



**Executive Board of the  
United Nations Development  
Programme, the United Nations  
Population Fund and the United  
Nations Office for Project Services**

**Distr.: General**  
26 November 2013

Original: English

**First regular :**

27 to 31 January 2014, New York

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

**UNFPA – Evaluation**

**UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND**

**Transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015**

*Summary*

The UNFPA transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015, is aligned with the revised UNFPA evaluation policy that the Executive Board approved in decision 2013/21, and with paragraphs 174 and 175 of General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system. The proposed evaluation plan for the 2014-2015 biennium encompasses both corporate evaluations, which include thematic and independent country programme evaluations, and programme-level evaluations. The evaluation plan also presents the resources allocated to evaluation that are incorporated in the UNFPA integrated budget estimates, 2014-2017 (DP/FPA/2013/14), which the Executive Board approved in decision 2013/32 at its second regular session 2013.

The transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan presents the approach to the planning and coverage of evaluations for 2014-2015. The elements of this approach include selection criteria, the process undertaken in developing the evaluation plan, and the coverage of outcomes of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013, so as to inform the midterm review of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2014-2017. Together, these elements constitute an evaluation package that will: (a) demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance achieved regarding development results; (b) support evidence-based decision-making; and (c) contribute important lessons learned to accelerate the implementation of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and determine how UNFPA can best support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

*Elements of a decision*

The Executive Board may wish to: (a) take note of the UNFPA transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015 (DP/FPA/2014/2); (b) acknowledge the transparent and participatory consultative process undertaken by UNFPA in developing the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015; (c) approve the UNFPA transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015, as contained in document DP/FPA/2014/2, including its approach; the proposed corporate evaluations, as set out in annex 1; and the proposed programme-level evaluations, as set out in annex 2; and (d) take note of the topics for consideration in the evaluation plan, 2016-2017, as set out in annex 3.



## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Background and purpose of the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015 .....	3
II. Approach to planning and coverage .....	3
A. Principles.....	3
B. Selection criteria.....	4
C. Process .....	4
D. Coverage .....	4
III. Corporate evaluations.....	5
A. Proposed thematic evaluations .....	8
B. Proposed independent country programme evaluations .....	10
IV. Programme-level evaluations .....	10
V. Expected budget.....	12
VI. Elements of a decision .....	14
 Annex 2. Proposed programme-level evaluations.....	 15
 Annex 3. Topics for consideration in the evaluation plan, 2016-2017.....	 20

## **I. Background and purpose of the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015**

1. In line with the revised UNFPA evaluation policy (DP/FPA/2013/5), evaluation at UNFPA serves three main purposes:

(a) It is a means to demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance achieved;

(b) It supports evidence-based decision-making;

(c) It contributes important lessons learned to the knowledge base of the organization.

2. As defined in the revised UNFPA evaluation policy, evaluations fall into two categories:

(a) Corporate evaluations: Corporate evaluations are independent exercises undertaken or commissioned by the Evaluation Office in order to assess issues that contribute to achieving the goals of the UNFPA strategic plan with regard to development effectiveness and organizational performance;

(b) Programme-level evaluations: Programme-level evaluations are managed by the business units in charge of the concerned programmes; independent external evaluators pre-qualified by the Evaluation Office conduct programme-level evaluations according to terms of reference approved by the Evaluation Office.

3. The transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan is in accordance with paragraph 37 of the revised UNFPA evaluation policy approved by the Executive Board in decision 2013/21, and is aligned with paragraphs 174 and 175 of General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system. The purpose of the transitional evaluation plan is to present the proposed evaluations for the 2014-2015 biennium.

## **II. Approach to planning and coverage**

### **A. Principles**

4. The following principles have guided the elaboration of the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015:

(a) The plan is based on the priority criteria put forward in paragraph 14 of the revised evaluation policy;

(b) The plan ensures a reasonable and geographically balanced coverage of UNFPA interventions;

(c) The Evaluation Office developed the plan through a consultative process.

5. In addition, the Evaluation Office considered the capacity of UNFPA to absorb evaluation results and to implement the recommendations made.

## **B. Selection criteria**

6. All selection criteria, in the order of priority established in the policy, guided the selection of corporate and programme-level evaluations. With regard to corporate evaluations, the Evaluation Office placed emphasis on: (a) strategic relevance; (b) risk associated with the subject; and (c) potential for replication and scaling up. With regard to programme-level evaluations, emphasis was placed on the feasibility of implementing the evaluations.

## **C. Process**

7. The process of developing the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015, involved consultations with relevant organizational business units. With regard to corporate evaluations, the Evaluation Office conducted consultations at headquarters level, and with other United Nations organizations in order to identify possible joint evaluations. The selection of proposed programme-level evaluations is the result of consultations with the six UNFPA regional offices. The UNFPA Executive Committee also provided input for the draft transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan.

## **D. Coverage**

8. The transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015, completes the review of the outcomes of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013, in order to inform the midterm review of the strategic plan, 2014-2017. The evaluation plan also takes into account the principles and cross-cutting issues of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013: (a) national ownership; (b) national capacity development; (c) adolescents and youth; (d) gender equality and women's empowerment; (e) human rights; and (f) South-South cooperation. Evaluations will focus on outcomes; they will not assess impact, which would require a longer evaluation timeframe and the participation of other development partners.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Outcomes are defined as the short-term and medium-term effects of interventions; impact is defined as the longer-term, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, consequences of outcomes. The definitions stem from the Development Assistance Committee, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

9. Corporate evaluations (which provide thematic coverage) seek to address organization-wide issues; in particular, they address the outcomes of the UNFPA strategic plan and are responsive to human rights and gender-equality.

10. In the case of programme-level evaluations (which provide geographical coverage), emphasis was placed on considering the results of country and regional programmes. Reasonable evaluation coverage for the period 2014-2017 was set at 50 per cent of those country programmes whose end-of-programme cycle falls during the period 2014-2017. Relevant project managers undertake evaluations at the project level and are not included in the scope of the revised evaluation policy; hence they are excluded from the present transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan.

11. With regard to evaluations of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) or of the “Delivering as one” programmes at country level, United Nations country teams initiate such evaluations. These evaluations employ a different funding mechanism and receive guidance from the United Nations Development Group, in particular from the Development Operations Coordination Office. Countries where a “Delivering as one” or an UNDAF evaluation is known to take place are included in the list of programme-level evaluations in the present document; however, budgeted expenses are not indicated, since they are not known at this time. With regard to such evaluations, the Evaluation Office will continue to participate in the relevant subgroups of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

### III. Corporate evaluations

12. The Evaluation Office evaluated the following outcomes of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013, in part or in total during the period, 2011-2013:<sup>2</sup>

(a) Outcome 2: Increased access to and utilization of quality maternal and newborn health services;

(b) Outcome 3: Increased access to and utilization of quality family planning services for individuals and couples according to reproductive intentions; (the role of family planning in improving maternal health was assessed as part of the thematic evaluation of UNFPA support to maternal health, concluded in 2012);

(c) Outcome 4: Increased access to and utilization of quality HIV- and sexually transmitted infection- prevention services, especially for young people (including adolescents) and other key populations at risk;

---

<sup>2</sup>These evaluations include UNFPA support to maternal health (2000-2011) and the midterm evaluation of the maternal health thematic fund (2008-2011); the joint evaluation by UNFPA and UNICEF, of the UNFPA-UNICEF joint programme on female genital mutilation/cutting: accelerating change (2008-2013); and one ongoing joint evaluation (see footnote 3).

(d) Outcome 5: Gender equality and reproductive rights advanced, particularly through advocacy and the implementation of laws and policy;

(e) Outcome 6: Improved access to sexual and reproductive health services and sexuality education for young people (including adolescents).

13. For the 2014-2015 biennium, the proposed corporate evaluations will address the following outcomes of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013:

(a) Outcome 1: Population dynamics and its interlinkages with the needs of young people (including adolescents), sexual and reproductive health (including family planning), gender equality and poverty reduction addressed in national and sectoral development plans and strategies;

(b) Outcome 3: Increased access to and utilization of quality family planning services for individuals and couples according to reproductive intentions;

(c) Outcome 4: Increased access to and utilization of quality HIV- and sexually transmitted infection-prevention services, especially for young people (including adolescents) and other key populations at risk;

(d) Outcome 6: Improved access to sexual and reproductive health services and sexuality education for young people (including adolescents);

(e) Outcome 7: Improved data availability and analysis around population dynamics, sexual and reproductive health (including family planning), and gender equality.

14. The corporate evaluations proposed for 2014-2015 combine three thematic evaluations with two independent country programme evaluations. The Evaluation Office conducted an analysis of the potential for joint evaluations with other United Nations organizations and partners in 2014-2015, in addition to those completed or under way<sup>3</sup>.

15. For the period 2014-2015, the Evaluation Office will undertake the proposed corporate evaluations, especially the thematic ones, in phases. The timing will be based on discussions with senior management, the relevant business units and

---

<sup>3</sup>The joint evaluation of the UNFPA-UNICEF joint programme on female genital mutilation/cutting: accelerating change (2008-2013), by UNFPA and UNICEF, was completed in October 2013. The joint evaluation of joint gender programmes in the United Nations system (2006-2013) by the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), UNFPA, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Millennium Development Goal Fund, the United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office, the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation, and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, is ongoing.

stakeholders. Preliminary information on the scope of the planned corporate evaluations is provided in sections A and B, below.

## **A. Proposed thematic evaluations**

### **Evaluation of UNFPA support to the availability of quality family planning services, 2008-2014**

16. The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of UNFPA support to scale up the availability of family planning services and to increase the demand for the utilization of family planning services as part of sexual and reproductive health services. The evaluation will assess the UNFPA contribution to anchoring family planning in the sexual and reproductive health policy frameworks of programme countries and to developing national capacities to manage commodity procurement and distribution. It will also assess UNFPA use of community-based distribution to open alternative channels for those population groups with limited access to public health systems.

17. The evaluation will include a detailed analysis of sexual and reproductive health policies, strategies (including the UNFPA family planning strategy, 2012-2020), and programmes that have made family planning one of the key components of sexual and reproductive health and one of the three pillars of support to reduce maternal mortality and morbidity. It will assess the extent to which the mix of family planning policies, advocacy and communication, client education and rights-based quality service delivery, and their integration into comprehensive sexual and reproductive health services, have contributed to expected results. It will also assess coordination mechanisms, the division of labour among, and partnerships with, other actors in the field of family planning within the context of sexual and reproductive health.

18. The evaluation will focus primarily on outcome 3 of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013. The new UNFPA strategic plan, 2014-2017, will also inform the evaluation. The evaluation will address overall UNFPA support to family planning, i.e., regular resources, co-financing and thematic funds, notably the global programme to enhance reproductive health commodity security. The evaluation will focus on the period 2008-2014, and will extract lessons learned and provide a set of recommendations to inform UNFPA senior management of the implementation of the UNFPA family planning strategy, 2012-2020.

19. The Evaluation Office will launch the evaluation in 2015, with an estimated budget of \$550,000.

### **Evaluation of UNFPA support to adolescents and youth, 2008-2013**

20. The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the UNFPA contribution to the access and utilization of sexual and reproductive health services, including family planning, sexuality education, and prevention services for HIV and sexually transmitted infections, for adolescents and young people. The evaluation will also assess: (a) the UNFPA contribution to strengthening national capacity to incorporate the needs of

young people into population dynamics and its interlinkages; and (b) the support provided to young people to participate in policy dialogue and programming.

21. The evaluation will encompass, inter alia, a detailed analysis of UNFPA policies, strategies and programmes to integrate adolescent, youth issues and population dynamics into UNFPA interventions, in order to ensure that all UNFPA programmes reach adolescents and young people, especially those who are the most marginalized, as well as to ensure the establishment, by all relevant partners, of institutional mechanisms for youth participation at global, regional, national and local levels. It will assess coordination mechanisms, the division of labour among, and partnerships with, other actors in providing support to adolescents and youth within the context of sexual and reproductive health.

22. The evaluation will cover outcomes 1, 4 and 6 of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013. It will take into account the “four keys” of the UNFPA framework for action on adolescents and youth as well as the priority area on young people in the outcome framework, 2009-2011, of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).

23. The evaluation will focus on the period 2008-2013. It will extract lessons learned and provide a set of forward-looking recommendations to inform UNFPA senior management of the implementation of the adolescent and youth strategy, 2012-2020.

24. The Evaluation Office will launch the evaluation in 2014. The evaluation has an estimated budget of \$450,000.

### **Evaluation of UNFPA support to data availability to inform decision-making and policy formulation, 2008-2013**

25. UNFPA supported the conduct of population and housing censuses by strengthening processes and enhancing the national capacity to generate, produce, analyse, utilize and disseminate high-quality statistical data. This support represents a key component of UNFPA interventions at country level, and accounts for a significant proportion of resources within the population and development programmatic area. The majority of censuses fall under the 2010 round of population and housing censuses (2005-2014), and were conducted between 2008 and 2013.

26. The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of UNFPA support to data availability on population dynamics, reproductive health, youth, and gender equality issues, in order to inform decision-making and policy formulation. The evaluation will assess the extent to which data that is generated is disseminated and used to prepare policies, development plans and programmes, and to monitor and evaluate them. Where relevant, the evaluation will assess strengthening the capacity of national statistical offices. The evaluation will also assess the results of UNFPA support to data availability on population dynamics at global, regional and country levels, and will focus primarily on outcome 7 of the UNFPA strategic plan, 2008-2013.

27. The evaluation will cover the period 2008-2013. It will examine the achievements and constraints in this important programmatic area, formulate conclusions, extract lessons learned and propose actionable recommendations.

28. The Evaluation Office will launch the evaluation in 2014. The evaluation has an estimated budget of \$450,000.

## **B. Proposed independent country programme evaluations**

29. The Evaluation Office will continue to conduct independent evaluations of country programmes for accountability and learning purposes. Independent country programme evaluations are a way to provide the Executive Board, the UNFPA Executive Director and UNFPA management, as well as the principal stakeholders, with reliable information on UNFPA interventions at the country level. Furthermore, the conduct of country programme evaluations will enable the Evaluation Office to further develop evaluation methods, tools and guidance, in order to ensure their usefulness and technical adequacy in serving the needs of evaluation managers in UNFPA country and regional offices.

30. During the 2014-2015 biennium, the Evaluation Office will undertake country programme evaluations in the two regions that it has not covered thus far: Asia and the Pacific; and Eastern Europe and Central Asia.<sup>4</sup>

31. The estimated budget for the two country programme evaluations is \$100,000 per evaluation. The relevant country programme budget will cover a portion of the costs of the evaluation. The Evaluation Office will provide supplementary funding.

## **IV. Programme-level evaluations**

32. Programme-level evaluations seek to inform the development of the subsequent programme. They are conducted by external evaluators and managed by the business units responsible for the programmes being assessed, as indicated in paragraph 13 (a) of the revised evaluation policy (DP/FPA/2013/5). Both country programmes and thematic programmes of regional relevance were considered in the analysis.

33. As per paragraph 13(a) of the revised evaluation policy, country programme evaluations will be conducted at least once in every two programme cycles. Since this is the first evaluation plan under the revised evaluation policy, all country programmes for which the end-of-programme cycle falls during the period

---

<sup>4</sup>Independent country programme evaluations were conducted in the following regions between 2011 and 2013: Latin America and Caribbean (Plurinational State of Bolivia); West and Central Africa (Cameroon); East and Southern Africa (Madagascar); and Arab States (Lebanon). The evaluation for Lebanon is under way.

2014-2015 were included in the analysis. Therefore, the evaluations included in the proposed list cover only one programme cycle.

34. The Evaluation Office considered all selection criteria, in the order of priority established in the revised UNFPA evaluation policy, in its analysis, with feasibility being a key factor in selecting programme-level evaluations. Whether the conditions necessary to achieve good-quality evaluations were in place is the responsibility of individual business units. The conditions refer to:

(a) Timeliness: (i) in ensuring that a critical mass of results have already materialized in the field and can contribute to data collection by the evaluators; and (ii) in completing the evaluation within a time frame that allows it to meet the needs of the main users at the most appropriate time;

(b) Evaluability, which depends on: (i) the soundness of the results framework; and (ii) the existence of a results-oriented monitoring system;

(c) The existence of skilled staff to manage the evaluation;

(d) The availability of adequate financial resources.

35. It is anticipated that, during the 2014-2015 biennium, 36 programme-level evaluations in all six UNFPA geographical regions will be conducted.

**Table 1 - Proposed programme-level evaluations for the biennium, 2014-2015**

Regions	Country programme evaluations		
	2014	2015	Total, by region
Africa (East and Southern)	2	2	4
Africa (West and Central)	1	3	4
Arab States	2	2	4
Asia and the Pacific	6	3	9
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	5	0	5
Latin America and the Caribbean	4	5	9
<b>Total country programme evaluations</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>35</b>
Regional programme	-	1	1
<b>Grand total per</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>36</b>

year			
------	--	--	--

36. With regard to financial resources, the cost of a country programme evaluation conducted at decentralized levels reflects: (a) the complexity of the programme; (b) the related volume of activities; and (c) the overall programme budget (regular and other resources). The Evaluation Office estimates that the budget allocated to a country programme-level evaluation should be no less than \$70,000, as there are fixed costs in undertaking an evaluation that depend on the number of consultant days or the number of deliverables (such as designing the report, drafting it and finalizing it).

37. During the period 2014-2015, the Evaluation Office will continue its support to programme-level evaluations and the business units that manage them, through its three-tiered quality-enhancement process. That process consists of: (a) providing methodological guidance on how to design and conduct a country programme evaluation at UNFPA; (b) designing and managing training sessions on country programme evaluation methodology, in order to develop the evaluation capacity of UNFPA country offices and of national counterparts; and (c) the Evaluation Office undertaking selected independent country programme evaluations, in collaboration with the concerned country offices. In line with the revised UNFPA evaluation policy, the Evaluation Office will be responsible for the quality-assurance system of programme-level evaluations. It will also disseminate and share knowledge generated by all evaluations, through UNFPA knowledge-management networks and practices.

## V. Expected budget

38. The preparation of the UNFPA integrated budget estimates, 2014-2017, pre-empted the preparation of the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015. The cost of the proposed corporate evaluations fall within the estimated resources included in the UNFPA integrated budget estimates, 2014-2017, with some funding provided by the two country programmes that the Evaluation Office will independently evaluate. The overview is provided in Table 2 below. More details are included in annex 1.

**Table 2 – Cost overview of corporate evaluations, 2014-2015**

Evaluations	Starting year	Estimated budget
Evaluation of UNFPA support to the availability of quality family planning services, 2008-2014	2015	\$550,000
Evaluation of UNFPA support to adolescents and youth, 2008-2013	2014	\$450,000
Evaluation of UNFPA support to data availability to inform decision making and policy formulation, 2008-2013	2014	\$450,000

Evaluations	Starting year	Estimated budget
<b>Total - thematic evaluations</b>		<b>\$1,450,000</b>
Turkey country programme evaluation (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)	2014	\$100,000
Bangladesh country programme evaluation (Asia and the Pacific)	2015	\$100,000
<b>Total – independent evaluations of country programmes</b>		<b>\$200,000</b>
<b>Grand total - budget</b>		<b>\$1,650,000</b>

39. The cost of programme-level evaluations is borne by the country programmes themselves. Details by country are included in annex 2; the overview of costs is shown in table 3.

**Table 3 - Overview of costs of programme-level evaluations**

Regions	Country programme allocation
Africa (East and Southern)	\$295,000
Africa (West and Central)	\$310,000
Arab States	\$275,000
Asia and the Pacific	\$715,000
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	\$245,000
Latin America and the Caribbean	\$630,000
<b>Total – country-level programme evaluations</b>	<b>\$2,470,000</b>
Regional programme-level evaluation	\$80,000
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>\$2,550,000</b>

40. Table 4 below provides an estimate of the overall cost of the evaluation function at UNFPA. It apportions the amount for the Evaluation Office included in the integrated budget estimates, 2014-2017, approved by the Executive Board in decision 2013/32. The cost of the monitoring and evaluation advisers at the regional level, as well as the monitoring and evaluation country focal points or advisers at the country level, is excluded from the estimates below.

**Table 4 - Overview of the estimated budget, 2014-2015, of the evaluation function**

Type of evaluation	Estimated budget, 2014-2015
Evaluation Office costs (staff and miscellaneous costs) <sup>a</sup>	\$2,911,000
Corporate-level evaluations	\$1,650,000
Programme-level evaluations	\$2,550,000
<b>Estimated budget of the evaluation function, 2014-2015</b>	<b>\$7,111,000</b>

<sup>a</sup> Figures are rounded to the nearest thousand.

41. The estimated budget of the evaluation function, 2014-2015, as shown in table 4, represents 0.4 per cent of the programmatic estimated budget for both regular and other resources, apportioning for 2014-2015 the integrated budget estimates, 2014-2017. The ratio amounts to 1.0 per cent when considering regular resources only.

42. The implementation of the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015, may be adversely impacted if funds are unavailable or curtailed, or if there are unforeseen staff movements.

43. The Evaluation Office will incorporate the lessons learned from implementing this plan, including the level of resources in relation to the expected results, into the preparation of the next evaluation plan for consideration by the Executive Board in 2015.

## **VI. Elements of a decision**

**44. The Executive Board may wish to:**

**(a) Take note of the UNFPA transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015 (DP/FPA/2014/2);**

**(b) Acknowledge the transparent and participatory consultative process undertaken by UNFPA in developing the transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015;**

**(c) Approve the UNFPA transitional biennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2014-2015, as contained in document DP/FPA/2014/2, including its approach; the proposed corporate evaluations, as set out in annex 1; and the proposed programme-level evaluations, as set out in annex 2;**

**(d) Take note of the topics for consideration in the evaluation plan, 2016-2017, as set out in annex 3.**

## Annex 1. Proposed corporate evaluations

Evaluations	Starting date	Estimated budget
Evaluation of UNFPA support to data availability to inform decision making and policy formulation, 2008-2013	First quarter 2014	\$450,000
Evaluation of UNFPA support to adolescents and youth, 2008-2013	First quarter 2014	\$450,000
Evaluation of UNFPA support to the availability of quality family planning services, 2008-2014	Second quarter 2015	\$550,000
<b>Total - thematic evaluations</b>		<b>\$1,450,000</b>
Turkey country programme evaluation (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)	First quarter 2014	\$100,000
Bangladesh country programme evaluation (Asia and the Pacific)	First quarter 2015	\$100,000
<b>Total – independent evaluations of country programmes</b>	-	<b>\$200,000</b>
<b>Grand total – budget</b>	-	<b>\$1,650,000</b>

### Independent country programme evaluations

Country programme evaluation	Estimated budget	Year	Evaluation staff available in country office	Country programme budget (regular and other resources) <sup>a</sup>	Country programme programmatic areas	Total number of outputs in the country programme
Turkey, 2010-2015	\$100,000 <sup>b</sup>	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$8,900,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
Bangladesh, 2012-2016	\$100,000 <sup>c</sup>	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$70,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>					

<sup>a</sup>Source: country programme documents.

<sup>b</sup> Of the \$100,000, the country programme will fund \$40,000, and the Evaluation Office will fund \$60,000. Figures are indicative.

<sup>c</sup>Of the \$100,000, the country programme will fund \$80,000, and the Evaluation Office will fund \$20,000. Figures are indicative.

## Annex 2. Proposed programme-level evaluations

Country programme evaluation	Estimated budget	Year	Evaluation staff available in country office	Country programme budget (regular and other resources) <sup>a</sup>	Country programme programmatic areas	Total number of outputs in the country programme
<b>Africa (East and Southern) region</b>						
Angola, 2009-2013	\$100,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$30,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	8
Swaziland, 2011-2015	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$9,100,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
Burundi, 2010-2014	\$80,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$16,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Botswana, 2010-2014	\$45,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$13,600,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
Zimbabwe, 2012-2015 <sup>b</sup>	UNDAF evaluation (no country programme evaluation)					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$295,000</b>			<b>\$69,200,000</b>	<b>0.4%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	
<b>Africa (West and Central) region</b>						
Burkina Faso, 2011-2015	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$31,700,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Cape Verde, 2012 -2016	“Delivering as one” evaluation (no country programme evaluation)					
Chad, 2012-2016	\$90,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$22,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	10
Ghana, 2012-2016	“Delivering as one” evaluation (no country programme evaluation)					
Mauritania, 2012-2016	\$80,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$16,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	8
Senegal, 2012-2016	\$70,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$19,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6

Country programme evaluation	Estimated budget	Year	Evaluation staff available in country office	Country programme budget (regular and other resources) <sup>a</sup>	Country programme programmatic areas	Total number of outputs in the country programme
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$310,000</b>			<b>\$89,700,000</b>	<b>0.3%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	
<b>Arab States region</b>						
Somalia, 2011-2015	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$27,200,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	5
Yemen, 2012-2015	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$25,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Morocco, 2012-2016	\$65,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$14,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	5
Sudan (the), 2013-2016	\$70,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$91,000,000	Population dynamics, maternal and newborn health, family planning, gender equality, and data availability and analysis	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$275,000</b>			<b>\$157,200,000</b>	<b>0.2%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	
<b>Asia and the Pacific region</b>						
N.B. The Evaluation Office will conduct an independent evaluation of the Bangladesh country programme as part of its 2015 workplan.						
China, 2011-2015	\$75,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$22,000,000	Reproductive health and population dynamics	11
Cambodia, 2011-2015	\$120,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$24,200,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	13
Democratic People's Republic of Korea (the), 2011-2015	\$60,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$9,700,000	Reproductive health and population dynamics	4
Indonesia, 2011-2015	\$80,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$29,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	3

Country programme evaluation	Estimated budget	Year	Evaluation staff available in country office	Country programme budget (regular and other resources) <sup>a</sup>	Country programme programmatic areas	Total number of outputs in the country programme
Lao People's Democratic Republic (the), 2012-2015	\$80,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$22,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Maldives , 2011-2015	\$65,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$2,750,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
Iran (Islamic Republic of), 2012-2016	\$80,000	2014 /2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$10,700,000	Reproductive health and population dynamics	5
Myanmar, 2012-2015	\$85,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$29,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	4
Thailand, 2012-2016	\$70,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$11,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$715,000</b>			<b>\$161,850,000</b>	<b>0.4%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	
<b>Eastern Europe and Central Asia region</b>						
N.B. The Evaluation Office will conduct the independent evaluation of the Turkey country programme as part of its 2014 workplan.						
Armenia, 2010-2015	\$40,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$4,800,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Azerbaijan, 2011-2015	\$40,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$6,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	8
Tajikistan, 2010-2015 <sup>c</sup>	\$55,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$8,900,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
Turkmenistan, 2010-2015 <sup>c</sup>	\$40,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$6,200,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Uzbekistan, 2010-2015 <sup>c</sup>	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$8,900,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$245,000</b>			<b>\$34,800,000</b>	<b>0.7%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean region</b>						

Country programme evaluation	Estimated budget	Year	Evaluation staff available in country office	Country programme budget (regular and other resources) <sup>a</sup>	Country programme programmatic areas	Total number of outputs in the country programme
Brazil, 2012-2015	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$13,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and South-South cooperation	7
El Salvador, 2012-2015	\$70,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$6,400,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Panama, 2012-2015	\$50,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$4,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	6
Uruguay, 2011-2015	\$40,000	2014	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$9,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Dominican Republic (the), 2012-2016	\$50,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$10,300,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	5
Haiti, 2013-2016	\$100,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$26,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	9
Honduras, 2012-2016	\$80,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$18,000,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	7
Multi-country programme for the English and Dutch speaking countries, 2012-2016	\$100,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation officer	\$17,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	8
Peru, 2012-2016	\$70,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation focal point	\$14,500,000	Reproductive health, population dynamics and gender equality	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$630,000</b>			<b>\$119,200,000</b>	<b>0.5%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>\$2,470,000</b>			<b>\$631,950,000</b>	<b>0.4%</b> (Evaluation budget as a percentage of the country programme budget)	

<sup>a</sup> Source: country programme documents.

<sup>b</sup>The Zimbabwe country office conducted a midterm programme review in 2013. The Government requested that no individual agency evaluations be conducted. An UNDAF evaluation will be undertaken.

<sup>c</sup> The country programme evaluations of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan will be conducted using a modality that allows for maximizing evaluation resources (e.g., consultants) to reach a maximum-scale effect.

<b>Regional programme evaluation</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Evaluation staff</b>	<b>Objectives of the evaluation</b>	<b>Scope of the evaluation</b>
Thematic evaluation of UNFPA support to strengthening family planning commodity security in the countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, 2008-2014	\$80,000	2015	Monitoring and evaluation regional adviser	Assess the extent to which regional programme support for Eastern Europe and Central Asia has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable in contributing to the improvement of family planning commodity security in the region; identify key lessons learned in order to improve the next programming cycle	The evaluation will cover all programmatic interventions directly relevant to commodity security within the UNFPA mandate

### **Annex 3. Topics for consideration in the evaluation plan, 2016-2017**

#### **Evaluation of the contribution of regionalization to UNFPA corporate and development results, 2009-2014**

1. The proposed evaluation will provide a systematic and independent analysis of the extent to which regionalization has contributed to the achievement of UNFPA objectives as stated in its strategic plans, 2008-2013 and 2014-2017, and relevant programming frameworks. It will assess new UNFPA institutional and working arrangements among headquarters, regional and country offices, in order to achieve corporate and development results.
2. UNFPA has strengthened its regional presence through the creation of six regional offices located in Bangkok, Thailand; Cairo, Egypt; Dakar, Senegal; Istanbul, Turkey; Johannesburg, South Africa; and Panama City, Panama. UNFPA created the regional offices in order to become a stronger field-focused organization and to provide country offices with more technical support in the areas identified in the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development, as well as to develop stronger South-South cooperation. This strategic decision has not yet been the subject of an in-depth independent evaluation.
3. The evaluation will take place after UNFPA has had sufficient time to learn from the business model associated with its strategic plan, 2014-2017, and to reaffirm its regional presence, including the establishment, in 2013, of the regional office for West and Central Africa, in Dakar.
4. The Evaluation Office will launch the evaluation in 2016, to inform the preparation of the strategic plan, 2018-2022.
5. The estimated budget for this evaluation is \$550,000.

#### **Evaluation of the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security, 2013-2020**

6. The programme document of the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security (Phase II) requires that an independent assessment at the midterm point of programme implementation be undertaken, as well as a final evaluation.
  7. The Evaluation Office proposes to undertake the midterm evaluation of the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security (Phase II) in 2016.
-