Overall Assessment: The report's structure is incomplete and not drafted according to the international standards (no executive summary, acronyms are not indicated in the text, methodology poorly explained, no indication of limitations). The report is written in a fragmented way, showing diverse styles and approaches which makes the report a sum of chapters with no coherence. No evaluation protocol is presented but rather a brief explanation of the process. Proper analysis of UNFPA contribution to results is not clearly presented, interventions are enumerated along with statements regarding national needs and contextual factors and cause and effect links between UNFPA support and results are very difficult to identify. Despite this, the lessons learned section contains useful observations; however it is not clear how these link to earlier analyses. Moreover, the lack of a proper conclusions stage following on from findings and results in too many recommendations and limits the scope of the evaluators to effectively communicate their assessment of results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</strong></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</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>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report’s structure is incomplete and not drafted according to the international standards (no executive summary, acronyms are not indicated in the text, methodology poorly explained, no indication of limitations). The report’s sequence does not follow standard reporting convention, instead opting to present findings separate from evaluation criteria, which is not a logical approach as criteria should be embedded in the analysis and presentation of the findings. The report is written in a fragmented way, and it is evident from the diverse styles and approaches of various chapters that there were multiple authors. There has been no effort to make the report coherent. The information provided in the annexes is limited to the very minimum requirements.
### 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

**Unsatisfactory**
There is no stand-alone Executive Summary included in the report.

### 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

**Unsatisfactory**
The methodology is briefly described including a list of methods used (interviews with stakeholders, field visits and document review). Methodological choice is not explained and justified, for example no clear reason is given to justify limiting the field visits to just one region (the ToRs foresee field missions to 3 regions; the south, central and northern regions).
A debriefing workshop was organized with the CO to present and discuss the findings yet no reference is made to the involvement of national stakeholders in this process.
No evaluation protocol is presented but rather a brief explanation of the process.

### 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**
Some sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified mostly UNFPA’s and Government documents; there is consistent use of references throughout the report.
Basic financial data regarding the budget and expenditure of the Programme is not presented in the report which hinders the analysis of efficiency.
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 chapter starts abruptly without a proper explanation on how the analysis will be conducted; general examples of interventions are provided but there is a lack of clear logic or reasoning behind the choice of those examples. Statements are made without providing clear evidence, for example it states that UNFPA support to the SWAP was relevant but it does not explain why (p 34). Interventions are enumerated together with statements regarding the national needs and contextual factors on the different areas. However, analysis of UNFPA contribution to results is not clearly presented and cause and effect links between UNFPA support and results (mainly outputs) are very difficult to detect by the reader. Findings are not presented in a clear manner as explained in criteria 1.

6. Conclusions

To assess the validity of conclusions

**Conclusions**
- Conclusions are based on credible findings;
- Conclusions are organized in priority order;
- Conclusions must convey evaluators’ unbiased judgment of the intervention.

Poor
The content of this section is a short list of key activities and some achievements but it seem isolated from the rest of the report. Conclusions amount to an overall statement which is very positive but based on very weak evidence. For example, the report states that the planned results of the Country Programme have been globally achieved without providing a consistent explanation (p 78). The Conclusions section should present the independent judgment of the evaluation team. This chapter should be a clustered set of concluding comments presented in priority order.

The Lessons learned section contains useful comments but it is not clear how this link to earlier narrative.
## 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**

Due to the lack of a logical flow from findings to conclusions to recommendations, recommendations are very broad and not targeted. Moreover, recommendations are presented by focus area but with different structures. They are too many suggestions without explaining the “how to”, thus recommendations are not operational. Recommendations are not organized by clusters nor in a logical way; prioritization of recommendations also fails because of the structure. It is unmanageable for the CO to implement all recommendations; also follow up to these recommendations will be an impossible task for the regional office.

## 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 ToRs are incomplete and poor quality; there is very little guidance on the objectives and scope of the evaluation. Furthermore the main issues / evaluation questions to which the evaluation team should respond to are not presented in the ToRs.

Despite these weaknesses, the evaluation team does not providing clear evidence-based answers regarding UNFPA’s contribution to planned results in the 3 focus areas, which is the main objective indicated in the ToRs. The reader is overwhelmed with the quantity of examples of interventions (with good or bad results) without a clear sense of the overall picture.
<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>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</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