
Overall assessment:
The report has a logical structure that begins with a clear executive summary that provides a useful snapshot of the evaluation. The methodology is described in detail, though the choice of methodology is not justified. The Findings section is lengthy and detailed, drawing on various types of evidence for analysis; however availability of data has created an imbalance in analysis of programme areas, and judgments are made by the evaluators that is not based on evidence or verified. Conclusions are weak and contained in a very brief section that bears little relation to the preceeding findings section. Despite this shortcoming the recommendations are strategic and linked to findings, and limited in number but not prioritized. Overall, this is an effective report that meets the needs stated in the ToRs of analyzing evaluation findings and making clear and focused recommendations for the next CP, but has been undermined by weaknesses in key sections.

Quality Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</td>
<td>Very Good</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.

Good
The structure is clear and includes key elements, although some editing/redistribution of content between sections would make for a more balanced read.
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*

**Good**

The Executive Summary provides clear background and context to the CPE. The section is brief, highlighting in short paragraphs key findings and conclusions although it would benefit structurally from subheadings and from a clearer indication of the key recommendations. However, the executive summary functions well as a standalone 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**

The Methodology is clearly described, with reference to methodological tools which are provided in annexes (e.g. list of documents reviewed, and questionnaire and focus group process provided, as well as list of interviewees). The use of triangulation is discussed, as well as efforts to address the issue of attribution. Limitations are discussed (logistics, gaps in indicator data) and efforts to overcome (cross-referencing of data) stated. Overall the methodology is well described and discussed, but methodological choice is not addressed, and appears to have been selected on the basis of the model set out in the TORs.

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 evaluation team has attempted to utilize both quantitative and qualitative data wherever possible. Data sources are clearly stated and include national and international sources, although these include estimates/draft reports or reports dating from prior to the CP, or using the CP as source (although limitations with these are acknowledged in some instances).
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**
Findings are arranged by programme area and subdivided by evaluation criteria, alongside consideration of design and management. The sections commence with a lengthy discourse on context which, while useful and provides baseline information, should be briefer or tabulated. Although there is use of both qualitative and quantitative data, the link between UNFPA interventions and results is not always substantiated in the analysis by reference to robust evidence or triangulated to ensure credibility of analysis. Some discussion is overly long and lacks focus (9 paragraphs on design of RH; 21 paragraphs on one aspect of effectiveness), which detracts from otherwise useful analysis. Given the paucity of data, as well as lack of distinct programming in the case of gender, both gender and PD sections are less detailed in their analysis.

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**
Given the extensive and detailed analysis in the previous Findings section, it is surprising that this is a short (2 pages) section with little content which makes only a few specific programmatic conclusions, overall providing an overview that is rather decoupled from findings.

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 are usefully limited to 16, mostly for RH. Linkage with findings is apparent but the inadequate conclusion section makes it difficult to establish how these have been prioritized. Recommendations mostly include bullet point actions which make them more strategic and feasible but further detail would enable implementation.
### 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>| Good | Evaluation questions are all closely adhered to by the evaluator, with a clear focus on tailoring evaluation criteria to needs (eg. Consideration of sustainability in light of humanitarian response). However, the evaluators have not made any amendments, particularly to take into account the results from the Mid-Term Review, which is a missed opportunity to refine the evaluation. |</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>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>5</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>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. - if “Findings 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