2nd Draft: Inception Report:

Final Evaluation of UNDP’s Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Youth Co:Lab)

Submitted by:

Dana Peebles

Kartini International

Mar. 17, 2022

dana.peebles@kartiniconsulting.com

194 MacNab Street North

Hamilton, ON Canada

L8R 2M4

On the traditional territories of the:

Erie, Neutral, Huron-Wendat, Haudenosaunee and Mississaugas

Covered by the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant

## Table of Contents

[Table of Contents ii](#_Toc98420895)

[List of Acronyms iv](#_Toc98420896)

[List of Tables and Figures v](#_Toc98420897)

[Inception Report: 1](#_Toc98420898)

[Final Evaluation of UNDP’s Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Youth Co:Lab) 1](#_Toc98420899)

[1. Background and Context 1](#_Toc98420900)

[1.1 Key Components of the Intervention 2](#_Toc98420901)

[1.2 Evaluation Purpose 2](#_Toc98420902)

[1.3 Scope of the Evaluation 3](#_Toc98420903)

[1.4 Evaluation Objectives 3](#_Toc98420904)

[2. Evaluation Criteria and Questions 4](#_Toc98420905)

[3. Evaluability Analysis 5](#_Toc98420906)

[4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology 11](#_Toc98420907)

[4.1 Outcome Harvesting 11](#_Toc98420908)

[4.2 Appreciative Inquiry 12](#_Toc98420909)

[4.3 Empowerment Lens 13](#_Toc98420910)

[4.4 Data Collection Methods 16](#_Toc98420911)

[4.5 Secondary Data Collection 16](#_Toc98420912)

[4.6 Primary Data Collection 16](#_Toc98420913)

[4.7 Case Study Approach 17](#_Toc98420914)

[4.8 Purposive Sampling 17](#_Toc98420915)

[4.9 Web-based Surveys 27](#_Toc98420916)

[4.10 Limitations of the Evaluation 27](#_Toc98420917)

[4.11 Evaluation Ethics and Principles 29](#_Toc98420918)

[5. Data Analysis Approaches 29](#_Toc98420919)

[5.1 Theory of Change Mapping 29](#_Toc98420920)

[5.2 Contribution Analysis 29](#_Toc98420921)

[5.3 Capacities Assessment 30](#_Toc98420922)

[5.4 Audience Analysis 30](#_Toc98420923)

[5.5 Empowerment Analysis 30](#_Toc98420924)

[5.6 Network Analysis 30](#_Toc98420925)

[5.6 Multiple Lines and Levels of Evidence 31](#_Toc98420926)

[7. Cross-cutting Issues 31](#_Toc98420927)

[8. Evaluation Matrix 32](#_Toc98420928)

[9. Proposed Schedule 44](#_Toc98420929)

[9. Resource Requirements 45](#_Toc98420930)

[10. Proposed Outline of the Draft and Final Report 47](#_Toc98420931)

[Annex 1: Excerpt from Evaluation Terms of Reference 51](#_Toc98420932)

[Annex 2: Defining Characteristics of FreeChild Models of Participation 56](#_Toc98420933)

[Annex 3: Interview Guides – Focus Group Discussions 57](#_Toc98420934)

[Annex 4: Semi-Structured Interview Guides for Key Informants 62](#_Toc98420935)

[Annex 5: On-line Survey Questions: Youth Participant Survey and Partner Survey 70](#_Toc98420936)

[References 79](#_Toc98420937)

## List of Acronyms

CSOs Civil Society Organizations

RPD Regional

SDGs Sustainable Development Goals

TOC Theory of Change

TOR Terms of Reference

UNDP United Nations Development Program

UNESCAP United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group

Youth Co:Lab Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship

## List of Tables and Figures

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Proposed Evaluation Questions

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Proposed Evaluation Questions

Table 3: Sample Outcome Harvesting Question Process

Table 4: Sample Appreciative Inquiry Framework for Analysis

Table 5: Empowerment Lens for Young People

Table 6: Selection Criteria for Country Case Studies

Table 7: Purposive Sampling Criteria and Size per Country and at Regional Level

Table 8: Evaluation Limitations and Mitigation Strategies

Table 9: Evaluation Matrix

Table 10: Proposed Schedule

**List of Figures**

Fig. 1: Theory of Change

Fig. 2: Meaningful Participation Model for Children and Young People

# Inception Report:

# Final Evaluation of UNDP’s Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Youth Co:Lab)

## Background and Context

UNDP’s Regional Youth Project on Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (Youth Co:Lab) in the Asia Pacific (2017 – 2021) was designed to address both the opportunities and challenges related to the fact that:

“The world today is home to the largest generation of young people in history, [with]1.2 billion people aged 15 to 24. Yet more than one fifth of young people are neither in employment, nor in education or training. At the same time, young people are a tremendous source of innovation, ideas and solutions. “ (UNDP, 2022).

The majority (60%) of these young people live in the Asia Pacific, representing 700 million people in total in this region. A key challenge they face is a significantly higher unemployment rate than that of the rest of the population (10.4% versus 4.1%). Another is significant under-employment or poor job quality with 68% of young people employed in the informal sector. For diverse groups of vulnerable and minority youth such as young women, youth living in humanitarian settings, youth with disabilities, migrant youth, indigenous youth and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth, these challenges are even greater (hereinafter referred to as diverse groups of youth).

Young people in the region also face these challenges within the context of a rapidly changing world from a technological, climate, economic and conflict perspective. At the same time, their energy, presence and innovative approaches to solutions represent a key element that will help the world achieve the goals of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and for this reason, amongst many others, need to be empowered to lead.

This then, has been the focus of the Co:Lab project co-designed and co-led by the UNDP and Citi Foundation: to establish a common agenda for Asia-Pacific countries to empower and invest in youth to accelerate implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). They have been doing this by working with young people, governments, the private sector and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to help young people develop the 21st century skills of digital literacy, soft skills and global citizenship. Their aim has also been to catalyse and scale up “youth-led social enterprises to help position young people front and centre to address the region’s most pressing challenges.” [[1]](#footnote-1)

The key outcome of the project based on the Regional Program Document (RPD) for Asia and the Pacific 2018-2021 is Outcome 2: to accelerate structural transformation for sustainable development. The main outcome for the evaluation process itself is to ensure a strong and improved design for the future project strategy that reflects both progress made and current regional and global challenges, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

### 1.1 Key Components of the Intervention

Youth Co:Lab was designed to do this by working at both the regional and national levels and based on the premise that change needs to take place concurrently through activities targeting downstream, mid-stream and upstream processes and realities. Fig. 1 below summarizes the key strategies and approaches used for each of these streams and highlights how each change level builds on and is connected to the others.

**Fig. 1:**



Source: PPt presentation on Final Evaluation of Youth Co: Lab, Jan 11, 2022.

The evaluation therefore will be examining the strategies and processes/activities used at each level and the different results generated by these different approaches.

###  1.2 Evaluation Purpose

This data and analysis will be used to:

* Support accountability and facilitate learning and knowledge sharing
* Inform the diverse project stakeholders, including young people and funders about the results, consolidate results and lessons learnt and provide forward-looking recommendations
* Guide the design of the future project strategy in spring 2022.

### 1.3 Scope of the Evaluation

As outlined in the evaluation ToR, the final evaluation will assess the project’s progress against the expected outputs and outcomes as defined in the results and resources framework (RRF) and project’s theory of change (ToC) from January 2017 to January 2022. It will cover project activities and results at regional level and through deep dives in specific countries selected from the nineteen (19) currently participating actively in the project. The evaluation will also build on the findings and recommendations of the deep dive analysis of the Youth Co:Lab project conducted during the Mid-Term Review of the RPD of UNDP Asia-Pacific and use the findings of the global evaluation of UNDP’s youth portfolio.

As a part of this, the final evaluation will assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project. It will also assess the extent to which the project has adopted human rights-based and gender responsive approaches, identify lessons learnt and provide recommendations to expand and enhance project activities and ensure the sustainability of results.

### 1.4 Evaluation Objectives

The key objectives of the final evaluation are thus to:

* Assess the performance of the project in terms of achieving the intended project output results and contribution to outcomes according to the project’s theory of change
* Assess the project’s unique value proposition and sources of comparative advantage relative to other initiatives
* Assess the project’s partnership strategies and performance in achieving intended results through collaboration with ecosystem partners
* Assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency and effectiveness of the project activities and the sustainability of the results achieved towards the intended output and outcome level results at:

o Downstream level: direct empowerment of young people
o Midstream level: strengthening of the ecosystem to support youth entrepreneurship, innovation, and leadership

o Upstream level: work with governments to enhance the enabling environment for youth entrepreneurship, innovation, and leadership

* Identify challenges and factors that have affected the achievement of project results and assess the effectiveness of the approaches that the project has adopted to address these challenges
* Assess to what extent the project has adopted human rights-based, gender responsive and leave no one behind (LNOB) / diversity and inclusion approaches
* Identify lessons learnt from the project and provide concrete and forward-looking recommendations to inform the design of the next project cycle
* Assess the project’s alignment with UNDP’s RPD and Strategic Plan and the UN Strategy on Youth and the project’s contribution to the mainstreaming of the youth empowerment agenda.

## Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The TOR presented a list of assessment criteria and 45 guiding questions to help shape the development of the evaluation matrix. In consultation with the Youth Co:Lab team the evaluator has streamlined these down to 17 by blending those that share common elements, eliminating duplications and converting others to act as indicators. The evaluator also asked the Youth Co:Lab team to help identify those that were an absolute priority for the evaluation purposes keeping in mind the limits of the resources available for the data collection and analysis process.

The data sources and tools proposed to collect data to answer these questions are outlined in Section 7.

**Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Proposed Evaluation Questions**

| **Ealuation****criteria** | **Key Questions** |
| --- | --- |
| **Relevance** | * 1. What are the strengths and potential gaps in terms of project design and implementation advancing youth empowerment and addressing their priority needs in the Asia-Pacific?
 |
| 1. To what extent and in what ways has the project evolved to respond to changes in the operational context due to the COVID-19 pandemic?
 |
| **Coherence** | 1. To what extent is the project aligned to the strategic priorities of its key stakeholders, including key UN strategies such as the SDGs and UN Youth Strategy and private sector partners?
 |
|  **Effectiveness** | 1. What are the results achieved against the project RRF indicators?
 |
| 1. Which key internal and external factors have contributed to, affected and/or impeded achievement of expected results?
 |
| 1. What is the added value of the project’s regional approach?
 |
| 1. How effective has the Youth Empowerment Alliance and related partnerships been at the regional and national levels in building an enabling environment and strengthening the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship and social innovation leadership in the Asia-Pacific?
 |
| 1. How effective have the project’s communications activities been in terms of increasing visibility of the youth empowerment agenda and influencing decision making among the key stakeholders in the region?
 |
| 1. How effective has the project been in mainstreaming youth empowerment in UNDP at the national and regional levels and in its different thematic areas of work?
 |
| **Efficiency** | 1. Have sufficient resources (financial and human) been strategically allocated for the achievement of project results?
 |
| 1. Is the partnership structure used the most effective and efficient means to support achievement of the intended results?
 |
| 1. To what extent did project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
 |
| **Sustainability** | 1. To what extent can the achieved results be expected to be sustainable?
 |
| **Gender** | 1. To what extent has the project been able to mainstream gender throughout the intervention, including in its design, implementation and monitoring?
 |
| 1. To what extent have the project’s actions to strengthen the capacities of the youth entrepreneurship ecosystem been gender-responsive?
 |
| **Human Rights/ LNOB** | 1. What have been the most effective strategies to empower young women and vulnerable and minority youth?
 |
| 1. To what extent has the project been able to promote structural/ institutional changes to advance the inclusion and empowerment of minority youth (e.g., influence policies or regulations)
 |

## Evaluability Analysis

Using standard evaluability criteria the evaluator concluded that the Youth Co:Lab project is highly evaluable when assessed against most related assessment criteria. These are summarized in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Evaluability Analysis Assessment Categories and Ratings**

| **Assessment Category** | **Evaluability Level** | **High** | **Med.** | **Low** | **Observations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Design | Quality of the design of the Project document  | **X** |  |  | There is a clear logic of intervention based on the ToC; the Result Matrix contains Outcome and output level results and indicators. However, only one indicator in the revised log frame requires the collection of sex disaggregated data. Iterative process was used to revise project design during course of implementation to respond to changing context and increased support.  |
| Justification of the intervention | **X** |  |  | Project addresses both regional and national priorities and responds to great need for diverse types of support for youth in the region.  |
| Human rights and gender analysis conducted to clearly define the underlying structural issues in realizing Human Rights, Gender Equality and LNOB |  | **X** |  | The project context identifies key issues related to rights and equality issues but does not include an analysis of the structural and other reasons underlying these inequalities and rights issues for diverse groups of youth in the region.  |
| Responsiveness of the design to Human Rights, Gender Equality and LNOB | **X** |  |  |  Project results are defined in the terms of benefits for both rights holders and duty bearers. In addition, vulnerable groups are clearly defined and their needs reflected in the project design.  |
| Clear, realistic and commonly understood objectives | **X** |  |  | Objectives are clear, as are outcomes and clearly linked to regional and national priorities and UNDP’s Strategic Plan and UN Strategy on Youth  |
| A targeted strategy to contribute to changes for both rights holders and duty bearers | **X** |  |  | Project ‘s TOC uses a 3-stream strategy to focus on influencing and supporting of duty bearers and the empowerment of female/male/other genders of youth rights holders at multiple levels.  |
| Activities lead to goals and objectives regarding Gender Equality, Youth Empowerment and LNOB |  | **X** |  | The scope of activities detailed are likely to lead the outcomes outlined.  |
| SMART indicators |  | **X** |  | Majority of indicators developed to measure outcomes and outputs are measurable but lacking adequate granularity of specific beneficiary group disaggregation in terms of reporting, while noting that the project is actually tracking this data by specific project component. Results are tracked at the country level but there are no country-specific annual/multi-annual targets for these results. This limits the evaluation’s ability to assess effectiveness and efficiency at the national level in a comparable and systematic way to the regional results.  |
| Monitored performance indicators and monitoring system in place | **X** |  | **X** | Regular monitoring of project performance planned with clear targets and participation of responsible parties; evidence of extensive project monitoring documents. Some of results related to beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries are self-reported without there being other means of confirming these results or their quality.  |
|  |
| **Clarity and Coherence of Evaluation Questions** | The evaluation questions state the issues to be assessed clearly and in a coherent way and reflect realistic expectations of what can be evaluated to a quality standard within the time frame and resources available.  |  | **X** |  | There were too many guidingevaluation questions as formulated in TORs to be evaluated to a quality standard within the evaluation resources avaialble. There were so many questions it would have been challenging to collect all the data required to a credible degree. However, once grouped in a more streamlined way there was considerable coherence in the Evaluation questions.  |
| **Availability of information** | The results are verifiable based on the planned collection systems: Baseline data and reports. |  | **X**  |  | Baseline data available at regional level in general reports but there is not a specific project baseline analysis.  |
| Availability of project documents and reports to the donor; Presentations; financial documents (reports to the donor) | **X** |  |  | Reports readily available along with detailed annexes. |
| Human rights, LNOB and gender-sensitive indicators built into the intervention |  |  **X** |  | Could be developed with higher degree of disaggregation and included in more indicators. |
| Disaggregated data available |  |  **X** |  | Disaggregated data available in diverse project activity trackers but results of each tracker need to be collated manually and is not included in most project indicators. Results are tracked at the country level but there is no disaggregation of country-specific annual/multi-annual targets for the results. |
| There is capacity to provide data for a HR & GE responsive evaluation | **X** |  |  | Based on documentation available there appears to be a strong capacity to provide data (availability of expertise, investments of the project into monitoring capacity of partners and stakeholders)  |
|  |
| **Context**  | Good evaluation timing (useful evaluation at that point in time) | **X** |  |  | The timing is good since it coincides with end of project for and planning of next intervention.  |
| The political situation is conducive to the evaluation  | **X** |  |  | Diverse partners in the region still have a strong interest in investing in youth empowerment and entrepreneurship and would like to see an external assessment of the project’s strategies and outcomes to date. |
| The security situation is conducive to the evaluation (travels are possible to project locations and to stakeholders’ locations) |  | **X** |  | The COVID-19 situation with does not allow the evaluator team to travel to the project locations so the data collection has to be remotely. This may limit access to some beneficiaries.  |
|  | Availability of key stakeholders in the field (no national events, such as elections, holidays, during the evaluation time period  | **X** |  |  | Since the location of the evaluation respondents, participants and key informants is in diverse locations in the region, there may be mixed availability but no major events anticipated at this time and the data collection period will extend over a 6 week period to allow for flexibility of access.  |
| Availability of key stakeholders at the UNDP Regional Office – Asia and Pacific and Youth Co:Lab  | **X** |  |  | Personnel will be available during the data collection period.  |
| There are an adequate number of activities implemented to assess project and approach outcomes | **X** |  |  | The project engaged in a wide range of activities which appear to be well documented and for which it should be possible to establish contact with diverse participants.  |

There were three concerns the evaluability assessment process raised. The first is related to the limited number of indicators that are disaggregated by sex, marginalized and vulnerable groups. The project does have extensive data disaggregated in this way, but this is all in the form of raw data and is not reported on for the most part in project progress reports. Therefore, the data is available but will take some time to aggregate and cross-reference with the project results.

The second is related to the fact that this is an evaluation which covers a wide range of activities at three different stream levels in multiple countries as well as the regional level. Commonly a regional evaluation of this scope would involve a multi-person evaluation team. This evaluation process originally only had one evaluator which would have limited the scope of what would be possible to evaluate and the degree of verification of results possible. The sampling approaches suggested, therefore, have to be both purposive and limited to the number of Key Informant Interviews s(KIIs), Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and online based surveys possible to quality standards with the human resources available. Youth Co:Lab has mitigated this challenge as much as possible by providing close to full time technical and logistical support to the evaluator from its own staff as well as has agreed to hire an additional Regional Coordinator to provide data collection support. The Reference Group Lead has also identified three volunteers from UNDP’s evaluation network who will conduct up to five interviews each, with a care being given to ensure that they do not interview evaluation participants in their own countries where they work.

The issue of self reporting of some results will require some deeper investigation but it will not be possible to confirm this in a significant way for the benefits of the different social enterprises on their clients/website users, etc.

## Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Given the scope and breath of the Youth Co:Lab project, the final evaluation will require use of mixed methods that will collect and analyze different types of data at all three stream levels as well as about the project’s different strategies used and related activities. Given the strong empowerment focus of the project, the analytical frameworks and approaches below have incorporated different means of measuring changes in empowerment for all three streams.

The three primary approaches recommended are that of Outcome Harvesting, a modified form of Appreciative Inquiry and the use of an Empowerment Lens. The rationale for using each of these frameworks are outlined in the following three sub-sections.

### 4.1 Outcome Harvesting

###

This approach involves linking everyday experiences to testing the theory of change. It essentially asks diverse stakeholder and beneficiaries to list/describe all significant changes they or their organizations have experienced due to their participation in the project. They are also asked to pinpoint what inputs or factors led or contributed to these changes and which changes were most important for them. This allows a project to document all types of changes that have occurred during its implementation. Often not all these changes are included in the project’s log frame which generally uses very formal change indicators. Thus, you can use Outcome Harvesting processes to both identify all types of changes for which the project has served as a catalyst as well as to confirm the achievement of the formal log frame results. Empowerment-related results are often harder to define concretely and the Outcome Harvesting process can help capture different examples of what empowerment and innovation means in different contexts and at the different stream levels.

It does not necessarily serve to confirm all project results as participants cite those which they themselves have directly experienced or observed. However, It is a particularly effective methodology for the use at the downstream level since it is participatory in nature and involves the participants in the analysis and categorization of the changes they identify as being important. This approach can also be adapted to be equally effective at the organizational level.

Ideally Outcome Harvesting is a process conducted using a workshop style form of data collection and analysis and can take from 2 to 6 hours to complete if applying a fully participatory process. However, the key questions and process can also be compressed to work within an hour long and a half a Focus Discussion Group format.

Another reason for selecting the Outcome Harvesting approach is as the inception process revealed that the project scaled up significantly over its five-year implementation period and used an iterative process to do so. Consequently, the original project log frame and subsequent revisions may not capture all the key results to which the project has contributed – either directly or indirectly. Tracking all these changes (results) will help determine both the effectiveness of specific project strategies and provide valuable input to inform future project strategy planning.

**Table 3: Sample Outcome Harvesting Question Process**

|  |
| --- |
| What changes have you (or your organization) experienced since you have been involved with Youth Co:Lab? |
| Which of these are the most significant for you/your organization? | To what do you attribute these changes/results?(Internal/External Factors | How have any of these changes empowered you or your organization?  | Which groups have benefited directly from these changes? | Which groups have not yet been able to benefit from these changes (and why)? |
| What lessons have you or your organization learned from these changes and the activities/processes used to help make them happen? |

### 4.2 Appreciative Inquiry

This approach focuses on identifying positive experiences that have taken place within an institutional context related to specific themes such as the mainstreaming of youth empowerment, entrepreneurship and innovation. It asks the key informants or focus group participants within specific institutions to identify positive experiences they have had related to specific themes as well as to which factors they attribute these experiences or changes. The premise is that it is then possible to assess which processes and activities an institution can reinforce, repeat or scale up in the future to build on these past successes. Appreciative Inquiry uses a positive deviance approach but also is a process that uncovers areas in which there is a need for improvement. It thus, can address the key objectives of the evaluation related to assessing different aspects of the project’s performance and to help inform future project planning.

**Table 4: Sample Appreciative Inquiry Framework for Analysis**

|  |
| --- |
| What has worked well and what hasn’t?For example: |
| Contribution of Youth Co:Lab policy advocacy work to relevant policy change at the country levels  | How have project strategies and activities at the upstream level helped build an enabling environment and strengthened the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship, leadership, and social innovation? | How effective have the project’s advocacy and communications activities been in terms of increasing visibility of the youth empowerment agenda and influencing decision making among the key stakeholders in the region? | Organizational, strategic approaches and capacities to efficiently and coherently perform roles related to building of an enabling environment, ecosystem strengthening for youth entrepreneurship approaches, leadership and social innovation and processes  | Incorporation of human rights, gender equality and inclusion of minority and vulnerable youth in efforts to build an enabling environment, strengthen the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship approaches, leadership and social innovation and processes |
| What lessons have emerged from Youth Co:Lab’s processes related to the building of an enabling environment, ecosystem strengthening for youth entrepreneurship approaches, leadership and social innovation and processes? |

While ideally an Appreciative Inquiry process takes place over the course of more than one meeting with key informants, it is also possible to include questions based on this approach within a standard Key Informant interview format based on an evaluation matrix. You can also apply it to aspects of the data analysis process and in how you frame the lessons learned and conclusions processes.

### 4.3 Empowerment Lens

The evaluator will use an Empowerment Lens to assist in the analysis of evaluation questions related to the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of project strategies and activities to empower youth in different ways. This Empowerment Lens is based on a blend of several analytical frameworks: the Changes in Power Framework; Meaningful Participation Framework[[2]](#footnote-2) and the Hart Ladder of Participation[[3]](#footnote-3). An underlying assumption this evaluation makes is that meaningful participation is a key component of youth empowerment.

Table 5 below outlines the key types of changes in empowerment and participation that are assessed to determine the extent to which and in which ways young people are empowered due to their participation in project activities.

**Table 5: Empowerment Lens for Young People**

| **Changes in Power and Meaningful Participation[[4]](#footnote-4)** |
| --- |
| Power Over1. Do diverse groups and genders of youth have more power over decisions made that directly affect their lives
2. Have diverse groups and genders of young people become civically minded and wish to make a contribution of their time, ideas and talents to better their communities
 |
| Power Within1. Diverse groups and genders of young people have developed a sense of self-worth based on their ability to make choices and take the initiative
 |
| Power With1. Do diverse groups and genders of youth feel as if their opinions, needs and experiences are valued and acted on by other groups, networks, state actors, etc.?
2. Young people develop a positive sense of belonging to their community, to caring adults and to their peers.
 |
| Power To:1. Do diverse groups and genders of youth feel empowered to take positive action?
2. Have diverse groups and genders of young people acquired a sense of responsibility and accountability, the ability to thrive despite adversity?
3. Have diverse groups and genders of young people been enabled to master sound leadership and/or entrepreneurial skills to either earn a living and/or act as social innovator in their communities, countries or globally?
 |

The evaluator has posed questions designed to help analyze the different ways in which the Youth Co:Lab project may have contributed to the empowerment of diverse groups and genders of young people through its diverse strategies, approaches and activities The four categories of analysis are drawn from the Changes in Power Framework commonly used in feminist analysis and the questions are adapted from that framework and the two meaningful participation frameworks. The evaluator proposes using this blended framework to help inform the indicators developed to answer some of the key evaluation questions as well as guide some of the reflections in the evaluation’s lessons learned and conclusions sections.

The Changes to Power framework typically looks for changes in power relations at four different levels:

1. **Power over**: changes in subordination, exclusion, and inequalities.
2. **Power within**: a specific group’s personal and collective self-reflection, self-recognition as subjects of rights and agents, and capacity development.
3. **Power with**: networking and coalition building at the local, national and transnational levels. This may be with both other organizations working with or on behalf of a specific demographic group as well as other social and even state actors.
4. **Power to**: vision and goal of empowerment, including a specific demographic group fully exercising all their rights as well as state actors implementing their role as primary duty bearers.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The other questions are adapted from a combination of Hart’s recognize that forms of young people’s participation vary according to their access to information, decision-making power and opportunities to take action. Both models also acknowledge that children and young people may be subject a form of youth engagement that is adult-initiated and run. Young people have no understanding of issues and actions, nor any input into organizing. Adults use their power, status and access to resources to engage youth to further personal or organizational aims. As such, this form of engagement lacks the key elements of meaningful participation and while it may benefit young people in other ways, it does not empower them.

The model depicted on the next page in Fig. 2 is adapted from the FreeChild model and illustrates a continuum of forms of meaningful participation by young people. The spiral depicts a process of social change over time and represents the enlargement of opportunities as people of different ages become engaged. There is not a hierarchy of forms of participation as appropriate forms will vary with the capacities, abilities and interests of children, young people, adults, organizations and communities, and the situational context. The key participation categories in the FreeChild model include:

* Model #1 – Adult Initiated and Controlled
* Model #2 - Adult Initiated with Shared Decision-making
* Model #3 - Young People Initiated with Shared Decision-making and Support
* Model #4 - Non-Participation or Participation that is not Meaningful
* Model #5 - Community Members Equally Make Decisions and Take Action[[6]](#footnote-6) (refer to Annex 2 for details on the key characteristics of each model).

Adolescent Assigned Action but inform Decision-making

The FreeChild Participation model focuses solely on participation. For the purposes of this project evaluation there is also a need to look at empowerment from the perspective of social enterprise skills. This is covered by the last bullet point in the “Power to” in Table 4 above.

**Fig. 2: Meaningful Participation Model for Children and Young People**

**No meaningful participation by Children and Young People**

**Adult Initiated & Controlled with Children and Young**

**People Consulted**

**All Community Members Equally Make Decisions & Take actions**

**Children and Young People**

**Initiate,**

**&**

**Take action**

**Adults initiate,**

**Shared action with Children and Young People**

**Children and Young People**

**Assigned Action but Inform**

**Decision-Making**

Adolescent Assigned Action but inform Decision-making

**Adults initiate, Shared action with Adolescents**

Adolescent Assigned Action but inform Decision-making

Source:Fletcher, Adam. N.D., Youth Voice Toolbox. FreeChild Project.

### 4.4 Data Collection Methods

The evaluation will collect data using the following methods: Document review; Website reviews, Interviews and meetings, including Focus Discussion Groups; and two web-based surveys.

### 4.5 Secondary Data Collection

The document reviewwill include a review of all relevant documentation, including:

* Project documents
* Theory of change and results framework
* Project reports on quality assurance
* Annual workplans
* Activity designs
* Consolidated interim and annual reports
* Monitoring reports
* Beneficiary feedback data
* Training evaluation reports
* Event participant lists
* RPD ROARs
* Technical/financial monitoring reports
* Project website and communications
* Other relevant websites
* Websites of young entrepreneurs
* Regional Asia-Pacific Forums on Youth Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (APFYLIE) and Youth Co:Lab Summits documents/websites (where still live

The document review will draw upon the key assessment criteria and indicators outlined in the evaluation matrix.

### 4.6 Primary Data Collection

The primary data collection process will include:

* **Key Informant Interviews** with UNDP staff (from the regional Asia Pacific office, selected Country Offices, regional and national partners, government officials in five countries, Youth Co:Lab staff, Citi Foundation staff, funders/donors, civil society organizations, private sector actors, and academics.
* **Focus discussion groups** with young people who have participated in the Movers Program, Springboard program, Regional Asia-Pacific Forums on Youth Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (APFYLIE), Youth Co:Lab Summits and the Regional Dialogue on Youth Indigenous Social Entrepreneurship, Young Entrepreneurs, and Youth Empowerment Alliance, ensuring that there is a balanced and proportionate representation by gender, and diverse groups of vulnerable and minority youth as well as those that have dropped out of these programs or were not selected for higher levels of participation.
* **Web-based surveys** which will be sent to as many of the project’s participants snd partners as possible.

### 4.7 Case Study Approach

The evaluation TOR call for the presentation of case studies as a part of the analytical process, with a discussion of a possible five during the Inception process. These would be approximately 1 page in length and would predominantly use an Appreciative Inquiry approach. Since Youth Co:Lab has already collected many success stories at the downstream level the case studies will focus at the mid and upper stream and strategy levels. This is as opposed to being strictly focused on success stories of young social entrepreneurs at the downstream level. The latter would be covered in more detail through the data collected to answer the evaluation questions in the six sample countries and through the regional FGDs, particularly those related to effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluator suggests the following general themes for the five case studies:

1. Midstream – Financing Solutions, Regional Summits, Youth Empowerment Alliance
2. Upstream Approach - Systemic Approach (with a focus on policy change), Diagnostics Approach

If possible, the case study for the Youth Empowerment Alliance would be set up to be presented in a video interview format. It would also be useful, resources permitting, for there to be an interview-based case study with one of Youth Co:Lab’s major partners such as Citi Foundation. These videos interviews would be scripted with modified semi-structured interview guides and would potentially require editing support from UNDP. The case studies will not be solely restricted to examples from the country studies but could be drawn from significant examples of project approaches from any country or from the regional level.

### 4.8 Purposive Sampling

Youth Co:Lab has provided detailed summaries of the key project results in its annual progress reports. The evaluation will also cross-reference these with the annual RPD ROARs where applicable. At the same time, given the regional nature of the evaluation and the fact that Youth Co:Lab is actively working in 19 countries (and has worked with 28 countries to date), it is not within the scope of the evaluation process and resources to confirm all the results outlined in the project’s annual progress reports. Instead, the evaluator proposes using a purposive sampling approach to both triangulate the results reported and to do a deeper dive into the quality and significance of these results. For example, the 2021 CITI annual report states that 5.9 million people have benefited from 60 youth start-ups.[[7]](#footnote-7) This number is based on the cumulative number of users of the various SDG related products/services in the portfolios of the mature social enterprises for which the regional Springboard program acted as an incubator and catalyst. Youth Co:Lab uses this number as an estimate of beneficiaries of Youth Co:Lab social enterprises overall. However, the number is not able to tell us just what these benefits are. Thus, to unpack what the youth start-ups mean by direct beneficiaries in this context (amongst other issues), the evaluator would include a focus group drawn from this group of 60 youth entrepreneurs.

The evaluator proposes selecting a six-country sample from those that have participated in the project in the diverse components. The evaluation would select representative participants from each of these countries to take part in a series of either regional or national FGDs and KIIs, depending upon the project component targeted. This sample size is proposed as it is the maximum possible within the parameters of the evaluation resources (budget, human and time) and as a sample of this size provides sufficient scope to be representative of the different project configurations and contexts in which YCL is working. The purpose of these country studies is to take a more qualitative look at how the project operates in these different contexts as opposed to be a means of verifying overall project quantitative results. This part of the process will confirm some of the project's results but is taking a more qualitative approach to look at what works well and what does not at different stages of the project’s implementation and for different country contexts.

The data collection in each country would cover all three streams as well as all project components. The main selection criteria for the countries is based on:

* Representation of all project components
* Geographic and country income factors to help assess whether the YCL approach works well in different country contexts
* How long the project has been implemented in each country to help track how long it takes to achieve key project results in different country contexts.

Another potential selection factor considered but not included in the overall selection criteria was the stability of UNDP personnel overseeing the project’s implementation in each country. This is as this staff turnover has had an observed negative impact in this regard. However, the lead evaluator is recommending that this issue be addressed through the YCL staff KIIs and a small number of KIIs with UNDP personnel in countries where there have been challenges related to staff turnover such as the Maldives and Nepal. This is since it will be more difficult to obtain the contact referrals needed to conduct a more in-depth country study in that context. It is an important consideration however, to include in the KII selection since this challenge affects continuity and sustainability of some programming at the CO and national programme level.

**Table 6: Selection Criteria for Country Case Studies**

| **Selection Criteria**  | **Details of Selection Criteria** | **Possible Candidates** | **Shortlist**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country Income Level**(based on GDP per capita) | 1. 2 countries at lower middle income level
2. 2 countries at medium income level
3. 2 countries at upper middle or high income level
 | 1. Bhutan, Cambodia, Myanmar, Laos PDR, Indonesia, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Timor Leste, Vietnam
2. Maldives
3. China, Malaysia, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Sinapore, Hong Kong, Thailand, SAR, Japan,
 | * Cambodia, Nepal, Philippines, Vietnam
* China, Maldives, Thailand
* Indonesia, Samoa
 |
| **Population Size** | * 2 with smaller populations (should include at least one Small Island Developing State
* 2 with mid-size populations
* 2 with large populations
 | * Bhutan, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Fiji, Maldives, Vanautu, Hong Kong SAR, Cambodia
* Rep. of Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, Sri Lanka
* Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam
 | * Cambodia
* Samoa
* Maldives
* Nepal
* China
* Philippines
* Thailand
* Vietnam
 |
| Have hosted a regional summit | At least one country | China, Thailand | * China
* Thailand
 |
| Have hosted a Youth Summit | At least one country | China, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Vietnam | * Thailand
* Vietnam
 |
| Have organized at least one national dialogue process  |  | Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, HKSAR, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Rep. of Korea, Vanuatu | * Cambodia
* Indonesia
* Maldives
* Nepal
* Philippines
* Samoa
* Thailand
 |
| Regional Representation | 2 from South Asia1 from the South Pacific1 from East Asia2 from South East Asia | Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, HKSAR, India, Indonesia, Laos PDR, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Rep. of Korea, Vanuatu | * Nepal
* Maldives
* Samoa
* China
* Cambodia
* Thailand
* Vietnam
 |
| Presence of a national Movers Coordinator | At least two countries  | Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam Thailand  | * Bangladesh
* Cambodia
* India
* Indonesia
* Nepal
* Vietnam
* Thailand
 |
| Young entrepreneurs in country have been involved in the Springboard Program |  | 2021 China – 5; Indonesia – 30Thailand – 6; India – 12Pakistan – 12; Timor Leste – 9Vietnam – 7; Malaysia – 13; Cambodia – 5; Bangladesh – 9; Maldives – 3; Samoa – 6; Bhutan – 8; Singapore – 9; Japan – 4; South Korea – 3;Sri Lanka – 16; Myanmar – 1Hong Kong SAR – 6; Papua New Guinea – 1; Fiji - 2 | * China
* Indonesia
* Vietnam
* Cambodia
* Maldives
* Malaysia
* Samoa
* Sri Lanka
 |

Following the most recent discussions with the YCL team and Reference Group the shortlist stands at: **Bangladesh, China, Samoa, Singapore, Vietnam and Thailand.** Singapore represents a country that started participating partway through the project and Bangladesh, China, Samoa, Vietnam and Thailand, countries that have been participating since the project’s implementation.

The proposed sampling of KIIs and FGDs at the country and regional levels is designed to cover all three stream levels, the main project activities and inclusion of youth participants as well as diverse types of partners, funders and UNDP personnel. This is in order to assess issues related to results and effectiveness of business models, sustainability, inclusion and the future strategies needed. It is not intended as an in-depth country study process but rather a means to gather more qualitative information about key project results and business models and to test aspects of the YCL’s Theory of Change.

The sample size proposed suggests a combination of 19 FGDs at the regional and national levels which would reach between 119 to 153 people, the majority of whom would be youth. There would also be 53 different sets of KIIs at the country and regional levels, targeting between 64 to 74 informants. The combined total of FGDs and KIIs is 72 and a total range of evaluation participants between 183 and 224 persons. The goal would be to achieve a minimum of 200 evaluation participants to ensure substantive coverage for the 10,000 reported project beneficiaries. This would be further complemented by the two on-line surveys for participants and partners.

Table 7 below outlines more details on the proposed FGDs and KIIs and the related selection criteria.

**Table 7: Purposive Sampling Criteria and Size per Country and at Regional Level**

| **Project Component** | **Target Stakeholders/****Beneficiary** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sample Size Proposed**  | **Selection Criteria** | **Specific Countries/****Organizations Targeted** | **Regional Level** | **Total of FGDs/ participants** | **Total Number of KIIs** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Innovation Challenges/National Dialogues | Youth participants | 1 FGD – youth | Between 6-8 youth | Youth: 3 female, 2 male – all from vulnerable or minority groups (including gender minorities) | Bangladesh, Singapore, Samoa |  | 3 FGDs (18 – 24 participants)  |  |
| Investors | 1 FGD | 6 investors | Investors: who invested in a youth-led business | 1 each from the 6 country sample |  X | 1 FGD (6 participants) |  |
| Government | 1 KII | 1-2 persons | Lead Gov’t officials /partners in the Innovation challenge/national dialogue process  involved in the challenge | Bangladesh, Thailand, Samoa |  |  | 3 KIIs (3 to 6 persons) |
| Supporting partners | 1 KII | 1-2 persons | Key supporting partners in selected countries | Bangladesh, Thailand, Singapore  |   |  | 3 KIIs (3 to 6 persons) |

| **Project Component** | **Target Stakeholders/****Beneficiary** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sample Size Proposed**  | **Selection Criteria** | **Specific Countries/****Organizations Targeted** | **Regional Level** | **Total of FGDs/****participants** | **Total Number of KIIs** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Movers Program | Youth Volunteers | 3 FGDs (1 English Speaking, 2 non-English speaking) | 6-8 volunteer participants/ FGD | Representational balance of youth volunteers from gender and diversity perspective, should include at least 2 who only participated as volunteers for 1-2 workshops | Bangladesh, Thailand, Vietnam  |  | 3 (18 -24 participants each) |  |
| Youth trainees  | FGD(1 for English Speakers, 2 for non-English speakers) | 6 – 8 participants  | Representational mix of youth trained by the Movers Volunteers | Bangladesh, Singapore China, Vietnam |  |  3 (24 – 32 participants) |  |
| National Movers Program Coordinators | FGD | 5-7 participants | National Movers program coordinators | Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam Thailand | X |  1 (5-7 participants) |  |
| Youth Empowerment Alliance/Springboard/Regional Summits | Youth participants | FGD | 6-8 youth participants/ FGD  | Mix of youth participants with representative of genders, minority youth and those who have been involved for shorter and longer times plus successful and less successful | Drawn from: Bangladesh, Singapore, Samoa (English Speaking) Thailand, China (non-English speaking) | X | 2 (12-16 participants) 2 (12-16 participants) |  |
| CSO & Academic partners | FGD | 6-8 participants/FGD | Key CSO & Academic partners from YEA and Springboard | Bangladesh, China, Samoa, Singapore, Vietnam and Thailand | X | 1(6-8) |   |
| Private Sector partners | FGD |  6-8 participants/FGD | Key private sector partners from YEA and Springboard |  Bangladesh, China, Samoa, Singapore, Vietnam, Thailand | X | 1 (6-8) |  |
| Govt’ partners | KIIs | 1-2 person/KII | Key gov’t partners from YEA and Springboard | Bangladesh, China, Singapore | X |  | 3 (3 – 6 persons) |
| Young Social Entrepreneurs participants in Regional Summits | KIIs | 8 | 4 from 2nd regional summit, 4 from virtual summit, from most successful social entrepreneurs | Open | X |  | 8 |
| Financing Solutions Partners | KIIs | 1 per type of financing solution  | Main regional partners in the country for business development support services Crowdfunding (YCL)AccelerationGrants |  | X |  | 3 |
| National Business Development Support Partners | FGDs  | 6 participants/ FGD | Representative sample of national partners in the country for business development support services (mixed group from the sample countries) | Bangladesh, China, Samoa, Singapore, Vietnam, Thailand |  | 2 (12 participants) |  |
|  | UNDP Country Office Staff | KIIs  | 1 (joint interview) per CO | Youth Focal Point; Program Officers involved in Youth Co:Lab programming and Team Leader representative of management | Bangladesh, China, Samoa, Singapore, Vietnam, Thailand |  |  | 6 (12 participants) |
| Staff turnover countries | UNDP Country Office Staff  | KII  | 1 KII with UNDP staff | For UNDP staff in countries where there has been a staff gap due to turnover, Maldives, Nepal, etc. Youth Focal Point; Program Officers involved in Youth Co:Lab programming and Team Leader representative of management | Maldives, Fiji and Nepal | X |  | 1 (3 participants) |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Regional Activities/****Actors** | UNDP Regional Office Asia Pacific | KII | 7 | Individual interviews with 4 regional thematic advisors and with Regional Youth Advisor |  | X |  | 7 (7participants) |
|  | Regional Partners | KIIs  | 10-11 | * Citi Foundation
* Asian Venture Philanthropy Network
* Islamic Development Bank
* CVC Philanthropy
* The Commonwealth
* UNESCAP
* Impact Hub Cambodia
* Intel
* Asia Indigenous People’s Pact
* UNV
* ILO
 |  | X |  | 10- 11 participants) |
|  | Youth Co:Lab Personnel | KIIs | 7  | Key Youth Co:Lab personnel, including communications staff |  | X |  | 7 (7 participants) |
| Research and Knowledge Products | Researchers | KIIs | 4  | Researchers/partners from different types of knowledge products (e.g. toolkits, flagship reports, YCL's own reports, ecosystem diagnostics, thematic reports, etc.) Can include UNDP staff and Youth Co:lab personnel | UNICEF, UNDCF, GEM, SDSN | X |  | 4 (4 participants) |

YCL staff have indicated that approximately 10% of the project’s youth participants are from minority or vulnerable groups. Therefore the FGDs and KIIs will need to maintain this ratio to be representative.

### 4.9 Web-based Surveys

The FGDs and KIIs would be complemented and supplemented by two web-based/on-line surveys. One would be directed towards diverse groups and genders of youth who have taken part in diverse project activities (including simply making use of the project websites). The thematic focus of the survey will be how their participation has affected their empowerment from several perspectives (as outlined in the Empowerment Lens). The other survey will target the project’s diverse partners in the Youth Empowerment Alliance.

The surveys will be structured and administered in a way that ensures full confidentiality of the respondents. For the youth participant survey, the evaluation process would draw up list of past participants in Youth Co:Lab activities using a random selection process and send an invitation to them to participate in the survey. The idea would be to include to send the survey to as many past youth participants as possible. **The YCL staff have indicated that there may be a need to include some kind of incentive to encourage youth participation in the survey.**

The youth survey would also include the option to take part in an on-line discussion group for those who would like to provide more in-depth feedback about their experiences, and on diverse project activities and about future needs. The survey would run for 3 weeks and be followed by the discussion chat for two weeks with the discussion questions based in part on issues and responses from the survey. The evaluation team would set up this chat using a software app that is easily accessible in both Asia and Canada.

The survey would be solely in English unless the UNDP Is able to provide translation services for other key languages spoken in the region (e.g., Chinese). This limitation introduces an element of bias related to who can take part in the survey as it means it would only be accessible to those who speak English who may be, by implication those who are better educated or have more access to the types of resources that would allow them to learn English, noting that of the potential participant countries only a few have English as one of their national languages. The survey development process would also include a piloting process to ensure the language is clear and that there are no technical barriers.

The partner survey would be sent to all 200 YCL partners in the Youth Empowerment Alliance component– with the exception of those who will be taking part in a key informant interview as a part of the country studies.

### 4.10 Limitations of the Evaluation

The inception process has identified the following limitations and risks to the evaluation process:

**Table 8: Evaluation Limitations and Mitigation Strategies**

| **Limitation**  | **Mitigation Strategy** |
| --- | --- |
| Due to COVID-19 travel restrictions the data collection process must be conducted remotely. This creates a number of challenges for the evaluation process: | * To ensure the full coverage proposed for the sampling required the evaluator is also proposing that the data collection period have a duration of six weeks and that additional interviewers/facilitators based in the region be added to the team.
 |
| * Use of internet-based communications platforms may limit access to some potential participants based on connectivity and internet cost issues
 | * Where this is the case and to ensure it is possible to reach more marginalized and vulnerable groups of youth, the evaluation may need to ask if the UNDP COs or partners concerned can assist with this internet access in safe settings.
 |
| * The project covers a wide range of countries and a fairly complex set of strategies at multiple levels. The sampling process proposed while purposive in approach, may miss some significant project successes and/or challenges in the countries not included in the sample.
* Given the time difference between the lead evaluator’s location and that of the potential evaluation respondents it may be difficult to cover the full sample size outlined in Table 7.
 | * The Youth Co:Lab team will provide feedback on the proposed country sample and project component selection and help identify any significant gaps that need to be addressed by the sampling approach.
* The online surveys will also allow for participation of diverse groups and genders of youth participants from countries not included in the country study sample and regional KIIs.
* The Evaluation Manager was able to find 3 qualified volunteers from UNDP offices in the region who will assist with the interviews and FGDs to provide greater accessibility for evaluation participants.
 |
| * Another important that could potentially limit access to evaluation participants is that of language as many will not speak English fluently.
 | * Youth Co:Lab/UNDP has agreed to provide interpreters for FGDs and KIIs as needed.
 |
| * Not all of the data needed to answer the evaluation questions credibly may be available.
 | * Youth Co:Lab is providing considerable human resource/logistics support to help obtain the data needed.
* Multiple lines of evidence process are proposed to help obtain the data needed from more than one source.
 |
| * Results are tracked at the country level but there are no country-specific annual/multi-annual targets for these results. This limits the evaluation’s ability to assess effectiveness and efficiency at the national level in a comparable and systematic way to the regional results.
 | * The country studies will review national level results to the extent possible and indicate /triangulate how these contribute to project level results. Otherwise the country studies will focus on a more in-depth qualitative analysis of YCL approaches and results within the countries selected.
 |
| * Some project results are based on self-reporting by project beneficiaries and it will only be possible to verify these in a limited number of FGDs and KIIs
 | * The evaluator is including a question on self-reported results in the youth participants survey.
 |

### 4.11 Evaluation Ethics and Principles

The evaluation process will apply UNDP’s core evaluation principles to ensure it is conducted in a way that is in alignment with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards, UNEG’s 2020 ethical guidelines and the handbook “*Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation: Towards UNEG Guidance”.*

As applied to this evaluation these core evaluation principles include:

* Fair power relations and empowerment in the interview and data collection process
* Independence and impartiality
* Transparency
* Quality and credibility
* Intentionality and use of evaluation
* Application of ethics practices to ensure confidentiality for and the safety of evaluation respondents and participants
* Feedback and consultation processes and evaluation methodologies designed to foster ownership of the evaluation results and recommendations, and innovative thought leadership in the area of youth social entrepreneurship and innovation.

## 5. Data Analysis Approaches

### 5.1 Theory of Change Mapping

The evaluation’s proposed methodology draws upon the project’s theory of change to help determine both the analytical approaches and which data collection methods it will use. The Theory of Change also informs the development of the evaluation matrix and the evaluator will reference it at the end of the evaluation through contribution analysis and multiple lines and levels of evidence. This Theory of Change mapping is particularly applicable to the effectiveness questions which address what are the most effective project strategies to achieve Youth Co:Lab’s key results at the downstream, mid-stream and upstream levels.

### 5.2 Contribution Analysis

The evaluation will use contribution analysis to develop an overall ‘performance story’ for Youth Co:Lab’s work on the empowerment of diverse groups and genders of youth social entrepreneurs and social innovation leaders and its work with its diverse partners. It will synthesize evidence from secondary sources, FGDs, KIIs and the case studies to assess plausible contributions to observed and documented changes as well as explore alternative explanations. The Outcome Harvesting methodology is a specific tool the evaluation will use to help collect data to inform this analysis.

### 5.3 Capacities Assessment

The evaluation will use data from semi-structured interviews, FGDs and secondary document synthesis to identify stakeholder capacity, gaps, strategic opportunities and vulnerabilities. The capacity assessment will focus on:

1. Ability to form strong coalitions or partnerships related to youth social entrepreneurship and innovation
2. Acquisition of 21st Century skills among diverse groups and genders of youth
3. Having access to a strong knowledge and research base related to youth in the region inclusive analytical tools
4. Ability of key stakeholders to adopt and implement inclusive youth social entrepreneurship and innovation policies and programs
5. Developing effective messaging related to youth social entrepreneurship and innovation.
6. Ability of the project to maintain the flow of positive benefits and services (efficiency and sustainability).

###  5.4 Audience Analysis

The evaluation will include an assessment of the audience for the project’s knowledge products and tools. The evaluator will collect this data through the use of with targeted interviews, data from the web-surveys, relevant website analytics and other social media analytic reports. The data from this analysis will feed into the final evaluation analysis (multiple lines and types of evidence).

5.5 Empowerment Analysis

Based on these multiple lines of analysis and particularly drawing upon the data from web-based surveys, the evaluation will also provide an empowerment analysis. This will examine and assess the different ways in which the Youth Co:Lab project has contributed to the empowerment of diverse groups and gender of youth in the Asia Pacific region. The analysis will also delve into what constitutes youth empowerment in the different project contexts.

### 5.6 Network Analysis

The evaluation analysis will present a simple graph that maps the intersections and complementarity between the different project components at the downstream, mid-stream and upstream levels.

### 5.6 Multiple Lines and Levels of Evidence

The use of mixed methods in the evaluation process will provide multiple lines and types of evidence that will make a structured approach to analysing diverse data sets possible. This also helps provide diverse sets of credible data to answer the evaluation questions. For this evaluation an extensive document review, KIIs, FGDs, web-based surveys, website reviews, contribution analysis, organizational capacity assessment, , empowerment analysis and network analysis will constitute these different lines of evidence and to help triangulate the evaluation findings. Using the metadata for each piece of evidence (sources and tools), the evaluator will sort and cluster these different lines of evidence under the relevant evaluation questions and indicators, e.g., it will assess the project’s design sustainability based on multiple data sources and forms of measurement.

##  Cross-cutting Issues

How Youth Co:Lab has addressed cross-cutting issues is a major focus of the evaluation.

3 of the 17 evaluation questions explicitly address either gender issues or the inclusion of vulnerable and minority youth. This is further complemented by the inclusion of an additional 8 indicators for other evaluation questions that will specifically measure how well the project has addressed the priority needs of specific groups and genders of youth within the context of those questions. For these questions and indicators, the final evaluation report will include a sub-heading that reports back on and analyzes the significance of the related data collected from the perspective of gender, vulnerable and minority youth. This analysis will be disaggregated as much as possible by specific demographic group. The caveat is that in some cases the sample size for some demographic groups may be too small to draw project-wide conclusions. In those instances, the analysis would focus on the lessons learned from the experiences and insights shared by these evaluation participants.

The Empowerment Lens approach included as a part of the evaluation’s proposed analytical frameworks will also serve as a tool to assess in which ways the project is contributing to the empowerment of specific groups of youth in different contexts.

The evaluation process will also strive to ensure that there is a representative mix of young people from a gender, vulnerable and minority group perspective in the FGDs conducted at the country and regional levels. The aim would be to ensure a similar level/proportion of participant of female, male participants and those from vulnerable and minority groups as participated in the project, e.g., if 60% of the young social entrepreneurs or leaders in a specific program or activity were female, then 60% of the FGD participants should be female. The FGDs, particularly those related to the Movers program will also be organized to ensure that they are accessible to youth with disabilities. The evaluation will also provide simultaneous translation where needed for the FGDs and KIIs to ensure that participation in these FGDs and KIIs is as inclusive as possible. The web-based survey on the project website will also provide additional opportunities for diverse youth to participate and self-identify as belonging to a specific demographic group (should they so choose).

The main challenge in addressing cross-cutting issues related to gender, vulnerable and minority youth is that neither the project’s log frame or any of its progress reports include much data disaggregated by these intersectional demographic characteristics. Most data related to participation and outcomes is aggregated through the term youth. Therefore, the evaluation will only be able to collect and analyze data disaggregated at this level through its FGDs, KIIs and web-based survey and through the collation of the diverse project trackers. This may limit the ability of the evaluation process to assess the extent to which the project has led to positive outcomes for specific groups of youth based on their unique demographic characteristics or to determine the extent of their inclusion.

## Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix presented in Table X provides a detailed outline of the evaluation assessment categories, questions, the proposed indicators, data collection methods and tools and analytical methods. There is a base of 17 evaluation questions and 48 indicators. Given the evaluation resources available and the broad scope of this regional project there may be a need to further streamline the evaluation indicators to really focus on what is the core of what is needed to adequately inform the design of the next phase of Youth Co:Lab.

**Table 9: Evaluation Matrix**

| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators/ Success Standards****Legend: Q = Qualitative Indicator; # = Quantitative Indicator** | **Data Sources and Collection Methods** | **Methods for Data Analysis** | **Evidence availability/****reliability****0-None or N/A****1-Weak/low****2-Fair/medium quality****3-Strong/high** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 1 Relevance** |
| 1. What are the strengths and potential gaps in terms of project design and implementation advancing youth empowerment and addressing their priority needs in the Asia-Pacific?
 | 1.1 Project components directly address the priority needs of: * % of Youth social entrepreneurs and leaders who had access to the project have access to business finance and mentorship.
* % of the involvement of diverse groups and genders of youth in social innovation leadership.
* # of capacity building and technical support related to inclusive youth policy development of governments
* # of Private sector links to corporate social responsibility and access to building youth-led businesses and youth markets (Q)

1.2 Extent of disaggregation of participation by diverse groups and genders of youth in project indicators (#)1.3 The degree to which the project has clarity on the design, objectives and expected outcomes (Q)1.4 The extent to which the project design informed by and addresses diversity analysis and needs of diverse groups of youth (Q)1.5 Adequacy of disaggregation of results by regional and country levels.  | FGDsKIIsWeb surveyDocument reviewWebsite reviews* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. To what extent and in what ways has the project evolved to respond to changes in the operational context due to the COVID-19 pandemic?
 | The extent in which the project design and operations were revised to respond to the challenges generated by the COVID-19 pandemic. (Q) | FGDsKIIsDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 2 Coherence** |
| 1. To what extent is the project aligned to the strategic priorities of its key stakeholders, including key UN strategies and private sector partners?
 | The degree to which the project design, approaches and target groups address priority objectives of: * The last UNDP’s Regional Programme Document (2018-2021)
* The last UNDP’s Strategic Plan (2018-2021)
* Youth 2020
* UN Strategy on Youth
* SDGs
* Citi Foundation’s Pathways to Progress Initiative
* UNDP policies on Human Rights, LNOB and inclusive practices

(Not at all, to limited extent, to moderate degree, to significant degree) (Q) | Document reviewKIIs* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Citi Foundation staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
 | **3-Strong/high** |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 3 Effectiveness** |
| 1. What are the results achieved against the project RRF indicators?
 | 4.1 # of project results achieved against project RRF indicators for each stakeholder group at the downstream, mid-stream and upstream level (to be presented in table format) (Q)4.2 Identification of areas in which project has not achieved its expected results (Q)4.3 Description of any unexpected results (both negative and positive) (Q)4.4 Description of specific project results related to the empowerment of diverse groups of young women (Q)4.5 Description of specific project results related to the vulnerable and minority youth (Q) | FGDsKIIsWeb surveyDocument reviewWebsite reviews* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Empowerment Analysis
* Capacities Assessment
* Theory of Change Mapping
 | **3-Strong/high** |
| 1. Which key internal and external factors have contributed to, affected and/or impeded achievement of expected results?
 | 5.1 Identification and description of key internal factors that have contributed to, affected and/or impeded achievement of expected results (Q)5.2 Identification and description of key external factors that have contributed to, affected and/or impeded achievement of expected results (Q) | FGDsKIIsDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Theory of Change Mapping
* Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Empowerment Analysis
* Network Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. What is the added value of the project’s regional approach?
 | 6.1 Identification and description of the opportunities the regional approach provided (Q)6.2 Extent to which the project was able to tap into these opportunities (Not at all, to a limited degree, to moderate degree, to significant degree) (Q)6.3 Extent to which project management at regional and national levels facilitated:* Effective and efficient project implementation
* Exchange of lessons learned and relevant knowledge across the region and among diverse stakeholders
* Agile business models and funding mechanisms

(Not effective, Limited effectiveness, moderate effectiveness, highly effective) (Q) | KIIsDocument review* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Network Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. How effective have the Youth Empowerment Alliance and related partnerships been at the regional and national levels in building an enabling environment and strengthening the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship and social innovation leadership in the Asia-Pacific?
 | 7.1 Number of partnerships established by the YEA at regional and national levels (#)7.2 Extent of increased engagement of diverse groups and genders of youth in activities that demonstrate local, national and/or global citizenship (Q & #)7.3 Number of diverse groups and genders of youth that have increased capacity and 21st century skills (#)7.4 Number of diverse groups of and genders of youth that have increased access to finance and technical advice to support the start-up and growth of social enterprises (#) | FGDsKIIsWeb surveyDocument reviewWebsite reviews* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Empowerment Analysis
* Network Analysis
* Theory of Change Mapping
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. How effective have the project’s communications activities been in terms of increasing visibility of the youth empowerment agenda and influencing decision making among key stakeholders in the region?
 | 8.1 # of following key stakeholder groups that report positively on their use of Youth Co:Lab’s key knowledge products for in helping with their visibility and empowerment. * Diverse groups and genders of youth
* National government stakeholders
* Private sector partners
* CSO and academic partners (Q & #)

8.2 Response or changes in behaviour/actions taken to diverse social media and communications strategies and options YCL has used by youth and diverse partners (Q) | FGDsKIIsWeb surveyDocument reviewWebsite reviews* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Network Analysis
* Audience Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. How effective has the project been in mainstreaming youth empowerment in UNDP at the national and regional levels and in its different thematic areas of work?
 | Extent and ways in which Youth Co:Lab actions and knowledge products have influenced the integration of youth empowerment at the Country Program and Regional program levels within UNDP’s different thematic areas of work(Not at all, to a limited degree, to a moderate degree, to a significant degree) (Q & #) | KIIsDocument review* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 4 Efficiency** |
| 1. Have sufficient resources (financial and human) been strategically allocated for the achievement of project results?
 | 10.1 Number and type of project’s results that met /did not meet targets within parameters of project’s allocated resources (Q & #)10.2 Number and type of project’s results that did not meet targets within parameters of project’s allocated resources due to resource-related issues (Q & #)10.3 Number and type of project’s results that met or did not meet targets related to the empowerment of the most vulnerable youth and young women within parameters of project’s allocated resources (Q & #) | KIIsDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. Is the partnership structure used the most effective and efficient means to support achievement of the intended results?
 | 11.1 Description of partnership structures project uses and the ways these have supported achievement of project results (Q)11.2 Amount and percentage of project funding and resources co-leveraged from other stakeholders (#)11.3 Extent to which partnership structure supports youth-led initiatives related to project objectives (Q & #)11.4 Description of potential alternative partnership structures (Q) | FGDsKIIsDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. To what extent did project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
 | 12.1 Existence of a project M&E system/process and M&E personnel (Q)12.2 Frequency & timeliness of monitoring reports (Q)12.3 Project workplans revised in response to M&E data provided by M&E system as needed (Not at all, to limited extent, to moderate degree, to significant degree) (Q) | KIIsDocument review* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 5 Sustainability** |
| 1. To what extent can the achieved results be expected to be sustainable?
 | 13.1 Number and type of outcomes likely to be sustainable for the project stakeholders/participants, including for young women and minority youth, such as youth with disabilities, sexual minorities or indigenous youth (Q & #)13.2 Identification and description of factors that will either contribute to or impede the sustainability of project’s results such as scalability, continuity of funding and stakeholder/beneficiary capacity (Q) | FGDsKIIsDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
* Empowerment Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 6 Gender** |
| 1. To what extent has the project been able to mainstream gender throughout the intervention, including its design, implementation and monitoring?
 | To what extent gender is mainstreamed in the project design, implementation, including M&E framework. (Q) | KIIsDocument review* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
* Empowerment Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. To what extent have the project’s actions to strengthen the capacities of the youth entrepreneurship ecosystem been gender-responsive?
 | 15.1 Description of ways in which the project’s actions to strengthen the capacities of the youth entrepreneurship ecosystem have been gender-responsive. (Q)15.2 Number of project actions/interventions to strengthen capacities of youth entrepreneurship system that have been gender-responsive (# & Q) | FGDsKIIsWeb surveyDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
* Empowerment Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| **Evaluation Criteria # 7 Human Rights/ LNOB** |
| 1. What have been the most effective strategies to empower young women and vulnerable and minority youth?
 | 16.1 Description of project strategies and business models designed explicitly to empower young women and vulnerable and minority youth (Q)16.2 Number and proportion of young women and vulnerable and minority youth that have directly benefited from participating in different project components compared to total number of participants (#)16.3 Identification and description of key challenges to the empowerment of young women and vulnerable and minority youth (Q) | FGDsKIIsWeb surveyWebsite reviewsDocument review* Diverse Groups of Female/Male Youth
* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
* Empowerment Analysis
* Theory of Change Mapping
* Audience Analysis
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |
| 1. To what extent has the project been able to promote structural/ institutional changes to advance the inclusion and empowerment of minority youth (e.g., influence policies or regulations)
 | 17.1 Number of gov’t, CSO, academic and private sector stakeholders that have increased capacity and knowledge of effective ways to be inclusive of female, vulnerable and minority youth (#)17.2 Increase in institutional human and/or financial resources to address the inclusion of female, vulnerable & minority youth in institution’s work (Q & #) | KIIsDocument review* Government
* Private sector partners
* CSO partners
* Academic partners
* UNDP regional and CO staff
* Project staff
 | * Contribution Analysis
* Analysis of Multiple Lines of Evidence
* Capacities Assessment
* Empowerment Analysis
* Theory of Change Mapping
 | **2-Fair/medium quality** |

## Proposed Schedule

**Table 10: Proposed Schedule**

| **Milestones/Deliverables** | **Work Days Allocation**  | **Deadline/Duration****(all dates in 2022)** | **Responsible** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I. Inception Phase**  |  |  |  |
| Induction Meetings  | .25  | Week of Jan 10[[8]](#footnote-8) | Paulina Meskus/Youth Co:Lab Team |
| Background document review  | 2 | Week of Jan 17- 21 | Dana Peebles |
| Drafting of Inception Report  | 6.5  | Weeks of Jan 17 – 28, **Due Jan. 31.**  | Dana Peebles |
| Consolidated feedback from Reference Group | (9) | **By Feb. 11 & Mar. 15** | Paulina Meskus/Reference Group/ Youth Co:Lab team |
| Revisions of Inception Report and Evaluation Matrix | 1.75 | **By Mar. 17** | Dana Peebles |
| **Sub-Total for Evaluator** | **10** |  |  |
|  |
| **II. Data Collection Phase** |  |  |  |
| Document Review | 3 |  | Dana Peebles |
| Organization of KIIs, FGDs and web surveys |  | Mar. 14 – Apr. 15 | Paulina Meskus plus Team/COs |
| Conducting of KIIs, FGDs and web surveys | 17  | Mar. 14 – Apr. 15  | Dana Peebles/ Regional Coordinator/Volunteers Evaluators with translation/technical support as needed |
| **Sub-Total for Evaluator** | **20** |  |  |
|  |
| **III. Data Analysis & Report Drafting** |  |  |  |
| Analysis of KII, FGD and Survey data | 2.5 | Mar. 14 – Apr 19 | Dana Peebles |
| 1st draft of Final Evaluation Report | 7.5 | **By April 29** | Dana Peebles |
| 5 case studies | 5 | **By April 29[[9]](#footnote-9)** | Dana Peebles |
| Consolidated feedback from Reference Group | (10) | **By May 13** | Paulina Meskus/Reference Group/ Youth Co:Lab team |
| 2nd draft of Final Evaluation Report | 2.5 | **By May 18** | Dana Peebles |
| Consolidated feedback from Reference Group | (5) | **May 23, 2022** | Paulina Meskus/Reference Group/ Youth Co:Lab team |
| Final draft of Final Evaluation Report | .5 | **May 25, 2022** | Dana Peebles |
| Drafting of Evaluation Brief (content)[[10]](#footnote-10) | 1 | **By May 26** | Dana Peebles |
| Evaluation Presentation | 1 | **May 27** | Dana Peebles |
| **Sub-Total for Evaluator** | **20** |  |  |
|  |
| Total Days  | **50** | **Total duration – 23 weeks** |  |

## 9. Resource Requirements

The evaluation process will require the following resource support for each phase of the evaluation as outlined below:

**Inception Phase**

* Sharing of background documents on the project
* Timely provision of consolidated feedback on the Inception Report and proposed methodology and evaluation approaches

**Data Collection Phase**

For the **FGDs** the evaluation will need the following human resource support from the Youth Co:Lab team and the UNDP Offices located in the six countries selected for the more in-depth review:

* Identification of potential FGD participants based on the selection criteria outlined in Table 7. These lists should include higher numbers than those outlined in Table 7 to help ensure that we can reach sufficient numbers of participants for the sample sizes to be credible from a data collection and analysis perspective.
* Provision of their contact information to Youth Co:Lab’s Evaluation Manager or availability to make these contacts directly to the potential FGD participants.
* To help ensure the participation of vulnerable and minority youth the evaluation will also need UNDP country and/or regional Asia Pacific offices to provide interpretation at a simultaneous translation level. this interpretation should be done by non-UNDP or project personnel. This includes sign language interpretation where needed.

For the KIIs, the evaluation will need the Youth Co:Lab team and the UNDP Offices located in the six countries selected for the more in-depth review to:

* Help identify the key informants to be interviewed based on the selection criteria outlined in Table 7.
* Set up the KIIs and provide logistical support for the interviews as well as interpretation where needed.

At the **regional and Country Office level**, the evaluation will need approximately an hour of personal time for each Key Informant identified. They will also need to provide any additional documents or contacts that will assist in the evaluation’s data collection objectives and triangulation.

For the **web-based surveys** UNDP/Youth Co:Lab will need to:

* Provide technical support to administer the surveys and provide confidential access to survey responses solely to the evaluator and translator (where the latter is applicable).
* Provide spoken word versions of the youth participant survey to ensure the site is accessible to young people with visual disabilities (if the site is already being used by young people with visual disabilities.
* Ideally also translate the survey into Chinese and translate the responses back into English.

For the **video-based case studies** there will be the need for UNDP to provide editing services and to help identify a youth facilitator to lead the interview discussion. The evaluator would be present during this interview but would not serve as the lead interviewer.

**Size and Location of Evaluation Team:** Given the broad scope of the evaluation and the fact that it covers multiple countries and time zones, UNDP has identified three UNDP staff from its evaluation network based in the region who have volunteered to conduct up to five KIIs each. YCL has also agreed to hire a Regional Coordinator Consultant to facilitate most of the FGDs and some KIIs to make participation in the evaluation process more accessible to the different stakeholders who need/want to take part. The inclusion of two qualified youth evaluators in this volunteer team also models the objectives of the project by ensuring that a youth perspective is included in the data collection and analysis process. The lead evaluator will provide training and oversight of the work done by the volunteer member of the team as well as conduct approximately 40 to 45 of the interviews and FGDs directly. She will use the other time not spent conducting approximately half of the interviews and FGDs providing this technical support, adding an additional survey to the evaluation process and conducting a more in-depth analysis of communications analytics, etc. than would have been possible without this additional support.

**Report Drafting**

* Timely provision of consolidated feedback on the 1st and 2nd drafts of the Final Evaluation Report
* Provision of any additional documents and/or contacts needed to fill any gaps identified in the draft report

The evaluator will be responsible for the primary content of the final evaluation report and standard report formatting. UNDP/Youth Co:Lab would need to provide any graphics, photos , layout and the more advanced/slick formatting required for the dissemination of the approved report and the evaluation products.

## 10. Proposed Outline of the Draft and Final Report

This outline is based on the core structure outlined in UNDP’s Independent Evaluation Office Guidelines, with a few suggested revisions to the order of presentation. The evaluator notes that the introductory sections from sections 1 to 9 asks for a lot of background information which would require around 20 pages to provide the level of detail requests. While the ideal would be to present the main body of the report in no more than 30 pages to help keep the report reader-friendly, because of the structure requested and given the number of evaluation questions and indicators, the report is more likely to be approximately 45 pages in length plus annexes.

1. **Title and Opening pages** including the following basic information:
* Name of the evaluation intervention
* Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
* Countries of the evaluation intervention
* Names and organizations of evaluator
* Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
* Acknowledgements.
1. **Project and evaluation information details** on second page (as one page):

|  |
| --- |
| **Project/outcome Information** |
| **Project/outcome title** |  |
| **Atlas ID** |  |
| **Corporate outcome and output** |  |
| **Country** |  |
| **Region** |  |
| **Date project document signed** |  |
| **Project dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
|  |  |
| **Total committed budget** |  |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** |  |
| **Funding source** |  |
| **Implementing party[[11]](#footnote-11)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation information** |
| **Evaluation type (project/ outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)** |  |
| **Final/midterm review/ other** |  |
| **Period under evaluation** | **Start** | **End** |
|  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |
| **Evaluator email address** |  |  |
| **Evaluation dates** | **Start** | **Completion** |
|  |  |  |

1. **Executive Summary (four/ five page maximum).** A stand-alone section of two to three pages that will :
* Briefly describe the intervention of the evaluation (the project(s), programme(s), policies, or other intervention) that was evaluated
* Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended uses
* Describe key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods
* Summarize principal findings, conclusions and recommendations.
1. **Table of contents**
* including list of boxes, figures, tables, and annexes with page references.
1. **List of acronyms and abbreviations**

1. **Introduction**
* Will describe the purpose of the evaluation, why the intervention is being evaluated at this time, and why it addressed the questions it did
* Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they wanted to learn from the evaluation and why, and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
* Identify the project being evaluated
* Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report meets the evaluation purposes evaluation and information needs of the intended users.
1. **Description of the Intervention**

This section will:

* Describe **what is being evaluated**, **who seeks to benefit** and the **problem or issue** the evaluation seeks to address.
* Explain the **expected results model or results framework**, **implementation strategies** and the key **assumptions** underlying the strategy / theory of change.
* Link the intervention to UNDP’s RPD and Strategic Plan and Youth 2030 and the UN Strategy on Youth
* Identify the **phase** in the implementation of the intervention and any **significant changes** that have occurred over time (e.g. in the log frame), and explain the implications of these changes for the evaluation.
* Identify and describe the **key partners** involved in the implementation and their roles.
* Include data and an analysis of the **specific groups of young people and other stakeholders** affected.
* Describe the **scale of the intervention**, such as the number of components
* Indicate the **total resources**, including human resources and budgets.
* Describe the context of the **social, political, economic, and institutional factors**, and the **geographical landscape** within which the intervention operated, and the related challenges and opportunities project implementation and outcomes. Identify the key issues related to young people that the project has addressed from the perspective of gender equality, human rights, vulnerable/ marginalized groups, and leaving no one behind.
* Indicate any **design weaknesses** (or other **implementation constraints**
1. **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**
	1. Scope
	2. Purpose and Objectives
	3. Evaluation criteria and questions
2. **Evaluation Approach and Methods**
	1. Methods and Analytical Approaches/frameworks
	2. Data Collection Methods and Triangulation Approaches
		1. Inclusive Data Collection Processes
		2. Data sources.
		3. Sample and sampling frame
		4. Data collection procedures and instruments
		5. Stakeholder participation: who participated, how the level of involvement of female, male and otherwise gendered young people and how this contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and the results.
		6. Ethical considerations\* (could be moved to an annex)
		7. Background information on evaluator\* (could be moved to an annex)
		8. Identification of Major limitations of the Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies
3. **Data Analysis Procedures**
	1. Analysis Steps for each methodology used
	2. Data Triangulation and Verification processes
	3. Link of Analyses to the Evaluation Questions
	4. Data Analysis Limitations and gaps.
4. **Key Findings**
	1. Relevance
	2. Coherence
	3. Effectiveness
	4. Efficiency
	5. Sustainability
5. **Lessons** **Learned**
6. **Conclusions**
7. **Recommendations**
8. **Annexes.**

Evaluation TOR

Evaluation Matrix

Data-collection Instruments

List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted

Website sites

List of supporting documents reviewed.

Project results framework.

Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluationsigned by evaluators.

**Annexes**

## Annex 1: Excerpt from Evaluation Terms of Reference

EXCERPT from TERMS OF REFERENCE

3) EVALUATIONCRITERIAANDKEYGUIDINGQUESTIONS

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. In this evaluation, the questions are structured under the following criteria, defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC): relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In addition, the evaluation will address cross-cutting questions related to gender, human rights/leaving no one behind principles.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria  | Guiding questions  |
| Relevance and coherence  | To what extent have the project design and the project’s implemented activities been relevant for addressing the identified development challenges and advancing youth empowerment in the region? To what extent and in what ways does the project offer a unique value proposition to project stakeholders that distinguishes it from other initiatives in the youth empowerment space? To what extent is the project aligned to the strategic priorities of its key stakeholders, including UNDP Country Offices and private sector partners? To what extent and in what ways has the project evolved to respond to changes in the operational context due to the COVID-19 pandemic? What are the strengths and potential gaps in terms of project design and implementation in responding to the current context in Asia-Pacific? What are the risks and opportunities? To what extent have the project design and implementation been consistent with the gender-responsive, human rights based and LNOB / diversity and inclusion approaches? To what extent have the project activities been relevant for supporting key ecosystem stakeholders, such as governments and the private sector, to advance youth empowerment in the region?  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | To what extent have young people, including young women, vulnerable and minority youth, found the project relevant to their needs? How coherent is the project with the UNDP’s RPD and SP and Youth 2030 – the UN Strategy on Youth?  |
| Effectiveness  | To what extent has the project achieved its expected results? What are the areas of greatest achievements? What are the results achieved against the project RRF indicators? In which areas has the project not achieved its expected results? What have been the main challenges in the achievement of the expected results? What are the key internal and external factors that have contributed to, affected and/or impeded the achievement of expected results? How effective were the project implementation strategies? What is the added value of the project’s regional approach and to what extent the project has been able to tap into opportunities provided by the regional approach? Do the project workstreams complement each other effectively? What are the strengths and potential gaps? How effective have the project’s partnership strategies been for building the enabling environment and strengthening the ecosystem for youth entrepreneurship, leadership, and social innovation in Asia-Pacific? What are the key lessons learnt from the partnerships and how could these be leveraged in the future? How effective have the thought leadership, advocacy and communications activities of the project been in terms of increasing the visibility of the youth empowerment agenda and influencing decision making among the key stakeholders in the region? What have been the biggest successes and challenges? What have been the most effective strategies in terms of empowerment of young women and vulnerable and minority youth? What have been the key challenges in advancing this agenda? How effective has the project been in mainstreaming youth empowerment in UNDP and UN programming and in different thematic areas of work?  |
| Efficiency  | Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and utilised efficiently to achieve expected results? Have resources been sufficient for the achievement of results? To what extent and in what ways was the project able to leverage co-investment from other stakeholders to support the achievement of project objectives? To what extent was the project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results at regional and national levels? To what extent did project M&E systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly? Has the partnership structure of the project been effective and efficient to support achievement of the intended results?  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Have the resources been used efficiently to support the empowerment of the most vulnerable youth and young women?  |
| Sustainability  | To what extent can the achieved results be expected to be sustainable? Which factors are contributing positively to the sustainability of the project’s results? What are some of the possible challenges in terms of sustainability of the project results? What kind of factors are contributing to the sustainability of the results achieved in the empowerment of young women and minority youth, such as youth with disabilities, sexual minorities or indigenous youth? What are the key challenges or gaps? To what extent will financial and other resources and institutional structures be available to sustain the results and benefits achieved by the project beyond the project period? What can be done to improve the sustainability of the project results?  |
| Gender  | To what extent has the project been able to mainstream gender throughout the intervention, including design, implementation and monitoring of the project? What are the key project results with regards to direct empowerment of young women and addressing systemic barriers to the empowerment of young women? To what extent has the project been able to strengthen the capacities of the youth entrepreneurship ecosystem in terms of gender-responsiveness?  |
| Human rights /Leaving no one behind  | To what extent has the project been able to reach the most vulnerable, such as young people with disabilities, indigenous youth, LGBTIQ+ youth, and support the empowerment of minority youth? To what extent has the project been able to empower and support young social entrepreneurs to support vulnerable communities through their business models? To what extent has the project been able to promote structural/institutional changes to advance the inclusion and empowerment of minority youth (e.g., influence policies or regulations) To what extent has the project been able to build the capacities of the key stakeholders to advance the leave no one behind agenda?  |
| Lessons Learnt and recommendations  | What are the key lessons learnt during the project implementation? What are the recommendations for the future programme design? The recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear and result- oriented and realistic in terms of implementation. What could be the potential focus areas or priorities of the project’s strategy in its next cycle?  |

4) METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will adhere to the UNDP Evaluation Policy and UNDG Norms & Standards (provided in Annexes) with its findings and judgements based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the review report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework and analysis should also be discussed in the report.

The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the evaluation reference group, partners and other stakeholders, and direct beneficiaries, including young women and minority youth.

The final evaluation should employ a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments. The final methodology and data sources will be agreed upon in the inception report of the final evaluation. Some of the possible methods and data sources are provided in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Desk review  | Review of relevant documents including but not limited to:- Project Document, Annual Work Plans, results and resources framework (RRF) and Theory of Change (ToC)- Project Monitoring and Evaluation Data- Survey data- Project progress and activity reports- Third party feedback on the project- Knowledge products, advocacy and communication materials and content- Youth and stakeholder consultation data collected during the project implementation- Financial and management information- Relevant global, regional, and national research studies- RBAP Regional Programme Document, RBAP Regional Programme Document Mid-Term Review, UNDP Strategic Plan, Youth 2030 – UN Strategy on Youth- Citi Foundation guidelines  |
| Interviews and focus group discussions  | - Interviews with UNDP senior management, Citi Foundation, selected government counterparts and private sector partners, project stakeholders, entrepreneurs, youth participants, others- Focus group discussions with youth participants, Youth Co:Lab partners, UN partners, others. - Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and Project team as well as with other partners will be organised to ensure triangulation of the various data sources to maximise the validity and reliability of data.  |
| Case studies  | - Case studies on youth-led social enterprises / young entrepreneurs (selection to be determined)- Case studies on specific Youth Co:Lab country programmes (country selection to be determined)  |
| Surveys  | - Of youth, youth entrepreneurs, partners- Tracer surveys of participants in Youth Co:Lab activities  |

Annex 2: Defining Characteristics of FreeChild Models of Participation**[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**Participation Model # 1: Adult Initiated and Controlled**

* The agenda and mandates for program/policy are set by adults *(*this includes events
* Young people are informed and consulted about program/ policy design and implementation, but adults make all related decisions
* Young people are given the information they need to participate effectively
* Young people have some understanding why they have been asked to participate, who makes the program/policy decisions and why, and engage in the participation process participate voluntarily.

**Participation Model #2: Adult Initiated with shared decision-making**

* Adults initiate programme/policy design, and implementation and evaluation or set related agendas, and share related decision-making with young people
* Adult leadership of adults is predominant
* Young people have access to all relevant information needed to provide informed input.
* Young people’s input informs planning, decision-making and evaluation of program/policy design and implementation.

**Participation Model #3: Young People Initiated with Shared Decision-making and Support**

* Young people initiate programme/policy actions and agendas
* Young people may share decision-making and program/policy development and actions in consultation with adults, e.g. *,* policy decisions may be made in collaboration with adults because legally they may have to control the organisation’s governing bodies.
* Young people’s skills and leadership are predominant
* Young people are recognized as social change motivators and adults are engaged in the process for their experience, abilities and access to resources.
* Energy, ideas, enthusiasm, knowledge and skills of young people are combined with the ideas, knowledge, skills and access to resources of adults to affect change in program or policy at the organizational, community, national or international levels.
* The skills and the power of young people are the impetus to affect change in the program/policy or at the organizational, community level, national or international level.

**Participation Model # 4: Non-Participation or Participation that is not Meaningful**

* Young people have no input into process / policy or their input is routinely disregarded or their participation is only of a token nature
* Young people are not given the information they need to participate effectively or activities / discussions are not conducted in a way that is accessible to them
* Participation by young people is not voluntary and does not engage them

**Participation Model #5: Community Members Equally Make Decisions and Take Action**

* This approach engages every person within an organization or community in decision-making and action using consultative and democratic processes.  Through these processes all community members experience inclusive, meaningful, and empowering participation

## Annex 3: Interview Guides – Focus Group Discussions

**Focus Group Discussion Semi-Structured Discussion Guides**

1. **For Female/Male /Other Genders Youth Involved in the Movers Program**

Number of participants

Number female

Number male

Number that identify in other gender category

Number that identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countries in which located

No. from urban location:

No. from rural location:

1. How long have they each been involved in the program?
2. What roles have you been playing in the Movers program?
3. What kind of training and new skills did you receive as a part of the Movers program?
4. How have you been able to use this training and skills?
5. What is different about your life before and after taking part in the Movers program?
6. What things made these changes possible?
7. Which specific groups of youth have you been able to reach with this training?
8. Are there any specific groups you haven’t been able to reach?
9. Is there anything you would suggest to improve or change the Movers program in the future?
10. **FGD Question Guide for Female/Male/Other Genders of Youth involved in TOT Facilitated by a Movers Volunteer**

Number of participants

Number female

Number male

Number that identify in other gender category

Number that identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countries in which located:

No. from urban location:

No. from rural location:

1. What kind of training did you receive from a Movers Volunteer?
2. When did you receive this training?
3. What was the most important thing you learned from this training?
4. What new skills did you gain from this training?
5. How have you been able to use this new knowledge and skills?
6. What is different about your life before and after taking part in the Movers training?
7. What things made these changes possible?
8. Has the work you have done because of this training led to any changes in your community? If so, what were these?
9. Were there any specific groups of youth who did not take part in this training?
10. Is there anything you would suggest to improve the Movers Volunteer training in the future?
11. **FGD Question Guide for Female/Male/Other Genders of Youth involved in Youth Empowerment Alliance**

Number of participants

Number female

Number male

Number that identify in other gender category

Number that identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countries in which located

No. from urban location:

No. from rural location:

1. In what ways are you involved in the Youth Empowerment Alliance?
2. When did you become involved with the YEA?
3. Have you been able to start a social enterprise as a result of your participation in the YEA? (or are in the process of doing so)?
4. What is different about your life before and after taking part in the youth social enterprise support program in your country?
5. What factors made these changes possible?
6. What kinds of new opportunities have you been able to access for your social enterprise?
7. What things made it possible for you to have these new opportunities?
8. What kinds of new connections/partnerships have you been able to make?
9. Has your involvement in the youth social enterprise support program directly benefited or helped other people? Which groups and how?
10. Is there anything you would suggest to improve or change the Youth Empowerment Alliance in the future?
11. **FGD Question Guide for Female/Male/Other Genders of Youth involved in Springboard Program**

Number of participants

Number female

Number male

Number that identify in other gender category

Number that identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countries in which located

No. from urban location:

No. from rural location:

1. In what ways are you involved in the Springboard program?
2. When did you become involved with the Springboard program?
3. What have been the most important things you have learned through the Springboard program?
4. What is different about your life before and after taking part in the Springboard program?
5. What factors made these changes possible?
6. What kinds of new opportunities have you been able to access?
7. What factors made it possible for you to have these new opportunities?
8. What kinds of new connections/partnerships have you been able to make?
9. Have you been able to start or plant to start a new social enterprise or have taken on a social innovation leadership role in your community because of the Springboard program?
10. Are there any specific groups of youth you have observed that haven’t been able to take in the Springboard program? (Why do you think this is?)
11. Is there anything you would suggest to improve or change the Springboard program in the future?
12. **FGD Question Guide for Female/Male/Other Genders of Youth involved in Regional Summits (between 4 -5 participants)**

Number of participants

Number female

Number male

Number that identify as other gender

Number that identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countries in which located

Which regional summit they attended: (In person) Virtual

No. from urban location:

No. from rural location:

1. Why and how were you picked to attend a Youth Co:Lab regional summit?
2. What year did you participate?
3. What were the most important things you learned from taking part in the regional summit?
4. What is different about your life before and after taking part in this summit?
5. What factors made these changes possible?
6. What kinds of new opportunities have you been able to access?
7. What kinds of new connections/partnerships have you been able to make?
8. What have you done related to social innovation and social enterprises since taking part in the Regional Summit?
9. What inspired you to do this?
10. Are there any specific groups of youth you have observed that were not well represented at the regional summit?
11. Is there anything you would suggest to improve or change the regional summits in the future?
12. **FGD Question Guide for Female/Male Youth/Other Genders involved in National Summits**

Number of participants

Number female

Number male

Number that identify as other gender

Number that identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countries in which located

Which national summit they attended (year and country)

No. from urban location:

No. from rural location:

Year they each participated in the national summit in their country:

1. Why and how were you picked to attend a Youth Co:Lab national summit?
2. What were the most important things you learned from taking part in the national summit?
3. What is different about your life before and after taking part in a national summit?
4. What things made these changes possible?
5. What kinds of new opportunities have you been able to access?
6. What kinds of new connections/partnerships have you been able to make?
7. What have you done that is related to social innovation and social enterprises since taking part in the national Summit?
8. What inspired you to do this?
9. Are there any specific groups of youth you have observed that were not well represented at the national summit?
10. Is there anything you would suggest to improve or change the national summits in the future?
11. **FGD Guide for UNDP Country Offices with Youth Focal Point Turnover**

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location:

Gender: Female Male Other (if they choose to self-identify)

1. When did you start working as a Youth Focal Point for your CO?
2. What does this role involve?
3. How long a gap was there between your appointment in this role and the time the former Youth Focal Point left this position? (EQ 6,13)
4. What kind of support/induction information did you get when you started to serve in the Youth Focal Point role? (EQ 6)
5. What else would have been helpful for you to fulfill your Youth Focal Point responsibilities? (EQ 6, 13)
6. To what kinds of key results, including unexpected results has the YCL work contributed in your country? (EQ 4)
7. To which factors and strategies/approaches do you attribute these results? (EQ 4, 7)
8. Which of these results/changes do you think are sustainable and why? (EQ 13)
9. How well does Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system work for you and your CO? Is there anything you would change? (EQ 12)
10. Is there anything Youth Co:Lab should continue to do or do more of in the future to address UNDP’s regional and national programming needs related to youth and youth issues?

## Annex 4: Semi-Structured Interview Guides for Key Informants

1. **Interview Guide for UNDP Regional Youth Advisor and Regional Advisors Familiar with YCL**

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location:

Gender: Female Male Other (if they choose to self identify)

1. In what way is your work connected /involved with the Youth Co:Lab project?
2. In what ways is the Youth Co:Lab project relevant for UNDP at the regional and national levels? (EQs 1, 3)
3. Has the Youth Co:Lab project contributed to the way in which you integrate youth issues in regional programming in any way ( including in your area of thematic programming)? If so, how? (EQ 9)
4. To which key results related to the UN’s youth objectives has the Youth Co:Lab project contributed at the regional level? (EQ 4)
5. To which factors and strategies/approaches do you attribute these results? (EQ 4, 7)
6. Which of these results/changes do you think are sustainable and why? (EQ 13)
7. How has the Youth Co:Lab project responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 at the regional level?(EQ 2)
8. Do you think the Youth Co:Lab project has allocated its resources strategically to achieve its key objectives? (EQ 10)
9. How effective and efficient have you found the regional structure of the Youth Co:Lab project from a project delivery perspective? (EQ 6)
10. How effective and efficient have you found the regional and national partnership structure of the Youth Co:Lab project? (EQ 11)
11. Are you aware of and/or make use of any of the knowledge products and tools the Youth Co:Lab project has produced? (EQ 8)
12. Has the Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system provided you with timely and useful information to help guide your work with diverse groups and genders of youth? (EQ 12)
13. How has Youth Co:Lab addressed the barriers to the participation of female youth in UNDP supported programming in the region? (EQ 16)
14. How has Youth Co:Lab addressed the barriers to the participation of vulnerable and minority youth (such as youth with disabilities, youth from minority ethnic groups, youth who identify as LGBTQI, etc.) in the region? (EQ 17) Who is not yet being reached?
15. Is there anything Youth Co:Lab should continue to do or do more of in the future to address UNDP’s regional programming needs related to youth and youth issues?

**Interview Guide for UNDP Regional Thematic Advisors not directly familiar with YCL:**

1. In what way is your work connected /involved with the Youth Co:Lab project?
2. In what ways is working with diverse groups and gender of youth in your thematic area relevant for UNDP at the regional and national levels? (EQs 1, 3)
3. What factors have contributed to the way in which you integrate youth issues in regional programming in any way (including in your area of thematic programming)? If so, how? (EQ 9)
4. What are key results for diverse groups and genders of youth to which UNDP has contributed at the regional level in your thematic area? (EQ 4)
5. To which factors and strategies/approaches do you attribute these results? (EQ 4, 7)
6. Which of these results/changes do you think are sustainable and why? (EQ 13)
7. How has UNDP’s work in the region in your thematic area responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 at the regional level?(EQ 2)
8. What is the best way to structure a regional project for youth that operates at both the regional and national levels? (EQ 6)
9. Are you aware of and/or make use of any of the knowledge products and tools the Youth Co:Lab project has produced? (EQ 8) If none, what youth-related tools/knowledge products do you use?
10. How does UNDP’s work in your thematic area address the barriers to the participation of female youth in in the region? (EQ 16)
11. How does UNDP’s work in your thematic area address the barriers to the participation of vulnerable and minority youth (such as youth with disabilities, youth from minority ethnic groups, youth who identify as LGBTQI, etc.) in the region? (EQ 17) Who is not yet being reached?
12. What are the priority areas of support needed for diverse groups and genders of youth in this region in your thematic area in the future?

**3. Interview Guide for UNDP Country Offices**

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location:

Gender: Female Male Other (if they choose to self-identify)

1. In what way is your work connected /involved with the Youth Co:Lab project and since when?
2. In what ways is the Youth Co:Lab project relevant for UNDP in this country (EQs 1, 3)
3. Has the Youth Co:Lab project contributed to the way in which your CO integrates youth issues in its programming? If so, how? (EQ 9)
4. To which key results related to UNDP’s youth objectives has the Youth Co:Lab project contributed at the national level? (EQ 4)
5. To which factors and strategies/approaches do you attribute these results? (EQ 4, 7)
6. Which of these results/changes do you think are sustainable and why? (EQ 13)
7. Were there any unexpected results? Or results not achieved? (EQ4)
8. How has the Youth Co:Lab project responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 for your Country Office and for the diverse groups and gender of youth participants?(EQ 2)
9. Do you think the Youth Co:Lab project has allocated its resources strategically to achieve its key objectives and results? (EQ 10)
10. What works well and what does not for your CO with regard to YCL’s regional structure of from a project delivery perspective? (EQ 6)
11. How effective / efficient have you found the regional and national partnership structure of the Youth Co:Lab project? (EQ 11)
12. How/to what extent do the project stakeholders and beneficiaries and CO staff make use of the knowledge products and tools the Youth Co:Lab project has produced? (EQ 8)
13. How well does Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system work for your CO? Is there anything you would change? (EQ 12)
14. How has Youth Co:Lab addressed the barriers to the participation of female youth in UNDP supported programming in the region? (EQ 16)
15. How has Youth Co:Lab addressed the barriers to the participation of vulnerable and minority youth (such as youth with disabilities, youth from minority ethnic groups, youth who identify as LGBTQI, etc.) in the region? (EQ 17) Who is not yet being reached?
16. Is there anything Youth Co:Lab should continue to do or do more of in the future to address UNDP’s regional programming needs related to youth and youth issues?

**4. Interview Guide for Private Sector Partners**

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location:

Gender: Female Male Other Gender (if self-identified)

1. What year did your company become involved with the Youth Co:Lab project?
2. What role does your business play in the Youth Co:Lab project?
3. How does the work the Youth Co:Lab project respond to the priority needs of diverse groups and genders of youth in the region/country? (EQ 1)
4. What are the main results or changes you have observed among the diverse groups of female and male youth with which your company has worked through the Youth Co:Lab project? (EQs 4, 7, 15)
5. What factors do you think contributed to these results? (EQ5)
6. Which of these results/changes do you think will be sustainable in the future? Why? (EQ13)
7. What have been the benefit of participating in the Youth Co:Lab project for your company? (EQs 3, 11)
8. How could these benefits be further enhanced in the future? (EQs 3, 11)
9. What works well about the type of partnership structure you have with the Youth Co:Lab project? Is there anything you would change? (EQ 11)
10. Has your company revised or adopted any of its policies/practices related to working with youth? If so, to which factors do you attribute these changes? (EQ 7)
11. How has the Youth Co:Lab project responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 for your company and for the diverse groups and gender of youth participants?(EQ 2)
12. What is or should be the role of the private sector in this process?
13. Has the Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system provided you with timely and useful information to help guide your work with diverse groups and genders of youth? (EQ 12)
14. What has been the value added of the Youth Co:Lab project being regional for your company (if any)? (EQ6)
15. Are you familiar with or have made use of any of Youth Co:Lab’s knowledge products or tools? (EQ8)
16. Which specific groups and genders of youth do you think project is reaching and which ones have not been able to participate? (EQs 16, 17). How can this be improved?

**5. Interview Guide for Government Partners**

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location/Country:

Gender: Female Male Other Gender (if self identified)

1. What year did your government become involved with the Youth Co:Lab project?
2. What role does your government play in the Youth Co:Lab project?
3. How does the work the Youth Co:Lab project respond to the priority needs of diverse groups and genders of youth in your country? (EQ 1)
4. What are the main results or changes you have observed among the diverse groups and genders of youth who have been involved with the Youth Co:Lab project and your government? (EQs 4, 7, 15)
5. What factors do you think contributed to these results/changes? (EQ5)
6. Which of these results/changes do you think will be sustainable in the future? Why? (EQ13)
7. What has been the benefit of participating in the Youth Co:Lab project for your government? (EQs 3, 11)
8. How could these benefits be further enhanced in the future? (EQs 3, 11)
9. What works well about the type of partnership structure you have with the Youth Co:Lab project? (EQ 11)
10. Is there anything you would change? (EQ 11)
11. Has your government revised or adopted any of its policies/practices related to working with youth in the past five years? If so, to which factors do you attribute these changes? (EQ 7)
12. How has the Youth Co:Lab project responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 for your government and for the diverse groups and genders of youth participants?(EQ 20
13. Has the Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system provided you with timely and useful information to help guide your work with diverse groups and genders of youth? (EQ 12)
14. What has been the value added of the Youth Co:Lab being a regional project for your government (if any)? (EQ6)
15. Are you familiar with or have made use of any of Youth Co:Lab’s knowledge products or tools? (EQ8) (How have these helped your work?\_
16. Which specific groups and genders of youth do you think project is reaching and which ones have not been able to participate? (EQs 16, 17). (How could this be improved?)

**6. Interview Guide for CSO or Academic Partners**

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location/Country:

Gender: Female Male Other (if self identified)

1. What year did your organization become involved with the Youth Co:Lab project?
2. What role does your organization play in the Youth Co:Lab project?
3. How does the work the Youth Co:Lab project respond to the priority needs of diverse groups and genders of youth in your region and country? (EQ 1)
4. What are the main results or changes you have observed among the diverse groups and genders of youth who have been involved with the Youth Co:Lab project and your organization? (EQs 4, 7, 15)
5. What factors do you think contributed to these results/changes? (EQ5)
6. Which of these results/changes do you think will be sustainable in the future? Why? (EQ13)
7. What has been the benefit of participating in the Youth Co:Lab project for your organization? (EQs 3, 11)
8. How could these benefits be further enhanced in the future? (EQs 3, 11)
9. What works well about the type of partnership structure you have with the Youth Co:Lab project? (EQ 11)
10. Is there anything you would change? (EQ 11)
11. Has your organization revised or adopted any of its policies/practices related to working with youth? If so, to which factors do you attribute these changes? (EQ 7) (Probe for which types of policies)
12. How has the Youth Co:Lab project responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 for your organization and for the diverse groups of youth participants?(EQ 20
13. Has the Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system provided you with timely and useful information to help guide your work with diverse groups and genders of youth? (EQ 12)
14. What has been the value added of the Youth Co:Lab being a regional project for your organization (if any)? (EQ6)
15. Are you familiar with or have made use of any of Youth Co:Lab’s knowledge products or tools? (EQ8) (How has this contributed to your work?)
16. Which specific groups and genders of youth do you think project is reaching and which ones have not been able to participate? (EQs 16, 17). (How could this be improved?)
17. **Semi-Structured Interview Guide for YCL Staff**

(N.B. some adjustments to these questions will be made for the actual interviews based on the specific role each YCL staff member plays)

Date:

Name(s):

Position(s):

Location:

Gender: Female Male Other (if they choose to self-identify)

1. What way is your role in the Youth Co:Lab project?
2. What are the YCL key results related to youth social enterprises and entrepreneurships in the region and at the national level, including unexpected results? (EQ 4)
3. To what do you attribute these results? (EQ 4, 7)
4. What are YCL key results related to youth social innovation and leadership in the region and at the national level, including unexpected results? (EQ 4)
5. To what do you attribute these results? (EQ 4, 7)
6. To what kinds of results has YCL contributed with regard to policy or regulation changes that promote youth rights, inclusion and social entrepreneurship, including unexpected results??
7. To what do you attribute these results?
8. Which of all these diverse results/changes you have mentioned do you think are sustainable and why? (EQ 13)
9. How has the Youth Co:Lab project responded to the changes brought about by COVID-19 at the regional and national levels?(EQ 2)
10. Do you think the Youth Co:Lab project has allocated its resources strategically to achieve its key objectives? How and why? (EQ 10)
11. What works well and what doesn’t about how the project is structured at the regional and national levels? (EQ 6,11)
12. How has the Youth Co:Lab project contributed to the way UNDP integrates youth issues in its regional and national programming? (EQ 9)
13. How are different stakeholders/beneficiaries making use of the knowledge products and tools the YCL project has produced? (EQ 8) (other communications observations?)
14. What works well and what doesn’t with Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system? (EQ 12)
15. Which specific groups of youth is the project reaching well and why? (EQ 16)
16. Which groups are you not reaching as well and why?
17. What changes in its approaches does YCL need to make in the future to address regional and national programming needs related to youth and youth issues?
18. **KII Question Guide for Female/Male Youth/Other Genders involved in Regional Summits**

Date:

Name:

Regional Summit participated in:

Gender: Female Male Other (if they choose to self-identify)

Do they identify as belonging to any type of vulnerable or minority group (provide details of which type of group)

Countryin which located

From urban location:

From rural location:

1. Why and how were you picked to attend a Youth Co:Lab Regional summit?
2. You were selected to take part in this interview as you have been identified as being a successful participant in the Youth Co:Lab project. What does this success look like for you?
3. What helped you achieve this success?
4. What were the most important things you learned from taking part in the regional summit?
5. What is different about your life before and after taking part in the regional summit?
6. What things made these changes possible?
7. What kinds of new opportunities have you been able to access?
8. What kinds of new connections/partnerships have you been able to make?
9. What have you done t related to social innovation and social enterprises since taking part in the Regional Summit?
10. What inspired you to do this?
11. Have these post Regional Summit activities helped any other people? If so, in what ways and how many?
12. Are there any specific groups of youth you have observed that were not well represented at the national summit?
13. Is there anything you would suggest to improve or change the regional summits in the future?
14. Is there anything you would suggest to improve the Springboard or Youth Empowerment Alliance programs in the future?
15. Do you have any other success stories about your experience with the Regional Summit, Springboard or Youth Empowerment Alliance that you would like to share?

## Annex 5: On-line Survey Questions: Youth Participant Survey and Partner Survey

**A. Youth Participant Survey (All participant groups)**

Introduction:

* Will explain purpose of evaluation, who can participate, guarantee confidentiality, provide deadline for responding, give estimated time it will take to respond and contact details for any questions/clarifications.
1. Name
2. Age
3. Location (country)
4. Location in country : Urban \_\_\_\_ Rural \_\_\_\_\_
5. Gender Female \_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_ Other Gender Identity (if you choose to self identify) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you belong to any of the following groups (please tick all categories which apply to you:
	1. A person with a disability (either physical or mental)
	2. An ethnic minority
	3. A gender minority
	4. Indigenous
	5. Migrant
	6. Live in a humanitarian assistance setting such as a refugee camp or shelter
7. In which Youth Co:Lab activities have you taken part and what year did you start taking part in this/these activities? Please tick all that apply to you.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| Regional Youth Summit |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Youth Co:Lab National Summit/dialogue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asia-Pacific Forum on Youth Leadership, Innovation and Entrepreneurship (APFYLIE) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional Dialogue on Youth Indigenous Social Entrepreneurship |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth Co:Lab National program |  |  |  |  |  |
| Springboard program |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movers Volunteer program |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth Empowerment Alliance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use Youth Co:Lab website as a resource or for information/making connections |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please describe briefly) |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities helped you gain have more power over decisions that directly affect your life? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
2. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities made you want to become more involved with helping your community? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
3. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities made you feel better about yourself and/or given you more confidence to make choices and take actions? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
4. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities **m**ade you feel as if your opinions, needs and experiences as a young person are valued and acted on by other groups, networks, or organizations (including the government)? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
5. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities helped you develop a positive sense of belonging to your community? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
6. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities **m**ade you feel empowered to take positive action in your community? Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
7. If yes, what kinds of actions have you taken? (Please describe briefly)

- Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities:

1. Has your participation in Youth Co:Lab activities helped build your ability to thrive despite adversity?
2. Increased the skills or knowledge you need to: (Please tick all that apply)
	1. Be a leader and social innovator. Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
	2. Earn a living. Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
	3. Start a social enterprise. Yes \_\_\_ No\_\_\_
3. Has your participation in Co:Lab activities changed your life in any other ways? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
4. If yes, in what ways? (Please describe briefly)
5. Do you have any success stories or lessons learned about your experience working with Youth Co:lab you would like to share with us? If so, please describe briefly below:

Success Story:

Lessons learned:

1. Would you like to take part in an online discussion group about what the next phase of the Youth Co:Lab should be doing to help empower youth as social innovators and leaders in the Asia Pacific region? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_
2. If yes, please include your email address and we will be in touch with you soon to invite you to join this group. The discussion chat will be taking place from March 28th to April 5th.

Email address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for taking part in this survey. Your insights, inputs and experience are contributing to Youth Co:Lab’s design and approaches for the next phase of the project.

**B. Partner Survey (Youth Empowerment Alliance Partners)**

Introduction:

* Will explain purpose of evaluation, who can participate, guarantee confidentiality, provide deadline for responding, give estimated time it will take to respond and contact details for any questions/clarifications.
1. Name:
2. Position in organization:

\_\_\_\_\_ Director/CEO

\_\_\_\_\_ Finance Staff

\_\_\_\_\_ Program Staff

\_\_\_\_\_ Policy Staff

\_\_\_\_\_ Research Staff

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

1. Gender: Female Male Other Gender (if you choose to self-identify \_\_\_\_)
2. Location of organization:

\_\_\_\_\_ Australia

 \_\_\_ Bangladesh

\_\_\_\_\_Bhutan

\_\_\_\_\_Cambodia

\_\_\_\_\_China

\_\_\_\_\_ Fiji

\_\_\_\_\_ Japan

\_\_\_\_\_ Laos PDR

\_\_\_\_\_ Hong Kong SAR

\_\_\_\_\_ India

\_\_\_\_\_ Indonesia

\_\_\_\_\_ Maldives

\_\_\_\_\_ Mongolia

\_\_\_\_\_ Nepal

\_\_\_\_\_ New Zealand

\_\_\_\_\_ Pakistan

\_\_\_\_\_ Papua New Guinea

\_\_\_\_\_ Philippines

\_\_\_\_\_ Republic of Korea

\_\_\_\_\_ Samoa

\_\_\_\_\_ Singapore

\_\_\_\_\_ Soloman Islands

\_\_\_\_\_ Sri Lanka

\_\_\_\_\_ Timor Leste

\_\_\_\_\_ Thailand

\_\_\_\_\_ Vanautu

\_\_\_\_\_ Vietnam

\_\_\_\_\_ Other: Please indicate:

1. Is your organization a:

\_\_\_\_\_ Government organization

 \_\_\_\_\_ Private sector company

\_\_\_\_\_ Civil Society Organization

\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Institution

\_\_\_\_\_ Donor ( Bilateral or Multilateral organization)

1. What year did your organization start working with the Youth Co:Lab project?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. What is the role of your organization in the Youth Co:Lab project? (Please tick all that apply)

\_\_\_\_ Funder (for overall project or national program)

\_\_\_\_ Finance support for youth social entrepreneurs (grant or loan)

\_\_\_\_ Business Mentor or Technical Support

\_\_\_\_ Policy advice/development

\_\_\_\_ Consultations with diverse groups and genders of youth

\_\_\_\_ Knowledge product or tool production

\_\_\_\_ Provision of networks and connections to youth

\_\_\_\_ Training of youth on social innovation

\_\_\_\_ Training of youth on social enterprise development and growth

\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

1. What are the main results or changes you have observed among the diverse groups and genders of youth your organization has worked with through the Youth Co:Lab project? (EQs 4, 7, 15) (Please tick all that apply).

\_\_\_\_ New youth social enterprises established

\_\_\_\_ Youth social enterprises scaled up in size and reach

\_\_\_\_ Youth social enterprises have become more sustainable

\_\_\_\_ Increased social and business connections for youth social entrepreneurs and innovators

\_\_\_\_ Increased confidence of youth social entrepreneurs and leaders

\_\_\_\_ Increased influence of youth social entrepreneurs in your organization’s policy work

\_\_\_\_ Increase in skills in financial literacy

\_\_\_\_ Increase in digital literacy and skills

\_\_\_\_ Increased leadership skills

\_\_\_\_ Increased negotiation and inter-personal skills

\_\_\_\_ Increased engagement with and contribution to their communities

\_\_\_\_ Have not observed any significant changes

\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

1. What factors do you think contributed to these results for youth social entrepreneurs and leaders? (EQ5)

\_\_\_\_ Training/mentorship provided by my organization

\_\_\_\_ Increased access to financing

\_\_\_\_ Increased access to business connections

\_\_\_\_ Increased connections with other youth social entrepreneurs /leaders

\_\_\_\_ Increased understanding of youth social entrepreneurs and leaders by my organization

\_\_\_ Access to knowledge products and tools provided by Youth Co:Lab

\_\_\_\_Other (Please describe)

1. Which of these results/changes for young social entrepreneurs and leaders do you think will be sustainable in the future? (EQ13)

\_\_\_\_ New youth social enterprises established will continue to operate

\_\_\_\_ Youth social enterprises scaled up in size and reach

\_\_\_\_ Youth social enterprises have become more sustainable

\_\_\_\_ Increased social and business connections for youth social entrepreneurs and innovators

\_\_\_\_ Increased confidence of youth social entrepreneurs and leaders

\_\_\_\_ Increased influence of youth social entrepreneurs in your organization’s policy work

\_\_\_\_ Increase in skills in financial literacy

\_\_\_\_ Increase in digital literacy and skills

\_\_\_\_ Increased leadership skills

\_\_\_\_ Increased negotiation and inter-personal skills

\_\_\_\_ Increased engagement with and contribution to their communities

\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

1. For any of the points in Question 10 which you don’t think are sustainable could you briefly describe why?
2. What has been the benefit of participating in the Youth Co:Lab project for your organization? (EQs 3, 11) (Please tick all that apply)

\_\_\_\_ Increased access to new markets for my organization’s services and/or products

\_\_\_\_ Increased use of my organization’s services and/or products (not for profit)

\_\_\_\_ Improved credibility and reputation of my organization

\_\_\_\_ Opportunity for organization staff to feel they are making a contribution

\_\_\_\_ Increased understanding of the priority needs of youth social entrepreneurs and leaders

\_\_\_\_ Increased capacity to work effectively with youth social entrepreneurs and leaders

\_\_\_\_ Haven’t experienced a significant benefit from participating in the YEA

\_\_\_\_ Other benefits (Please describe)

1. What works well and what does not about the type of partnership structure you have with the Youth Co:Lab project? Please tick all options/statements that apply. (EQ 11)

| **Statement** | **Works well** | **Does not work well** | **Not applicable** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Partnership structure is clear about who in the partnership is responsible for what |  |  |  |
| Partnership structure provides access to regional and national resources and opportunities |  |  |  |
| It makes the work my organization is doing with young social entrepreneurs and leaders easier and more effective |  |  |  |
| It provides timely feedback about what is working well or what still needs improvement |  |  |  |
| It fits well with my organization’s policies and regulations |  |  |  |
| Partnership structure is respectful of and appreciates what my organization has to offer  |  |  |  |
| Financial processes are easy to manage and disbursements are timely |  |  |  |
| Project reporting requirements are clear and do not require large amounts of staff time |  |  |  |
| Other (Please describe) |  |  |  |

1. Has your organization revised or adopted any of its policies/practices related to working with youth since working with Youth Co:Lab?

 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

\_\_\_\_\_ Not applicable

1. If yes, to which factors do you attribute these changes in policy/practices? (EQ 7)

\_\_\_\_ Positive change in public opinion or in institutional culture related to youth inclusion

\_\_\_\_ Increased staff capacity related to working with youth or on youth issues

\_\_\_\_ Increased access to relevant tools and knowledge products from Youth Co:Lab

\_\_\_\_ Increased funding support to support youth-related policy revision or development

\_\_\_ Access to technical advice to support youth-related policy revision or development

\_\_\_\_ Increased participation of youth social innovators and leaders in the community

\_\_\_\_ Increased participation of youth social innovators in my organization’s work

\_\_\_\_ External support from non-Youth Co:Lab sources

\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

1. Has the Youth Co:Lab’s monitoring system provided you with timely and useful information to help guide your work with diverse groups and genders of youth? (EQ 12)

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

\_\_\_\_\_ Not applicable

1. What has been the value added of the Youth Co:Lab project being regional for your organization (if any)? (EQ6)

\_\_\_\_ Increased access to regional partners and connections

\_\_\_\_ Access to regional resources related to youth social enterprises and social innovation leadership

\_\_\_\_ Increased leverage to advocate for support for youth social enterprise and social innovation leadership issues

\_\_\_\_ Increased access to training related to youth social enterprise and social innovation leadership

\_\_\_\_ Access to exchange of good practices in the region

\_\_\_\_ Increased reputation from working with a regional UN project on these issues

\_\_\_\_ Other (Please describe)

\_\_\_\_ No significant value added of regional approach

1. Are you familiar with or have made use of any of Youth Co:Lab’s knowledge products or tools? (EQ8)

\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_ No

1. If yes, which Youth Co:Lab knowledge products and/or tools have you found to be the most useful?
2. Which specific groups and genders of youth do you think project is reaching effectively or is not reaching well (EQs 16, 17). Please tick all that apply.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Is reaching effectively | Is not reaching effectively |
| Urban youth (middle class and above) |  |  |
| Urban youth (poor) |  |  |
| Rural youth (middle class and above) |  |  |
| Rural youth (poor) |  |  |
| Urban youth (well educated) |  |  |
| Urban youth with low education  |  |  |
| Rural youth (well educated) |  |  |
| Rural youth with low education levels |  |  |
| Youth with disabilities |  |  |
| Ethnic minority youth |  |  |
| Youth from gender minorities (LGBTQI+) |  |  |
| Female youth  |  |  |
| Male youth |  |  |
| Youth living in humanitarian assistance context or refugee settlement  |  |  |
| Other category of minority or vulnerable youth (please describe) |  |  |

1. If you have any success stories related to work you have done with diverse groups and genders of youth that you would like to share please describe briefly below provide a link which describes this good practice or success story.
2. If you have share any lessons learned you would like to share based on your experience working with Youth Co:lab please describe briefly here.

Thank you for taking part in this survey. Your insights, inputs and experience provide valuable insights that are contributing to Youth Co:Lab’s design and approaches for the next phase of the project.
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