
Overall Assessment: This is a well-structured and concise report that meets that needs stated in the ToRs. An excellent Executive Summary provides a clear overview of the report and is followed by a detailed explanation of methodology. Shortcomings in availability of data are discussed, as are the steps taken by the evaluators to compensate for any gaps. However, the analysis is disappointing, limited to identifying where sub-outputs were achieved (due to lack of appropriate indicators or baseline data) rather than providing an evidence-based critique of programming choices. This undermines the subsequent conclusions, which contain little information and are arranged by evaluation criteria and do not present a picture of the evaluators’ judgment. Recommendations are stronger but fewer and prioritized recommendations would have made them more effective.

<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>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</td>
<td>Good</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>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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  

**Very Good**  
The Executive Summary provides a short explanation of each chapter, including an excellent brief explanation of methodology. Key findings by evaluation criteria are summarized, with concluding comments and summary of recommendations, overall functioning as a comprehensive 2 page 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  

**Good**  
Methodological choice is discussed and justified (e.g p6: focus group discussions 'helped in identifying issues to be addressed and the mechanisms to be used to cross-check and triangulate the data and highlighted on the need to contextually as and when required'). Use of structured interviews also discussed and justified as well as use of triangulation and overall the methodology stresses participatory methods used. The Operational evaluation conducted in 2008 was utilized as a reference point for the evaluation and responses from that evaluation were revisited with partners, enabling refinement of the evaluation focus. Limitations are stated, as well as steps taken by the evaluation team to rectify them.  

A Matrix provided in the Annexex provides detailed breakdown of IP involvement in evaluation of outputs, with the majority participating in questionnaires, interviews and forum. Had this been extended to include other stakeholders, a higher score for methodology would be have awarded, as this level of detail about participation is useful.
### 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 lack of reliable data is criticized by the evaluators (specifically weaknesses in quantification, achievability and specific duration of outputs). Evaluators attempted to compensate for missing baseline information by 'presenting complementary and proxy (indirect) impacts'. Examples include evaluations of activities by IPs used as proxies for achievements of sub-outputs, as well as UNFPA and national reports, and previous operational evaluations are used to good effect. Overall these combine to provide reasonably reliable alternative sources of data.

### 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**
Analysis includes comments on shortcomings in the programming and conduct of CP (e.g. p10 ‘too many unrealistically planned outputs or…such a broad gender component’) as well as limits to what conclusions can be drawn about results (e.g. p12 ‘the extents in which they [guidelines] are being used are not yet fully documented’). Examples of good practice are provided in boxes for programme outputs, which are selected on the basis of being effective, innovative and/or replicable, and balances well with critiques of shortcomings. However, discussion on whether outputs were ‘achieved’ often solely refers to completion of activities rather than through the use of evidence to demonstrate that the intervention achieved results.
### 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**
Findings were limited due to inadequate analysis which in turn limits the conclusions that can be drawn. Most of the evaluators’ conclusions make positive statement which are not justified (e.g. “CP is more or less effective”). Conclusions are grouped by evaluation criteria rather than in terms of the programme interventions, which is not useful for gaining an understanding of the evaluators’ judgment of the interventions.

### 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 do not seem rated in priority order and are too numerous (over 25). They are targeted, including proposed timing in some cases, and link to findings but are limited by the lack of substantive analysis. Overall, the strength of this section has been diluted by the volume and lack of focus of recommendations.

### 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.

**Good**
The scope and conduct of the evaluation stated in the ToRs has been adhered to, including revisiting the operational evaluation conducted in 2008 which was done by the evaluation team in association with key partners. ToRs include the requirement that the evaluation should strengthen national evaluation capacity through using participatory and inclusive approaches. While there was stakeholder involvement in the evaluation it is not clear how national evaluation capacity has been built.
<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></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>74</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