (child marriage and FGM/C) + X	1221 Technical assistance provided to Ministry of Education and Culture and Ministry of Health on the module for school teachers on Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) + X	
	1112 Trainings and technical advice provided to the Indonesian Midwife Association to implement and provide quality assurance on midwifery + X	1122 Technical assistance provided on handling GBV cases in health service points in one selected district + X	1132 Youth-friendly SRH information and services model (UNALA) scaled up in West Nusa Tenggara + X	1212 Technical assistance provided to parliamentarians on the prevention of harmful practices (child marriage and FGM/C) + X	1222 Technical assistance provided to Women Ulama Networks for community-driven prevention of harmful practices (FGM/C) + X	
	1113 Studies and analysis on sexual reproductive health and rights conducted to provide evidence for decision-making (strengthening health systems) + X			1213 Engaging religious and community leaders(including women's prayer groups) to change attitudes on Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM), SRHR, and child marriage + X	1223 Empowering adolescents with information and skills on MHM, SRHR, and child marriage + X	
	1114 Partnerships established and strengthened to achieve FP2020 goals + X					

Annex 3. Template for the Design Report

Cover page

Period covered by the Midterm Review (2018-2020)

DESIGN REPORT

Date (Month date year)

Second page

Programme map (half page)

Table (half page)

MTR team

Titles / position in the team

Names

Third page

Table of contents

Section	Title	Suggested length
CHAPTER 1: Introduction		
1.1	Purpose and objectives of the MTR	1-2 pages max
1.2.	Scope of the MTR	
1.3.	Purpose of the design report	
CHAPTER 2: Country and Programme Context		
2.1	Development challenges and national strategies	4-6 pages max
2.2	The role of BERANI	
CHAPTER 3: BERANI Strategic Response and Programme		
3.1	Strategic response	5 – 7 pages max
3.2	Response through theBERANI	
3.2.1.	The BERANI Joint Programme Financial Structure	
CHAPTER 4: Methodology and Approach		
4.1	MTR criteria and evaluation questions	7-10 pages max
4.2	Methods for data collection and analysis	
4.3.	Selection of the sample of stakeholders	
4.4.	Evaluability assessment, limitations and risks	
CHAPTER 5: Midterm review Process		
5.1	Process overview	3-5 pages max
5.2.	Team composition and distribution of tasks	
5.3.	Resource requirements and logistic support	
5.4.	Work plan	
TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES		20-30 pages max

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Annex 2. MTR Matrix

Annex 3. Templates or outlines of data-collection methods (e.g. interview protocols/guides, logbooks or equivalent, survey questionnaires)

Annex 4. List of financial data

Annex 5. Stakeholders map and list of persons consulted

Annex 6. Bibliography/ documents consulted

Annex 7. MTR agenda

Following Page

Abbreviations and Acronyms

List of tables

List of figures

Following Page

The key facts table (*this is a one page table summarizing key factual country data*)

Annex 4. Template for the Final Midterm Review Report

Cover page

Title:
Period covered by the review (xx-xx)

MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT

Date

Second page

Programme map (*half page*)

Table (*half page*)

MTR team	
Titles / position in the team	Names

Third page

Acknowledgements

Fourth page

Table of contents

Section	Title	Suggested length
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3-4 pages max
	CHAPTER 1: Introduction	
1.1	Purpose and objectives of the MTR	
1.2.	Scope of the MTR	5-7 pages max
1.3.	Methodology and process	
	CHAPTER 2: Country Context	
2.1	Development challenges and national strategies	
2.2	The role of BERANI	5-6 pages max
	CHAPTER 3: UNFPA Strategic Response and Programme	
3.1	BERANI Strategic response	
3.2	BERANI response	
3.2.1.	Brief description of BERANI strategy, goals, and achievements	
3.2.3	The Financial Structure of the BERANI	
	CHAPTER 4: Findings: Answers to the MTR Questions	
4.1	Answer to evaluation question 1	
4.2	Answer to evaluation question 2	
4.3.	Answer to evaluation question 3	
4.4.	Answer to evaluation question 4	25-35 pages max
	CHAPTER 5: Conclusions	
5.1	Strategic Level	
5.2.	Programmatic Level	3-5 pages max
	CHAPTER 6: Recommendations	
6.1.	Recommendations	4-5 pages max
	TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES	50-70 pages max

ANNEXES

Annex 1 Terms of Reference

Annex 2 List of persons/institutions met

Annex 3 List of documents consulted

Annex 4 the MTR matrix

Fifth page

Abbreviations and acronyms

List of tables

List of figures

Sixth page

Key facts table (*this is a one-page table summarizing key factual country data, and already included in the design report—the facts should coincide, unless some data entries have been adjusted based on new documentation/obtained during data collection phase*)

Seventh page

Structure of the MTR report

Eight page

Key facts table: (*name of the country*)

Annex 5. Abstract of the MTR report

MTR Programme Review (from-to) *Abstract*

Subject of the MTR

Purpose of the MTR

Methodology

Note: Short explanation of the MTR process and methodological approach.

Main Conclusions

Note: Summary of the main conclusions.

Conclusions should derive from findings and should express independent judgments; conclusions are the MTR team's responsibility. Conclusions should be assembled by homogeneous "clusters" (not by evaluation criteria).

Main Recommendations

Note: Summary of the main recommendations.

Recommendations should derive from conclusions; Recommendations may be organized by clusters, (e.g., strategic recommendations and recommendations associated with the country programme). Within each cluster, recommendations should be operational, ranked by priority level, with a time horizon, and, when possible, they should present alternative options indicating the pros and cons and addressed to the relevant

Annex 6. A template for the MTR matrix

Assumptions to be assessed	Indicators	Sources of information	Methods and tools for the data collection
Evaluation question 1			
Assumption 1:			
Assumption 2:			
Assumption 3:			
Evaluation question 2			
Assumption 1:			
Assumption 2:			
Assumption 3:			
Evaluation question 3			
Assumption 1:			
Assumption 2:			
Assumption 3:			

Annex 7. Management Response

UNFPA-UNICEF Management response	MTR Programme Review (from-to):(name of the country)
---	---

Note: The following management response lists the recommendations as they appear in the MTR report. Please refer to the report for more details on each recommendation. Recommendations may be organized by clusters, e.g.: strategic recommendations, recommendations associated with the country programme, recommendations associated with cross-cutting issues. Within each cluster, recommendations should be ranked by priority levels (from 1 to 3).

Instructions for completing the management response:

1. Boxes in white to be completed upon receiving the present request
 2. Boxes in grey to be completed one year later.
-

Cluster 1: Strategic recommendations

Recommendation #	To (e.g Executive Director's Office)	Priority Level(from 1 to 3)

Management response - Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation:.....

.....

.....

Key action(s)	Deadline	Responsible unit(s)	Annual implementation status updates	
			Status (ongoing or completed)	Comments

Recommendation #	To(e.g. Country office)	Priority level

Management response - Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation:.....

.....

.....

.....

Key action(s)	Deadline	Responsible unit(s)	Annual implementation status updates	
			Status (ongoing or completed)	Comments

Cluster 2: Recommendations associated with the programme

Recommendation #	To	Priority level		
<p>Management response - Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation:.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>				
Key action(s)	Deadline	Responsible unit(s)	Annual implementation status updates	
			Status (ongoing or completed)	Comments

Clusters 3: Recommendations associated with cross-cutting issues

Recommendation #	To	Priority level		
<p>Management response - Please provide your response to the above recommendation. Where recommendations (or parts of) are not accepted, please provide detailed justification. Where accepted, please indicate key actions for implementation:.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>				
Key action(s)	Deadline	Responsible unit(s)	Annual implementation status updates	
			Status (ongoing or completed)	Comments

Annex 8. Evaluation Quality Assessment Grid (EQA)

Organizational unit:		Year of report:						
Title of evaluation report:		Date of assessment:						
Overall quality of report:								
Overall comments:		[insert text]						
Assessment Levels								
Very good:	strong, average, practice	above best	Good:	satisfactory, respectable	Fair:	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	Unsatisfactory:	weak, does not meet minimal quality standards
Quality Assessment Criteria				<p><i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by <u>main comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i></p>				

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

- Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible non-technical language appropriate for the intended audience)?
- Is the report focused and to the point (e.g. not too lengthy)?
- Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?
- Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography, a list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix and methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?

Executive summary

- Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?
- Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?
- Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5-10 pages)?

2. Design and Methodology

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context

Assessment Level:

Comment:

Assessment Level:



- Does the evaluation describe whether the evaluation is for accountability and/or learning purposes?
- Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?
- Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described?
- Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change?
- Does the evaluation explain any constraints and/or general limitations?

Comment:

To ensure a rigorous design and methodology

- Is the evaluation approach and framework clearly described? Does it establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?
- Were the methods chosen appropriate for addressing the evaluation questions? Are the tools for data collection described and justified?
- Are the methods for analysis clearly described?
- Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their impact on the evaluation described? (Does it discuss how any bias has been overcome?)
- Is the sampling strategy described? Does the design include validation techniques?
- Is there evidence of involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation design? (Is there a comprehensive/credible stakeholder map?)
- Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?
- Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?

3. Reliability of Data

To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes

- Did the evaluation triangulate all data collected?
- Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of qualitative and quantitative data sources?
- Did the evaluation make explicit any possible issues (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues? I.e. did the evaluation make explicit possible limitations of the data collected?
- Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?
- Is there adequate gender disaggregation of data? And if this has not been possible, is it explained?
- Does the evaluation make explicit the level of involvement of different stakeholders in the different phases of the evaluation process?

Assessment Level:

Comment:

4. Analysis and Findings

To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

Findings

- Findings stem from rigorous data analysis
- Findings are substantiated by evidence
- Findings are presented in a clear manner and follow logically from the analysis

Assessment Level:

Comment:

Analysis

- Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions
- Contextual factors are identified
- Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained

<p>5. Conclusions</p> <p><i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are conclusions credible and clearly related to the findings? ● Are the conclusions demonstrating an appropriate level of analytical abstraction? ● Are conclusions conveying the evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention? 	<p>Assessment Level:</p> <hr/> <p>Comment:</p>
<p>6. Recommendations</p> <p><i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions? ● Are the recommendations sufficiently clear, targeted at the intended users and operationally-feasible? ● Do recommendations reflect stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining balanced and impartial? ● Is the number of recommendations manageable? ● Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation? 	<p>Assessment Level:</p> <hr/> <p>Comment:</p>
<p>7. Gender</p> <p><i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW)³</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected? 	<p>Assessment Level:</p> <hr/> <p>Comment:</p>

³ This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory). One question is if these criteria should be included in the overall evaluation quality assessment grid, or form a separate column and be assessed on its own.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved? • Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected? • Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis? 	
--	--

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)				7
2. Design and methodology (13)			13	
3. Reliability of data (11)			11	
4. Analysis and findings (40)			40	
5. Conclusions (11)		11		
6. Recommendations (11)		11		
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	7	22	63	7
Overall assessment level of evaluation report			Fair	
	Very good ↗ very confident to use	Good ↗ confident to use	Fair ↗ use with caution	Unsatisfactory ↗ not confident to use

(*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'finding and analysis' has been assessed as 'good', enter 40 into 'Good' column. (b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair'). (c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain⁴:

- How it can be used?
- What aspects to be cautious about?

Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory⁵:

Consideration of significant constraints⁶

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: yes no

If yes, please explain:

⁴ The purpose here is to clarify in what way the report can be used. This is in order to assist the elaboration of a relevant Management Response and the wider use of the evaluation findings back into programming. When a report has been assessed as Fair, it is obligatory to fill this text box in.

⁵ The purpose is, where relevant, to clarify for example severe unbalances in the report (for example, the report is good overall but recommendations very weak). It is optional to fill in.

⁶ E.g. this should only be used in case of significant events that have severely hampering the evaluation process like natural disasters, evaluators falling sick, unexpected significant travel restrictions, etc. More 'normal' limitations should be mentioned under relevant section above.

Annex 9. Ethical Code of Conduct for UNEG/ UNFPA Evaluation

Evaluations of UNFPA-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business. In particular:

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent**, implying that members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting/programming, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interests and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. Evaluators should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual informants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals** and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. Evaluations sometimes uncover suspicion of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. Evaluators should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
5. Evaluators are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations.

For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System

<http://www.unevaluation.org/search/index.jsp?q=UNEG+Ethical+Guidelines>

http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21

[Please provide date, signature, and write “Read and approved” in the space below]



