
Time-frame for the CPE stated in the ToR: 40 days
Cost of the CPE: $46,000

Overall Assessment: The report has not been quality checked for submission as a final version, and there are a number of spelling and formatting errors. Some sections of the report also appear to be missing. The executive summary mixes findings and conclusions and does not function as a stand-alone section. The methodology section in the main report is too brief and key information is missing. There is insufficient balance between the use of interview data and quantitative data in the report. The level of evidence provided in the findings is inadequate. Several evaluation criteria are not assessed appropriately, particularly sustainability and impact. The lessons learned and conclusions sections fail to adequately address programme issues. The recommendations lack focus and will be difficult to operationalise. There is insufficient detail in the report on key areas specified in the ToR, particularly the recommendations.

<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>
<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)</td>
<td></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.

- 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

Poor

Some sections of the executive summary lack sufficient detail (e.g. methodology), and information is at times presented in incomplete sentences (e.g. Methodology: ‘direct observations at facilities; youth friendly centres, refugee camp and others also constituted a source of data for our analysis’; e.g. Conclusions: ‘Enhanced National Supply Chain Management System including National Supply Chain Master Plan with Monitoring System’). The summary does not have a separate findings section but mixes them with conclusions. The summary should not have listed all the recommendations but only included the main ones. Overall, 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

Poor

The methodology section is extremely brief and there is no explanation of the choice of methods. Data collection tools are listed but lack adequate details about their use (e.g. ‘Focus groups discussions: Held with stakeholders at county and district level sites’). The limitations are briefly listed in a short paragraph but there is no information on the steps taken by the evaluators to mitigate them. Triangulation is mentioned and its use is well-explained by the evaluators.
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;

**Poor**
The evaluators refer to problems encountered in obtaining data but have not identified alternative sources of data. Analysis frequently refers to interview data as a main source but the typology of stakeholders is not made clear and is frequently vague (e.g. ‘the interviews of key stakeholders’; ‘according to various key stakeholders interviewed’). Overall there is a lack of quantitative data in the report. There are also very few references in the report.

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**
The causal links between UNFPA interventions and results are not clear (e.g. Main Achievements: ‘many young people have gained access to reliable information’; ‘there has been an increase in service providers’). There is a lack of evidence to support the positive statements that are made about UNFPA (e.g. ‘The translation of these strategies into activities led to achieving the expected outputs’ – no detail provided). In some instances, the completion of activities is presented as achievements (e.g. training of journalists). Evaluation criteria are discussed with insufficient detail, some only a few lines, for example sustainability of the gender component is addressed in only a single sentence: ‘As awareness continues …there is a strong potential for the gender programme to be sustained’). Other criteria are not assessed appropriately; for example enthusiasm amongst stakeholders to continue activities is presented as a measure of sustainability (e.g. ‘they were eager to provide services friendly to youth’). Impact is included but is not appropriately assessed (e.g. ‘One example of impact is…the local female deputy chief of police told the evaluation team in a community meeting, “I no longer have to stay up late to solve problems in my community since this ‘program’ started’ – used as an example of impact for both RH and Gender).
### 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**

The conclusions are poorly presented, consisting of long paragraphs that are not numbered or prioritized and which lack focus. Conclusions only address issues of programme design, management, M&E and capacity development and there are no conclusions that address the areas of RH, Gender and PD. Therefore findings that were indicated as important in the findings section have not led to corresponding conclusions. Some of the conclusions related to programme design and management are poorly phrased (e.g. ‘It then dawned on the evaluation team that UNFPA would be making a mistake to stray too far from its “niche” reproductive health’).

The conclusions section is preceded by a set of ‘lessons learned’ relating to programme design and management. However, some are poorly phrased and fail to provide insight into the programme (e.g. ‘Both strategies if developed and implemented wisely lead to eventual sustainability’).

### 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**

Many recommendations lack sufficient detail or focus (e.g. Recommendation 1. ‘UNFPA should carve a new strategic direction and respond to some of the Third CP challenges and focus on specific programme areas to cover; specific population to target; specific geographical areas to work; and specific interventions to be applied’- no further detail). Some recommendations are ambitious but the lack of detail to operationalize them means they may be beyond the capacity of the country office to implement (e.g. ‘support the development and implementation of a strong national research agenda on RH, population and development issues in Liberia’ – no further detail given). Although the recommendations are numbered, it is not clear if they are in priority order.
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.

**Poor**
The evaluators have not met the needs of the ToR as they have not provided the requested level of detail in the report, particularly with regards to the recommendations or responding adequately to the evaluation objectives.

<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>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>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td>5</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>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</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**