
Time-frame for the CPE stated in the ToR: 35 working days

Cost of the CPE: $60,000

Overall Assessment: The chosen structure of the report is poor, with the conclusions and recommendations combined in a section with the findings, and there is no overall section on recommendations. The executive summary is extremely long and does not present the findings and conclusions clearly. The methodology fails to provide some tools or explain how the evaluators planned to mitigate limitations. There are gaps in the referencing of data, and information shortages have not been appropriately addressed. There is a lack of evidence to support the findings and the use of different evaluation criteria is not made clear. The conclusions lack sufficient detail. The use of ‘suggested actions’ alongside recommendations is very confusing, and recommendations lack information on their operationalisation. The evaluators have attempted to address all aspects in the ToR despite the brevity of the ToR.

<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>

Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.

The reasoning that 'each of these sections can more or less be read alone' is not justified as it breaks the logical flow from findings to conclusions to recommendations. Some of the language used in the report is not appropriate and the report would have benefited from editing (e.g. 'massive'; 'communization being placed on the back burner'; 'there is very little an agency like UNFPA can meaningfully do to actually provide direct relief [in emergencies]'; 'when UNFPA began its programme in a big way'; 'being a pooling partner does not matter much').

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 summary is 14 pages in length, which is extremely long for an executive summary. The methodology is briefly described in a very short section. Limitations are not described and, although the title for the methodology sub-section includes 'key questions', the evaluation questions are not provided. The findings are presented alongside the conclusions and recommendations in a single sub-section. Only the recommendations are clearly indicated and some findings and conclusions are merged (unlike the main findings section) so it is difficult for the reader to identify these different aspects. The 'suggested actions' found in the main report are not referred to in the summary. The summary includes a large number of recommendations, not just the main recommendations (which would normally be expected in an executive summary).

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

The methodology section varies in the level of detail that it provides, with a high level of detail provided on non-essential issues that could have been presented in a table or annex (e.g. description of the first meeting between UNFPA and the evaluators; schedule of the various field visits). Some tools are
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

Limitations are mentioned, including that ‘studying and commenting upon such a wide ranging, complex programme in a coherent manner within a span of 35 days has been a huge challenge’. The indicators from the results framework are also mentioned as a limitation, which the evaluators state are impact indicators and ‘do not measure UNFPA’s contributions to these programmes’. The challenge of measuring the contribution of UNFPA is also mentioned, which is appropriate. However the evaluators do not clearly state how they plan to respond to all limitations. The use of triangulation has also not been mentioned.

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;

Various types of documentation and data sources are mentioned (such as UN agency and national surveys and documents). However information about references is insufficient or missing, particularly references for quantitative data. Interview data is a predominant source used but the typology of stakeholders is not made clear (e.g. ‘UNFPA expects’; ‘training programmes were appreciated by all the key stakeholders’). The potential for bias from relying on interview data has not been mentioned.
The evaluators rightly highlight information shortages (e.g. lack of pre and post training assessments) However details on the evaluators’ attempts to address these gaps are lacking and the data gaps remain, with only occasional use of alternative sources of information (i.e. post-training interviews with trainees).

5. Findings and Analysis

To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

Findings
- Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;
- Findings are substantiated by evidence;

The discussion of findings lacks concrete evidence and instead contains statements such as ‘data is not yet available’ or references to forthcoming surveys rather than the evaluators providing 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.

Many findings only focus on describing the activities and lack analysis (e.g. half a page describing activities to build a knowledge base on aging and inadequate analysis that only states 'the evaluation team finds that the process of developing the questionnaires and manuals was very systematic'). The link between results and the role of UNFPA is not made clear (e.g. description of single method family planning programmes makes no mention of UNFPA's work). There is no clear indication of where different evaluation criteria are assessed and in places the narrative combines multiple evaluation criteria. It is not clearly indicated where the evaluators move between them (e.g. by using sub-headings) so it is difficult to identify clearly the different elements of analysis or the evidence used.
The arrangement of the findings by specific activity type makes the section long – almost 50 pages for reproductive health (e.g. ‘collaboration with MOHFW'; ‘training programme for senior officers').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To assess the validity of conclusions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conclusions are based on credible findings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conclusions are organized in priority order;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Poor**

Conclusions are presented in a section combined with recommendations. The conclusions are not written in a way that provides sufficient detail and are often too short (one sentence) or too general (e.g. 'the approach being used is interesting, has potential and is challenging…and needs to be watched closely'). There is a second overall conclusion section at the end of the report, which fails to capture many aspects of the findings and preceding conclusions. As this section ends the report, which in standard reporting would end with the recommendations, it is not clear what function it serves as the relationship with the earlier large number of conclusions is unclear.
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 is no overall recommendations section but they are instead located after the findings for each programme area. The evaluators have used both ‘suggested actions’ and recommendations but the relationship between them is not clear or explained by the evaluators. The ‘suggested actions’ seem to play the role of recommendations but fail to function as recommendations as they are extremely brief and focused on very specific issues (e.g. ‘UNFPA should advocate for sustained use of the projections’).

Despite a small number of recommendations being written succinctly, the recommendations are too general to be operational (e.g. ‘broadening the vision and perspectives of development planners to understand population and development linkages…must continue’). The recommendations are also neither numbered nor prioritized.

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**
Given the brevity of the ToR (just over one page, plus a table of documents for review and field visit plan, and they do not include any evaluation questions), it is difficult to know what was expected from the evaluation. In response to these ToR, the evaluators have produced a report that provides information on standard aspects of an evaluation. The ToR include the request to review geographic focus, partnerships and operational modalities, which have been addressed by evaluators. Impact was not measured by the evaluators nor efficiency, and the reasons for excluding these aspects of the ToR are explained by the evaluators, which is appropriate. The evaluators state that the short duration specified (35 days) was a limitation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)</th>
<th>Assessment Levels (*)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Findings and analysis (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclusions (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recommendations (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting needs (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></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