
Time-frame for the CPE stated in the ToR: 21 days
Cost of the CPE: $22,561

Overall Assessment: The structure of the report is adequate and includes all key sections. The executive summary lacks key information from the main report, and is not well organised. The methodology section is clear and includes key details. There is a lack of data in the report and very few references are provided. Findings lack the causal link between activities and results, and supporting evidence is often absent. Conclusions repeat description of activities and the role of the lessons learned section in the report is not explained. There are a high number of recommendations which lack sufficient detail and there is confusion with the section on Future Direction. The evaluators have met the needs stated in the ToR, but could have commented on the inclusion of non-standard evaluation criteria in the ToR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards. Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure: i) Acronyms; ii) Exec Summary; iii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: Evaluation Branch, DOS ‘Country Programme Evaluation Survey’ 2012
## Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.

### 2. Executive Summary
**To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.**

Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):

- i) Purpose, including intended audience(s);
- ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para);
- iii) Methodology (1 para);
- iv) Main Conclusions (1 para);
- v) Recommendations (1 para).

Maximum length 3-4 page

**Poor**
The summary is not well organized as the methodology is located after the findings and lacks detail on the choice of tools. The summary does not include a findings section but instead a ‘brief description of interventions’, which is a combination of findings and descriptions of activities. All the recommendations are presented for PD and Gender, instead of presenting the main recommendations. In total, 29 recommendations are presented which is not appropriate for a summary. Overall the summary does not function as a standalone document.

### 3. Design and Methodology
**To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools**

Minimum content and sequence:

- Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;
- Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;
- Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;
- Details of participatory stakeholders’ consultation process are provided.
- Whenever relevant, specific attention to cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender equality) in the design of the evaluation.

**Good**
Detail on methods of data collection is included and the use of triangulation is explained clearly. Limitations are mentioned and the evaluators’ responses to some of these challenges are presented. Tools are presented in annexes including questionnaires.
The ToR include specific criteria which are not standard for a CPE (e.g. Management of CP implementation) and information to justify and explain the use of these criteria is missing.

### 4. Reliability of Data
**To clarify data collection processes and data quality**

- Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;

**Poor**
There are extremely few references to accompany the data presented in the report. Where there are references to quantitative data, they frequently lack indication of the source.
5. Findings and Analysis
To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

Findings
- Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;
- Findings are substantiated by evidence;
- Findings are presented in a clear manner

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

6. Conclusions
To assess the validity of conclusions
- Conclusions are based on credible findings;
- Conclusions are organized in priority order;

Poor
The findings frequently refer to the completion of activities with no mention of corresponding results (e.g. p.24 ‘all planned RH training activities on Antenatal Care, labour and delivery care, PNC and Family Planning, HIS, Country Commodity Manager (CHANNEL/CCM, –RHCS software) and LMIS have been implemented’.)

The causal link between activities and results is often missing (e.g. the discussion of an RH output states p.25 ‘the technical and financial support extended by UNFPA has resulted in the development of the national MMR Roadmap’, but gives no further details on the UNFPA support). Positive results are reported without supporting evidence or details about the result (e.g. p.33 ‘all these capacity development interventions have made substantial improvements…which have evidently become central for national planning’; p.38 ‘Judging by the immediate impact of UNFPA interventions…’).

The findings also include some statements that are phrased as recommendations (e.g. p.26 ‘this means that the next programme should maintain the status quo and work towards further improvement of service coverage’). There is no reference in the main report to the information contained in the annexed ‘summary of findings’.
- Conclusions must convey evaluators’ unbiased judgment of the intervention.

section. A small number of statements do function as conclusions but these are few and difficult to identify. There is no numbering or prioritization in this section. There is a separate chapter on lessons learned. Some are written as conclusions whereas others are vague and lack sufficient detail (e.g. p.69 ‘the mobile VCTS were attractive and convinced more people to carry out the VCT’; ‘fund disbursement on time is crucial and has its impact (positive/negative)’). It is not explained what the role of the lessons learned are in relation to the earlier conclusions.

7. Recommendations
To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations
- Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;
- Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible;
- Recommendations must take into account stakeholders’ consultations whilst remaining impartial;
- Recommendations should be presented in priority order

Poor
It is difficult to establish a clear link between the conclusions to the recommendations. The recommendations vary in terms of the level of detail they provide, and some are very brief and lack key details which may limit their operationalization (e.g. p.71 ‘The recruitment of HMIS specialist should be done ASAP’; ‘Establishment of sound coordination mechanism of HIV project with relevant sectors to ensure timely decision making to accelerate project output’).
Some elements of the section on ‘future direction’ are written as recommendations (e.g. ‘UNFPA should continue support to this initiative to ensure the full implementation of the GBV strategy’) but which are not presented in the recommendations section. The role of this section is not clearly explained.

8. Meeting Needs
To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the report).
In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.

Good
The evaluation report has met the needs presented in the ToR. However the inclusion of non-standard evaluation criteria in the ToR and the unusual structure for the report (multiple sections on findings) has not been commented on by the evaluators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)</th>
<th>Assessment Levels (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Findings and analysis (50)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclusions (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recommendations (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting needs (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. - if “Finding and Analysis” has been assessed as “good”, please enter the number 50 into the “Good” column. The Assessment level scoring the higher number of points will determine the overall quality of the Report.

OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Poor