

Time-frame for the CPE stated in the ToR: 35 days
Cost of the CPE: $69,880

Overall Assessment: The report does not present information clearly with some information scattered across several different sub-sections. The executive summary presents the findings/conclusions in a confusing arrangement. The methodology section is detailed and explanation is provided on how the evaluators responded to various challenges. The use of secondary sources of data to address data shortages are undermined by poor referencing. Findings are not adequately backed up with evidence, and the cause and effect links between UNFPA interventions and results are not made clear. The conclusions do not reflect the main programme findings for the three programme areas of gender, reproductive health and population & development. Issues related to programming areas are not addressed in any detail in the recommendations. The evaluators have commented on the ToR and used some elements in the design of the evaluation.

<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>Poor</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)

### 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).

**Poor**
The inconsistent use of sub-headings in the summary makes it difficult for the reader to identify the key elements. Several paragraphs summarise the ‘programme achievements’ but these are separate from the combined main findings and conclusions, and it is not clear what the relationship is between the sections. Combining the main findings and conclusions makes it difficult for the reader to identify the main messages. The summary also lacks sufficient detail about the methodology. The summary does not function effectively as 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

**Good**
The evaluation team developed an evaluation methodology framework which is based on the evaluation questions from the ToR. It includes detailed performance indicators for each evaluation question, sources of data, and data collection methods. It is presented in an annex and contains useful information on the methodological framework for the reader. The methodology section includes brief but comprehensive descriptions of the types of data collection methods used. Limitations are described in detail including the main challenge of the revision of the programme mid-way through the cycle. The evaluators mention the risk of bias as the evaluation ‘draw[s] heavily on the expert opinions of key informants involved in the development, implementation and monitoring of the programme’. The evaluators state that they used triangulation as an attempt to mitigate these challenges.

### 4. Reliability of Data

**To clarify data collection processes and data quality**

- Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;

**Poor**
Despite the evaluators stating their intention to use alternative sources in response to data shortages, the use of these sources in the report is rare. Where alternative sources
- Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit; are used (e.g. UNFPA reports, interview data, field visits), they are not triangulated.

- References are poor; for example, the evaluators only refer to 'the study' or 'a guide was developed'. References lack key details (e.g. the list of documents consulted includes 'Nepal MDG reports' but lacks information on the year of publication; 'available data [not provided in the report] indicate that UNFPA has successfully implemented a number of programme activities for strengthening the capacity of service providers, local community groups and local bodies to deliver reproductive health services').

## 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
The use of evidence is not sufficient enough to support the findings; for example, the evaluators only refer to the use of a training manual as evidence of capacity having been built. The evaluators also make general statements that do not have any supporting evidence (e.g. 'UNFPA is recognised as one of the leading advocates for addressing GBV issues, gender concerns and social inclusion in Nepal'). The link between UNFPA interventions and results are not made clear; for example UNFPA participation in forums is used as evidence of UNFPA causing a change in policy, but the cause and effect link is not explained. The evaluators make statements such as 'UNFPA has successfully expanded the capacity of implementing NGOs' but they use the completion of activities by partners as evidence, which is not adequate evidence of sustainability. The findings are also written in a way that does not flow logically but jumps from issue to issue.

## 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

### Poor
The conclusions mainly focus on issues related to the modifications to the country programme and programme management, not the 3 programme areas of gender, reproductive health and population & development that were
addressed in the findings. Findings that were indicated as important in the findings section have not led to corresponding conclusions. There are some significant omissions of findings (e.g. no mention of: withdrawal of UNFPA long-term support for HMIS; UNFPA support for the census; UNFPA involvement in national plan of action on GBV).

The lessons learned section does not add value to the report as they are very general (e.g. ‘it will be important for UNFPA to clearly delineate its key focal programme areas and highlight its comparative advantage in these areas’).

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

There are only two recommendations related to programme areas, which are poorly written. The first is too vague to be useful for the country office (e.g. ‘the next programme cycle should focus on consolidating programmes and refining structures’). The second is very long and states ‘UNFPA should critically assess existing and emerging RH, P&D and gender needs, and ensure that appropriate and long-term financial support is provided to address these needs’. The recommendation then discusses issues for each programme area. This format is not appropriate, and the recommendation should have been restructured into multiple recommendations that contained enough detail to be operational, as the programme area recommendations should form the core of the recommendations.

The recommendations related to programme management are written in a clearer way, but these are exceptions.
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 evaluation team used the ToR to develop the evaluation methodology framework which ‘expands upon the ToR questions and thus provides a wider interpretation of the issues’. The evaluators also report that the inclusion of programme transition in the evaluation, which was not in the ToR, was agreed in consultation with RO M&E advisor and CO and its inclusion is therefore justified. The evaluators state that they decided to address some evaluation questions ‘peripherally’ due to the large number of questions in the ToR. This is a useful comment, although the evaluators should have made clear how they selected which questions to retain. The inclusion of impact in the ToR was not realistic and the evaluators should have pointed out this limitation, rather than attempting an assessment. |
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td></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><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: Poor