
Overall Assessment: The scope of the evaluation is not sufficiently focused especially in view of the fact that: (i) this evaluation does not focus on evaluation questions/issues by focus areas but rather on evaluation criteria; furthermore not all five criteria are evaluation criteria: “coordination” and “monitoring”; (ii) the evaluation does not address a very important evaluation criteria which is sustainability or potential sustainability of effects/benefits over time. The methodological design, tools are systematically presented in the text and examples of tools are included in the annexes yet triangulation approaches are not clearly explained. Moreover, the link between the evaluation criteria and the evaluation questions presented in the ToR is not evident. The design is very much oriented around the so called “evaluation criteria” without much focus on the main outcomes by focus area which undermines the understanding of the extent to which results have been achieved, partially achieved or not achieved; Constraints/limitations are not mentioned in the Methodology section. Evaluators’ findings appear to be based on credible data however the number of interviews is very slim and hardly any beneficiaries have been consulted. Conclusions are presented on a very simplistic way without a clear link to findings; judgment presented in the conclusions is not based in evidence. Recommendations do not flow from conclusions; they are not ranked in order of priority nor targeted. Yet they present some valid inputs that may be taken into account for the next programming cycle.

<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.</td>
<td>POOR: The report is not well structured; it is organized around “evaluation criteria”. This choice is unfortunate since it does not allow for an overview of the Country Programme results. Very complete set of Annexes including use of methodology tools. (ToRs are not included in annexes but are uploaded at Docushare, CO is encouraged to integrate ToR as an annex of the evaluation report); The author should limit the use of acronyms and jargon to facilitate easy reading for a standard reader not familiar with UN terminology. A positive point of the report is schemes and graphs are used to present information in a user-friendly way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (where applicable)
- 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 Executive Summary is concise and provides an acceptable overview of the evaluation main results and recommendations though conclusions are presented in a very simplistic way.

### 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

**POOR:** The evaluation incorrectly considers “coordination” and “monitoring” as evaluation criteria, whilst not making reference to sustainability or potential sustainability which would have been appropriate to use as an evaluation criteria. The omission of impact is logical given the short timeline (3 years).

Methodology tools are indicated in the Annexes yet triangulation approaches could have been more clearly presented. The link between the evaluation criteria and the evaluation questions presented in the ToR is not evident. The design is oriented around the “evaluation criteria” without focus on the main outcomes by focus area which undermines understanding of the extent to which results have been achieved, partially achieved or not achieved; as well as whether effects are sustainable, etc.

Constraints/limitations are not mentioned in the Methodology section. Stakeholders’ participation appears to have taken place.

### 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:** The Evaluation Findings appear to be based on credible data (mostly, interviews / focus groups) as well as appropriate use of secondary data (reports, surveys). Summaries of results of interviews are available on the annexes. However the number of interviews is small and few beneficiaries have been consulted.
4. Reliability of Data continued

Sources are not indicated on the tables produced on implementation execution rates (for example: we don’t know whether budgets and expenditures figures come from Atlas data or AWPs). Baseline data has been provided in the annexes.

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: In this very descriptive report, hardly any analysis is produced. Evaluators did reconstruct the intervention logic of UNFPA’s Country Programme which was useful to assess the relevance though often the analyses stops at the level of the outputs and in some cases even at the level of activities. Regarding efficiency (see previous point) there is also some confusion between efficiency and effectiveness criteria (example: see page 33 – effectiveness of budget execution).
Findings are presented in a cumbersome manner; evaluators have chosen to structure their findings and related analysis around the 3 DAC criteria (relevance, efficiency and effectiveness plus 2 other coordination and monitoring, which again are not evaluation criteria). Contextual factors are not well described and the cause/effect links are not well explained.

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.

POOR: This section is give a low rating as it is too simplistic; conclusions are not clearly expressed nor linked to the earlier findings or presented in a hierarchical manner.
Nonetheless good examples of lessons learned is a strong point on this evaluation.
### 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:** Recommendations do not flow from conclusions; they are not ranked in order of priority nor targeted. Yet they present some valid inputs that may be taken into account for the next programming cycle.

### 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 evaluation questions are not realistic given the time neither allocated to the evaluation nor sufficiently focused to orient the scope of the exercise. As a result, the report cannot possibly meet the needs as expressed in the ToR. However the recommendations and lessons learned chapters provide very useful and relevant inputs for the preparation of the next Programming cycle.
<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></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>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td></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><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