Overall Assessment: the scope of the evaluation is insufficiently focused because of the absence of a clear set of evaluation questions. Very little (if anything) is said about the methodological design of the evaluation; apart from a generic list of evaluation tools, no explanation can be found regarding the methods and tools chosen, the methodological constraints and limitations faced and the way to overcome them. Above all, the report fails to present the reader with satisfactory analysis, leading to credible findings. The information provided is mainly descriptive, and although the data used are sufficiently reliable, they concern issues of relevance for monitoring purpose only (description of financial data, indicators at the level of activities and, more scarcely, outputs). The report lacks an actual section on conclusions. The absence of linkage with corresponding conclusions and the lack of information regarding their operational feasibility severely limits the usefulness of recommendations. Furthermore, the report lacks clarity and a logical structure. Its executive summary is far too long, while the absence of important information prevents it from being a self-standing document.

Quality Assessment criteria

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting
To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.

- 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.

Assessment Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Unsatisfactory**: the structure of the report lacks clarity, and the content and sequence of its sections are not appropriate for an evaluation report. Sections II to V (The findings of the evaluation; Level of accomplishment of planned activities; Situation of CP output and outcome indicators; Major achievements of the programme) should have been merged into a single section on findings. Section IV, which describes at length the status of indicators for all outputs of the programme should constitute an annex in which indicators should be displayed in a table (in its current form, this section is not reader-friendly). There is no actual section on conclusions (section IX, although it
### 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:** the executive summary is far too long (12 pages). It shows no actual effort to synthesize the evaluation results. A lengthy table of indicators is displayed along 3 pages containing raw data without any comment nor analysis. Several important elements are missing (i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology) which prevents it from being a self-standing 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

**Unsatisfactory:** apart from a short paragraph in p5, presenting a very general list of evaluation methods tools, nothing is said about the design and methodology of the evaluation. In particular, methodological choices are not explained. Constraints and limitations are not identified, nor the way to overcome them. Nothing is said about the triangulation of data and information sources.

### 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:** data sources are generally well identified and quoted. However, the respective credibility of primary and secondary data is not discussed, i.e. limitations relating to each category of data are not made explicit.
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.

Unsatisfactory: no analytical work can be found in the report, which remains very descriptive. “Findings” at best consist in factual observations, most often anecdotal (e.g. p15: “At the central level of the MOH, in spite of the fact that the RH unit is run by a dedicated team of staff, lead by an experienced Public Health expert and 1 experienced midwife, the work load was just too much for them.”), without any visible effort to test cause and effect assumptions. The information provided corresponds to what could be expected from a monitoring report rather than an evaluation report, with a focus on the monitoring of financial resources, of activities and, more scarcely, of outputs.

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.

Unsatisfactory: the “conclusions” section consists in a very global judgment on UNFPA’s intervention, without any reference to corresponding findings (e.g. p55: “In some of the components there has been some innovative and promising initiatives, which need close follow up, documentation and subsequent scaling up to ensure total coverage of the population. […] Of course there are still areas for improvement and some major challenges to address in order to optimize the results of the country program.”). This section does not provide the reader with expected clusters of conclusions, organized in priority orders.

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: an effort has been made to present recommendations in a clustered way (one cluster by programme component), which address some aspects of programming. However, these recommendations are not related to any conclusions and are weakened by the lack of prioritization and options regarding their operationalization.
### 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.

<p>| Unsatisfactory | although the ToR could not be found among the annexes of the report, the latter obviously fails to address commonly agreed evaluation requirements. No reference is made to evaluation questions, which leaves the scope of the evaluation too broad to be satisfactorily covered. Deficiencies regarding the ToR themselves were not pointed by the evaluation team. |</p>
<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></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><strong>83</strong></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:** Unsatisfactory