Title of Evaluation Report: Evaluation of the Sixth UNFPA Country Programme to the Philippines 2005-2010

Overall Assessment: The report’s structure includes all main elements but is too lengthy in key sections and the structure does not aid the reader in gaining a clear overview of the evaluation’s results. Very little information or detail on the methodology is provided. Multiple sources of data are utilized but referencing is weak and there is low use of a number of other relevant evaluations. The findings section is lengthy in the description of activities but it is often unclear if this refers to UNFPA. There is little use of evidence to justify statements made about achievements. As a consequence, the conclusions struggle to synthesis the findings but do partially achieve this and are able to communicate the evaluators’ judgments. Recommendations are poorly-written and lack sufficient specificity and detail to be of use to the CO. Overall the report is not well-integrated and does not meet the needs laid out in the ToRs.

<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</td>
<td>Poor</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 is structured as per the ToRs with all key elements, and some methodological information is annexed. However the findings section has a somewhat fragmented structure and is extremely lengthy (eg paragraph numbering extends to 7.1.87). The Findings discussion is extremely lengthy and has an imbalanced structure, with 9 pages on gender, 12 on PD and 41 on RH. There is a lack of consistency in sub-headings for analysis of different programme components which makes it difficult for the reader to obtain an overall picture. Addressing those elements of structure that make it unclear for the reader would improve the report’s clarity and structure significantly.
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): Max length 3-4 page
- i) Purpose, incl. intended audience(s); ii) Objectives & Brief description of intervention (1 para); iii) Methodology (1 para); iv) Main Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para).

**Poor**
This section only briefly mentions the evaluation scope and the methodology is only outlined with little detail provided. There is no mention of findings; only conclusions are mentioned which seem to be a mixture with findings. Recommendations are confusingly presented and not prioritized. The unconventional structure does not provide the reader with a clear overview of the evaluation and the summary is not a stand-alone section.

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**
Methodological tools are mentioned but lack description and their selection is not explained. The methodology section opens with the statement that “the evaluation is largely based on discussions” with no expansion on what that means. There is no mention of triangulation under this section (even though triangulation techniques are used in the report) or data validation techniques even though the report acknowledges there are problems in data consistency and accuracy. There is no mention of limitations encountered or addressed by the evaluators. The framework of analysis is briefly mentioned but there is no accompanying detail.

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;

**Good**
The UNFPA-collected baseline and endline data is used throughout the report for analysis of various projects. Multiple data sources are used for triangulation, for example project evaluation report compared with interviews, and there is a good mix of the use of quantitative and qualitative data. There are also some explicit references to the results of other evaluations which were mentioned in detail in the ToRs. However, references are sometimes poorly used, for example reference is made to ‘surveys’ as evidence of public awareness impact of UNFPA activities but these actually refer to surveys reported in a newspaper article, with no reference to the original survey data. Mention of newspapers ‘regularly’ carrying related articles but no data is given.
### 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 (or 'implementation') section opens with extensive description of activities, without clearly explaining if they refer to UNFPA’s activities, and then followed by sub-sections.
The link between UNFPA activities and results is not clear and not justified by use of evidence. Where there is data, there is no analysis to justify where a contribution has delivered results (e.g. UNFPA activities in stocking health centers or outreach to indigenous groups is described in detail, but not analysed). The evaluators have acknowledged that it is difficult to derive a direct causal link between interventions and some results but this is not made clear in the accompanying narrative of the presented data.

### 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**
Conclusions can be seen to relate to findings and to some degree convey the evaluators’ judgments and synthesize findings into a number of key statements. However, they are rather numerous and it is difficult for the reader to identify the link from findings to 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**
Recommendations are divided into 2 sections, for the whole CP and by programme area. For the first section - the whole CP-they are too numerous, do not appear to be prioritized, are not specific and some would be difficult to operationalize. Some statements are not written as recommendations. Recommendations for the CO are fewer, and some are well-written.

### 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 include a lot of evaluation questions, including Impact, and evaluators have not made any substantive comments on weaknesses in the ToRs. The final evaluation report has not addressed all criteria under the ToRs (or explained the reason why it can’t be addressed). Therefore the report does not meet the needs laid out in the ToRs.
### Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)

<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>50</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>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>95</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**