

Data collection and analysis

Desk Review

More than 321 Spotlight Initiative documents, produced during the period from 2019 to 2023, were reviewed to assess whether they should be analysed as part of the Compendium desk review. Documents included the Global Annual Report, Country Annual Reports, Regional Annual Reports, Annex D: Promising or Good Practices Reporting Templates, Midterm Assessments, Knowledge Products, Meta Review, Trust Fund Reports, programme showcase products and other reports. After reading and analysing for quality and relevance of the documentation in terms of sharing good or innovative practices and lessons learned, a total of 268 documents were selected and coded in the ImpactMapper software, according to the type of case study by thematic areas and lessons learned by pillar and thematic area. In addition, to deepen knowledge on scale up and sustainability factors connected to good and innovative practices, a 10-question survey was sent to all Spotlight Initiative programmes. In total, 10 Spotlight Initiative teams submitted survey responses, including the Africa Regional Programme, Afghanistan, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Mozambique, Niger, Samoa and Zimbabwe.

Summary table of documentation analysed by type of report and year

Type of report	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total
Global Annual Report	1	1	1	1	4
Country Annual Report	9	23	23	24	79
Regional Annual Report	2	5	5	5	17
Annex D	14	26	30	25	95
Mid-Term Assessment			38	1	39
Knowledge Brief			15	7	22
UN Trust Fund Annual Report	2	2		2	6
Meta Review				1	1
Programme Showcase Product			4		4
Other		1			1
Total	28	58	116	66	268

Site Visits

To dive deeper into a number of country contexts that displayed positive results and good practices, site visits were conducted in five countries with representation across Spotlight Initiative's five regions. To select countries for site visits, the ImpactMapper team thoroughly reviewed outcomes from the country programme documentation and proposed a list of countries. With Spotlight Initiative's team, the ImpactMapper team then finalised the choice of countries based on a few factors, including availability, whether their programmes were in their last year of implementation, or whether they had received recent field visits by other assessment teams. Physical site visits were carried out in Ecuador, Malawi and Trinidad and Tobago, and virtual site visits were conducted in Papua New Guinea and Tajikistan. 114 people were interviewed overall through the country visits – 89 of which were conducted in-person and 25 of which were held online.

Limitations

Desk research limitations

The data gathered through desk research was limited to the information provided by Spotlight Initiative programmes in their reports. Where possible, external research was conducted to contextualise in-country trends related to violence against women and girls and to check if other UN agencies had published information of relevance to the case studies. Where identified, supplemental external and public resources have been hyperlinked in the case studies.

Site visit limitations

The site visits afforded a much deeper insight into a variety of projects in a country, allowing the ImpactMapper team to interview multiple stakeholders per project. Thus, these case studies are significantly more detailed than the desk review and enabled a more holistic analysis of factors connected to success, scale-up or sustainability compared to the desk review case studies where less information was available. The country case studies that are longer are by no means indicative of a greater success of site visit case studies compared to desk research case study, rather it is merely a function of the greater details derived from the data collection process.

Survey data collection limitations

Data collected from the surveys also faced some limitations. First, only 29 percent (10 of the 34) Country and Regional Programme Offices submitted completed responses. Second, in many cases, responses to the survey were very brief and high-level and did not offer substantive additions that could be used in the case studies. Where possible, extra research through internet searches was conducted to fill in gaps with published case studies from other entities, and in some cases, the team sent individual follow up questions to different Spotlight Initiative programme offices when necessary.