
Overall Assessment: The report is logically **structured** but lacks the clear separation of a conclusions section. The **Executive Summary** reflects the structure of the report with a focus on findings but does not include conclusions and recommendations. The report is based on a sound **methodological** design and utilizes **data** that are credible. However **findings** are not evidence-based. **Conclusions** – though linked to findings – are not well elaborated and **recommendations** based on conclusions could have been more detailed and would then have been of greater use to guide stakeholders on how best to strategize for the next country programme. The report responds to all evaluation criteria set out in the ToRs and the majority of evaluation questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</strong></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</strong></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 user-friendly and logical. However, it suffers from the absence of a specific part on conclusions (which are mixed with findings), which is a key required component. In some instances a more inclusive writing style would have been able to reveal the same results in a more user-friendly way to the CO.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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 | The Executive Summary is short and concise but does not include a description of the purpose, objectives or intended audience. It also does not effectively present conclusions and recommendations. |
| **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 | The methodology design is well explained and techniques are described including limitations of data sources (i.e. “baseline study focuses on RH but not on PD and Gender data” p.21). Attention is paid to vulnerable groups such as youth and the poor. The reader is equipped with a good understanding why the methodology has been chosen and how the process of data collection was designed. A ‘very good’ could have been given if the limitations of the chosen approach would have been outlined. |
| **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; | Sources of data identified and described in detail. Limitations to the credibility of data are pointed out, such as the limitations of the baseline survey conducted by the CO. |
### 5. Findings and Analysis

**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 presented in a clear manner with contextual factors highlighted. However, there is a lack of analysis of the causal links between UNFPA’s activities and the results, and observed changes are missing from the report.

### 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 are based on findings and are well placed after each criteria assessment. However, as a core element of the report they should have been elaborated in greater detail (e.g. p.38 conclusions on gender are too brief), especially when compared to depth of the findings, and assigned a distinct section.

### 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 flow logically from the conclusions and findings but are not prioritized or categorized. The evaluation team should have addressed the causal factors behind their conclusions to make the recommendations more strategic. The recommendations are also very short and in some cases too short to be operational (e.g. no. 2 or no. 14).

### 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 report responds to all evaluation criteria set out in the TOR and the majority of evaluation questions for the respective criteria. Evaluators comment on the ToRs in terms of the lack of an overall objective and the subsequent assumption they made.
<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>78</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