EQA for UNFPA Cote d’Ivoire Country Programme Evaluation (2009-2013)


Time-frame for the CPE stated in the ToR: 45 days
Cost of the CPE: $74,180

Overall Assessment: The report is mostly well-structured and addresses the questions laid out in the Terms of Reference. However, the authors rely heavily on secondary sources and fail to appropriately discuss issues of data quality or limitations to their chosen methodology of document review and interviews. There are few signs that the evaluators triangulated information from multiple sources to increase its accuracy. These issues undercut the credibility of the evaluation. The conclusions and recommendations are mostly well supported by key pieces of evidence and are logically connected to each other.

<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>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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 (where applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: Evaluation Office ‘Country Programme Evaluation Survey’ 2013
- Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.

analysing a specific component of the programme. This makes it extremely difficult to follow the body of the report and obscures the logical argument, as the evidence is presented without a clear statement of the general analysis or conclusions.

The section “Méthodologie et processus de déroulement de l’évaluation” is part of the Introduction as a sub-section. This downplays the importance of a critical section. Nevertheless, this cannot reflect poorly on the evaluation team because the Terms of Reference include a sample structure in which the methodology is a sub-section of the introduction. The country logo and map are of poor resolution. Consultant titles, genders, and qualifications are not presented. Acronyms used in the text are defined in the List of Acronyms, but this breaks up the flow of the Executive Summary.

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 pages

Poor
The Executive Summary is an appropriate length (4 pages) and is well-organized with sub-section headers. However, the target audience is not specified. There is no consolidated description of the UNFPA country programme’s objectives or activities. The conclusions are organized by component, making it difficult to get a sense of the priority level of each.
Overall, the Executive Summary does not have enough supporting information to function as a standalone document. The conclusions are not backed up by a small number of key pieces of evidence, which makes it difficult to accept the conclusions and recommendations without looking deeper into the report for supporting facts.

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

Minimum content and sequence:
- Explanation of methodological choice, including

Poor
The methodology does not seriously discuss the potential constraints and limitations to the chosen methodology of document review and interviews with implementing partners. The only
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

limitations mentioned are logistical issues such as scheduling interviews, rather than a serious discussion of interviews and document review in the broader scope of possible evaluation methodologies. There is no consideration of how the limitations mentioned have affected the certainty of the final conclusions.

There is no discussion of triangulating information gathered from different types of interviewees. Interviews and field visits are categorized according to their methodology (i.e., as “individual,” “semi-structured,” and “focus group”). The only type of interviewee mentioned in the methodology is implementing partners, although interviews with many different types of stakeholders are mentioned in the annexes. The methodology section would benefit greatly from a discussion of how different types of stakeholders were chosen, how their perspectives or interests may differ, and how the same information was solicited from multiple types of stakeholders to validate and verify pieces of data.

There is a thoughtful discussion of triangulating information between document review and interviews. Although 38 documents are listed as having been reviewed in annex 3, many are not relevant and are not mentioned in the body of the report.

4. Reliability of Data

To clarify data collection processes and data quality

- Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;
- Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit;

Poor

Attribution of information is generally lacking, including for text in quotes that do not have citations (i.e., p32), and there are few mentions of sources or their credibility. Most data comes from secondary sources, in part because of poor planning that resulted in overlapping meetings.

The report indicates that 170 persons have been interviewed, without disaggregating into male and female interviewees or the location of interviewees and focus group participants. The evaluation rarely mentions information collected during these interviews in the body of the report.
The evaluation relies heavily on UNFPA annual reports without a discussion of the limitations of this source (i.e., pp40, 47, 52, 60). However, the evaluation team did successfully identify numerous sources of relevant data, including surveys, evaluations, and reports.

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.

Poor

The findings do not stem from rigorous data analysis and are not supported by clear evidence.

The report is overly focused on the contextual impact of the political crisis in Cote d'Ivoire, though it does not explain in detail how the crisis affected the programme. Most of the weaknesses and shortcomings identified in the programme are linked to the crisis in a simplistic manner.

There is little consideration of the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results. Indeed, for the intended goal of strengthening the right to sexual and reproductive health as part of the national programme of health (Product 1), there is only discussion of whether the national government has adopted a rights-based approach to sexual and reproductive health in several key policy documents. There is no mention of how the UNFPA’s programmes and actions may have affected that outcome (pp32-33). Other statements of attribution are made, but are not supported by evidence or cited [i.e., « De même, l’appui reçu de l’UNFPA permet l’AIBEF d’étendre la couverture géographique des services de PF dans plus de 80 points de distribution à travers le pays » (pp35-36)], leaving the reader to wonder about the credibility of the causal assertion.

Table 3 in section 4.2 adds significantly to the clarity of the analysis (p47). Section 4.2.2 is generally very well-supported with evidence and organized into conclusions about progress of the programme towards its objectives. However, this is not consistent for all the sections in the findings.
6. Conclusions
To assess the validity of conclusions
- Conclusions are based on credible findings;
- Conclusions are organized in priority order;
- Conclusions must convey evaluators’ unbiased judgment of the intervention.

**Good**
The conclusions are clearly and concisely stated. However, several conclusions may be premature or unduly optimistic about programmes that are only recently launched and therefore difficult to be adequately evaluated. For example, the “École des maris” is concluded to be driving a reduction in maternal mortality (pp73-74) despite the newness of the programme. In some cases the evaluators interpret differences in national outcomes as causal effects of programmes without considering the possibility of reverse causality (p79). Although the conclusions are numbered (albeit with some mistakes), this does not seem to be in priority order.

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

**Good**
The presentation of the recommendations makes the link to conclusions clear. The recommendations are prioritized. Most recommendations are targeted at appropriate offices within UNFPA such as the country office or headquarters. Although recommendations are broad, they are drawn from the conclusions. Specifically, the recommendation 1 on capacity building in Results-Based-Management is logically linked to many of weaknesses revealed during implementation. However, there are a number of recommendations targeted at the government that are outside of the scope of the evaluation.

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.

**Poor**
The ToR includes a number of specific questions for each programme area which are not explicitly addressed in the evaluation. The detailed questions in the Team Leader Terms of Reference (p89-90) are not outlined in the evaluation nor all specifically answered. The ToR request the evaluation team to evaluate the programme based on its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability and these categories have been used to structure the report.
<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>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Findings and analysis (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclusions (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recommendations (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting needs (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></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