



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL UNFPA/USA/RFP/17/035

TERMS OF REFERENCE LOT 3

Long Term Agreement for the supply of evaluation services
in the field of Sexual and Reproductive Health and
Reproductive Rights
(2018 – 2021)

EVALUATION OFFICE

December 2017

Contents

List of acronyms.....	3
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Background and Context	4
3. Objectives and Services Required	6
4. Quality Assurance	7
5. Required Profiles	8
6. Travel and Security Arrangements	10
Annex 1. Quality Assurance of the Evaluation Report	12
Annex 2. Evaluation Quality Assessment Check-list.....	19

List of acronyms

CARMMA	Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality in Africa
EQA	Evaluation Quality Assessment
EmONC	Emergency Obstetric and Newborn Care
EO	UNFPA Evaluation Office
FTYMs	Firts-time Young Mothers
FP	Family Planning
GNI	Gross National Income
GPRHCS	Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security
HIMS	Health Information Management System
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
LMIS	Logistics Management Information Systems
MDSR	Maternal Death Surveillance and Response
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MHTF	Maternal Health Thematic Fund
RH	Reproductive Health
RHC	Reproductive Health Commodity
RHCS	Reproductive Health Commodity Security
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
STIs	Sexually Transmitted Infections
ToR	Terms of Reference
RHCS TTF	Reproductive Health Commodity Security Thematic Trust Fund
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund

1. Introduction

Evaluation at the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) serves three main purposes: (a) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance in achieving development results and on invested resources; (b) support evidence-based decision-making; (c) contribute key lessons learned to the existing knowledge base on how to accelerate implementation of the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD).¹

The Evaluation Office (EO) will conduct an number of thematic or programme evaluations pertaining to UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021 (DP/FPA/2017/9), outcome 1 aiming at ensuring that every woman, adolescent and youth everywhere, especially those furthest behind, has utilized integrated sexual and reproductive health services and exercised reproductive rights, free of coercion, discrimination and violence

2. Background and Context

In UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021, outcome 1 will directly contribute to achieving Sustainable Development Goal 3, focusing on maternal mortality, skilled birth attendance, met need for family planning, adolescent birth rates and HIV incidence.

As part of its quadrennial evaluation plan for 2018-2021, and in relation to outcome 1, the Evaluation Office foresees the conduct of the following evaluations:

) **Final evaluation of the UNFPA Supplies Programme (2013-2020)**

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 the 69 world's poorest countries (GNI per capita of \$2,500 or less) with a need for support based on: low contraceptive prevalence rate, high unmet need for family planning, high adolescent birth rate and high maternal mortality ratio. The main beneficiaries of the UNFPA Supplies Programme are teenage girls and poor women.

) **Mid-term evaluation of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF - Phase 3: 2018-2021)**

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

¹ See UNFPA evaluation policy (revised, 2013) - DP/FPA/2013/5

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). All interventions are strategically selected to have the greatest impact. 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.

) **Thematic evaluation of UNFPA support to HIV prevention**

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 (sex workers, men who have sex with men and transgender persons).

The available **budget for each evaluation is expected to range between US \$300,000 and US \$500,000** depending on thematic and geographical scope as defined in terms of reference. The costs of each evaluation will include:

-) The professional fees charged for the evaluation as defined in the Terms of Reference
-) Other expenses as defined in the Terms of Reference associated with professional copy editing and translation of the Evaluation Brief (see section 3 below)
-) Travel related costs (see section 6 below) and other charges for participation in the reference group meetings; all field missions; analysis workshops; and dissemination meetings.

In addition to conducting the evaluations foreseen in its quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan, the Evaluation Office may use the Long-Term Agreement to request other, smaller-scale evaluations or evaluation-related services pertaining to UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021, outcome 1, at different points during the period of validity of the LTA. These services may include evaluability assessments, workshops or conferences related to but not included in the budget for evaluations, evaluation-related facilitation services and/or communication activities related to evaluation work.

3. Objectives and Services Required

The purpose of the long-term agreement is the provision of a number of high quality evaluation services for specific evaluations within the Evaluation Office's quadrennial plan.

The LTA holder is responsible for delivering the evaluation and all associated products to comply with the specific terms of reference (ToR) which will be issued for each evaluation. Evaluation services must also be in line with the Evaluation Office guidance and standards, as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). As per the EO standard practice, the evaluation process usually unfolds in the following four phases and encompasses (as a minimum) the indicated deliverables:

- J **Inception Phase** (covering a period of 2 to 3 months): The supplier will conduct the design of the evaluation in consultation with the EO evaluation manager. This phase will lead to the production of an *Inception report* (English).
- J **Data collection phase** (covering a period of 5 to 7 months): Data collection for the evaluations will utilize a range of different data collection tools, and will include both desk-based and in-country (field) and case studies. Data collected from the field-based country case studies will be analyzed and documented in a *Country case study report* (English).
- J **Analysis and reporting phase** (covering a period of 3 to 4 months): will lead to the production of a *draft final report* (English) to be submitted to the evaluation manager for comments. Prior to submission, the evaluation team must ensure that the draft final report has undergone a rigorous internal quality control (see section 4 below). On the basis of the comments expressed, the supplier will make appropriate amendments and submit the *final report*.
- J **Dissemination and follow up phase** (covering a period of 1 to 4 months): The supplier is expected to: (a) provide a professionally *copy edited report*; (b) translate the report *executive summary in French* and, as appropriate in Spanish; (c) draft the *Evaluation Brief* which consists in a short paper presenting (including the use of infographics) the main results of the evaluation; (d) produce *powerpoint presentation(s)*. The supplier may also be expected to contribute to other dissemination products and will be requested to participate in dissemination events.

The production of each of the above listed evaluation deliverables may entail several revisions until the deliverable is considered final by the evaluation manager. For each deliverable, the supplier will also produce a powerpoint presentation highlighting the main elements of the deliverable.

Please refer to the Evaluation Office webpage at <http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation> for examples of evaluation inception reports, country notes, final reports, briefs and translated executive summaries pertaining to the UNFPA outcome 1. Recent examples include: the *Evaluation of UNFPA support to family planning (2008-2013)* and the *Joint UNFPA-UNICEF evaluation of the H4+ joint programme Canada and Sweden (2011-2016)*.

Long Term Agreement for the supply of evaluation services in the field of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Reproductive Rights (2018 – 2021)

The LTA holder(s) will be expected to submit professionally edited reports. Should translation/interpretation services be needed, the LTA holder(s) will be expected to arrange and pay for such services. The rates for editing, translation, and interpretation must be included in the designated section of the Price Schedule Form.

The specific terms of reference for each evaluation will be provided to the LTA holder(s) with the secondary bidding request. It will provide key information for each evaluation, including: context and background of UNFPA support; evaluation purpose, objectives and scope; evaluation criteria and indicative areas of investigation; methodology and approach; evaluation process; management and governance set up; evaluation team; quality assurance; and time schedule and deliverables. Please refer to the Evaluation Office webpage at <http://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/mid-term-evaluation-unfpa-supplies-programme-2013-2020> for an example of ToR of a recent evaluation pertaining to the outcome 1 area.

The Evaluation Office will notify the LTA holder(s) of the planned start date of each evaluation at least 3 months prior to the expected start date. UNFPA will issue a secondary bidding request a minimum of three (3) weeks prior to the expected start date. For more details on the secondary bidding procedure and the evaluation of secondary bids, please refer to Section 36.4 of the RFP document.

Provided that UNFPA has complied with this minimum advance notice, the supplier will be expected to have the requested resources available to begin work on the indicated start date and complete work within the agreed-upon timeframe. Team members who have started work on the project will be expected to stay on the project until its completion.

4. Quality Assurance

For each evaluation, the supplier will conduct the first level of quality assurance for all evaluation products prior to their submission to the UNFPA Evaluation Office.

The supplier is expected to dedicate specific resources to quality assurance efforts that are independent from the evaluation team, and must consider all time, resources, and costs related to this in their technical and financial bid. The bidder must present the quality assurance mechanisms which will be applied throughout the evaluation process as part of the technical offer.

The EO recommends that the evaluation quality assessment checklist presented in annex 1 of this ToR document is used as an element of the proposed quality assurance system for the draft and final versions of the evaluation report. The main purpose of this checklist is to ensure that the evaluation report complies with evaluation professional standards.

The UNFPA evaluation manager, with the support of the evaluation reference group, will provide a second level of quality assurance.

The inception report and the draft final report will be subject to a third level of quality assurance, through a review by the EO external quality assurance panel.

The Director of the Evaluation Office maintains an oversight of the final evaluation report.

Finally, the final evaluation report will be subject to assessment by an independent evaluation quality assessment provider using an evaluation quality assessment grid (see annex 2). The evaluation quality assessment grid will be published along with the evaluation report on the Evaluation Office website.

5. Required Profiles

The evaluations will be carried out by multi-disciplinary teams that will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the UNFPA programmes or interventions during the period under review, nor will they have other conflict of interest or bias on the subject.

Bidders are encouraged to present an offer with partners from both the global south and the global north. However, from a contractual perspective, the LTA will be awarded and signed with a single entity which will bear the full responsibility for delivering the services under the LTA.

For each evaluation, the **core team** is expected to be composed of three to four evaluators, including the team leader. Collectively, the team should possess the following competencies:

-) Extensive experience (as defined further down) in conducting complex global thematic/programmatic evaluations for international development organizations with a specific focus on subject pertaining to UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021 – Outcome 1;
-) Experience of ensuring a human rights based approach as demonstrated by previous assignments;
-) Demonstrable knowledge of evaluation methodology and mix-method approaches;
-) Demonstrable ability to interact with a wide range of stakeholders on issues that are quite sensitive and understanding of ethical issues and approaches to informed consent with regards to collecting information;
-) Good understanding of UNFPA mandate and processes as demonstrated in the technical proposal;
-) Good knowledge of the UN system, including reform processes, and UN programming at the country level, will bring additional points. Such knowledge should be demonstrated in the technical proposal;
-) Demonstrable regional expertise and knowledge of the regional issues, as relevant for the evaluation considered, based on previous work experience;
-) Demonstrable analytical, communication and drafting skills in English, as evidenced by previous work experience;
-) Good communication skills (written, spoken) in languages spoken in the region and countries covered, as demonstrated by previous work experience, will bring additional points.

The above collective expertise and experience will be assessed using the profile requirements listed below. Further evaluation will be done during the secondary bidding where further details on local experts profiles will be provided.

The evaluation team will be composed of one or several of the following profiles, with associated qualifications, skills and competencies:

The **team leader** must hold an advanced degree in public health, social sciences or related fields, with at least ten (10) years of experience working in health and development and eight (8) years of evaluation experience, including experience of leading at least four (4) evaluations of a size, complexity and character similar to the above-mentioned evaluations of UNFPA support to family planning (2008-2013) and the joint UNFPA-UNICEF evaluation of the H4+ joint programme Canada-Sweden (Sida) (2011-2016),² as well as technical expertise in areas related to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights. His/her primary responsibilities will be:

-) guiding and managing the team throughout the evaluation phases
-) setting out the methodological approach
-) leading the first (pilot) field mission
-) reviewing and consolidating the team members' inputs to ensure quality and timeliness of the evaluation deliverables
-) liaising with the UNFPA Evaluation Office and representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders
-) delivering the inception reports, and evaluation report (including the country case study reports) in line with the requested outlines and quality standards

The **evaluators** will bring together a complementary and balanced combination of the necessary technical expertise in the thematic areas directly relevant to the evaluations falling under the outcome 1 of UNFPA Strategic Plan 2018-2021. These include: family planning; sexual and reproductive health and rights; maternal health; health systems of developing countries and humanitarian settings; health logistics management and procurement as well as expertise in gender and human rights. The team members should hold an advanced degree in public health, social sciences or related fields and have at least eight (8) years of individual experience in their respective areas of technical expertise. They must also have at least five (5) years of experience in applying evaluation methods in their respective areas of expertise. Evaluators must possess demonstrable analytical and writing/drafting skills in English, as evidenced by previous work experience. Fluency in French or Spanish will bring additional points. Bidders should provide work samples written by each proposed evaluator as an annex to the technical proposal. The primary responsibilities of team members will be to:

-) contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology
-) undertake in-depth documentary review

² The evaluation reports are available on the Evaluation Office webpage at: <http://www.unfpa.org/evaluation>

-)] conduct field work to generate additional evidence from field visits and consultations of a wide range of stakeholders
-)] participate in team meetings, including with stakeholders
-)] prepare inputs and make contributions to the evaluation deliverables

Data analyst(s)/researcher(s), capable of organizing and analyzing large sets of data in support of the rest of the evaluation team. The data analyst(s)/researcher(s) should have at least 5 years of experience in the field of data analysis and/or research.

Organization and logistics assistant, capable of providing administrative and logistical support to the rest of the evaluation team.

Local experts will complement the evaluation team. Required qualifications, skills and competencies are:

-)] Knowledge of national/regional/local context as required by each evaluation;
-)] Technical knowledge in related thematic area as required by each evaluation;
-)] Demonstrable analytical skills in English. Bidder should provide work samples as an annex to the technical proposal;
-)] Fluency in the local languages (past work experience in local languages);
-)] Administrative and logistical experience.

The primary responsibilities of the local experts are to:

-)] Support the core team on the preparation, conduct of the field missions as well as corresponding reporting;
-)] Contribute to various tasks related to the evaluation, which may include: desk review, stakeholder mapping, mission planning, including the mission agenda preparation, conduct interviews and interview/group discussions, draft interview logbooks, and prepare country evidence tables.

Interpretation services to local languages that are not UN languages may be required. Such requirements will be specified at the secondary bidding stage. The LTA holder will be expected to arrange and pay for such services. The cost of local-language interpretation is not included in this RFP, but will be included in secondary bidding.

6. Travel and Security Arrangements

Please refer to the Special Conditions of Contract section in the RFP document.

ANNEXES FOLLOW

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Quality Assurance of the Evaluation Report

Organizational unit:

Year of report:

Title of evaluation report:

Overall quality of report:

Good

Date of assessment:

Overall comments:

[insert text]

Assessment Levels

Very good:

strong, above average, best practice

Good:

satisfactory, respectable

Fair:

with some weaknesses, still acceptable

Unsatisfactory:

weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>		
I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>		Comment:	
1. Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?	<Select one>		
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	<Select one>		
3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	<Select one>		
4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process?	<Select one>		
<i>Executive summary</i>			
5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?	<Select one>		
6. 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)?	<Select one>		
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	<Select one>		

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		Comment:	
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	<Select one>		
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	<Select one>		
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	<Select one>		
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
4. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	<Select one>		
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	<Select one>		
6. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	<Select one>		
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	<Select one>		
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	<Select one>		
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	<Select one>		
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	<Select one>		
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for	Yes		

assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?		
--	--	--

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		Comment:	
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	<Select one>		
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	<Select one>		
3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?	<Select one>		
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	<Select one>		

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		Comment:	
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	<Select one>		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	<Select one>		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	<Select one>		
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	<Select one>		
5. Are cause and effect links between an	<Select		

intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	one>	
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	<Select one>	
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	<Select one>	
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	<Select one>	

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		Comment:	
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	<Select one>		
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated?	<Select one>		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	<Select one>		

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		Comment:	
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	<Select one>		
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	<Select one>		

3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	<Select one>	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	<Select one>	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	<Select one>	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Undefined
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		Comment:	
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	<Select one>		
2. Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved?	<Select one>		
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	<Select one>		
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<Select one>		

(*) 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 totalling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.

1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.

2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.

3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

	Assessment Levels (*)			
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)				
2. Design and methodology (13)				
3. Reliability of data (11)				
4. Analysis and findings (40)				
5. Conclusions (11)				
6. Recommendations (11)				
7. Integration of gender (7)				
Total scoring points				
Overall assessment level of evaluation report				
	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 'Analysis and findings' 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.

Annex 2. Evaluation Quality Assessment Check-list

1. Structure and Clarity of the Report To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.
2. Executive Summary To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section including key elements of the evaluation, such as objectives, methodology and conclusions and recommendations.
3. Design and Methodology To provide a clear explanation of the methods and tools used including the rationale for the methodological choice justified. To ensure constraints and limitations are made explicit (including limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations; robustness of data sources, etc.)
4. Reliability of Data To ensure sources of data are clearly stated for both primary and secondary data. To provide explanation on the credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit.
5. Findings and Analysis To ensure sound analysis and credible evidence-based findings. To ensure 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.
6. Validity of conclusions To ensure conclusions are based on credible findings and convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. Ensure conclusions are prioritised and clustered and include: summary; origin (which evaluation question(s) the conclusion is based on); detailed conclusion.
7. Usefulness and clarity of recommendations To ensure recommendations flow logically from conclusions; are targeted, realistic and operationally-feasible; and are presented in priority order. Recommendations include: Summary; Priority level (very high/high/medium); Target (administrative unit(s) to which the recommendation is addressed); Origin (which conclusion(s) the recommendation is based on); Operational implications.
8. SWAP - Gender To ensure the evaluation approach is aligned with the SWAP.