



Organizational unit: Year of report: **2020**

Title of evaluation report: **GoM/UNFPA 9th Country Programme Evaluation: Mozambique**

Overall quality of report: Very good Date of assessment: **3 November 2021**

Overall comments: This is a very well-done evaluation of a complex country programme in a country with serious humanitarian issues. There was an assessment of the theory of change for CP components. The evaluators used these and the programme framework as a base for the evaluation and included recommendations for further improvements of the programme logic. Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, there were limitations on data collection that the evaluation addressed. The findings flow clearly from the data, which include extensive use of documents and thorough interviews leading to strong and useful conclusions and recommendations. The analysis of both gender issues and disability issues is in-depth and provides useful examples of good practice. Disability was taken up in the evaluation scope and key questions. The findings note the work that UNFPA is doing to increase the focus on PWD in the next CP and related issues are then taken up in both conclusions and recommendations. The linkages of the CP to the SDGs are also well covered. The main shortcoming of the report is that the presentation is text-heavy. More use of white space, graphics and subheadings would make the document more reader-friendly.

Assessment Levels Very Good strong, above average, best practice Good satisfactory, respectable Fair with some weaknesses, still acceptable Unsatisfactory weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria *Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)*

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
--	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Partial	The report is well-written and structured with almost no observable errors. However, it would be more user-friendly if it were less text-heavy. Contributing factors are narrow margins and relatively small font size (Times New Roman 10) and minimal use of visual aids other than tables. In one of the few graphics presented (figure 4.1) the text is too small to easily read.
--	---------	---

2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	Yes	The main report is 61 pages.
---	-----	------------------------------

3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?	Yes	All of the desired annexes are present.
---	-----	---

Executive summary

4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	Yes	The summary is a stand-alone with all of the appropriate sections, including a lessons learned section.
--	-----	---

5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Partial	At four pages, it is concise, although more text-heavy than the rest of the document. Increased use of subheadings and numbering of recommendations would have made this section more accessible to readers.
---	---------	--

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------------

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context

1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The context is clearly described in Chapter 2.
--	-----	--

2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Yes	It is noted that there was no ToC until the end of the design phase of the evaluation when CO produced ToCs for each thematic area for the next CP. The evaluators then provided a critique of these in the methods section of the report.
--	-----	--

To ensure a rigorous design and methodology

3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	Yes	There is a clear description in both the text and in the matrix.
--	-----	--

4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools are described and the reasons for their choice shown. They were affected by the limitations caused by COVID-19 and this was explained.
--	-----	--

5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	Partial	There is mention of the CO providing stakeholder maps to the team but there is no presentation of mapping in the report. The consultation process is described, including on recommendations so that the views could be taken into account in the final version.
--	---------	--

6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	No	It is noted that data analysis was done but it was not described.
--	----	---

7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The main limitations derive from COVID-19 and how they were addressed is shown.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	Two regions were selected based on a purposive sample, but how the specific beneficiaries were chosen is not described in detail.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Partial	There is minimal use of disaggregated data. Even though evaluators were hampered in accessing some data, evaluation participants could have been gender disaggregated and tools could have required this information. Specific disability-related disaggregated data is not provided but this is understandable as it is noted that the CP is now gradually stepping up its response regarding PWD.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues are central to the design, this includes consideration of PWD. The evaluators looked at the extent to which PWD were considered in the CP within the Findings section including observations on accessibility of facilities, quotes from implementing partners on this topic.
3. Reliability of Data		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Triangulation is thorough.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The qualitative sources are varied, including especially key informants, but also others including rights-holders. The limitations, for example, of quantitative data are noted by the evaluators when this is evident.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	There is clear evidence that the data were collected with a concern for ethical considerations.
4. Analysis and Findings		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	In each case the findings were substantiated.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretations was always described.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is structured according to the questions.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The evaluators showed a clear concern for cause and effect links and, which the expected connections were not clear in the theory of change, this is noted. In a number of cases, unanticipated outcomes were noted, sometimes favorably, sometimes not.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Partial	There is minimal discussion on outcomes for different target groups, other than noting what groups could be better covered such as those with disabilities, adolescents exploited in sex work, non-binary and LGBTI populations, etc.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors are noted in each case.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues are shown clearly in the analysis. The analysis of gender and disability issues are particularly strong. There is discussion on a recently conducted UNFPA study on the engagement of PWD and the recommendations made for the next CP.
5. Conclusions		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The links with findings are clearly shown in the text.
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The conclusions are very extensive (5 pages). They take the findings and show their greater importance. Cross-cutting issues, including for disability, are covered.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias.
6. Recommendations		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The conclusions on which the recommendations are based are shown in each case.

2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The recommendations are mostly for the country office and headquarters and in each case the operational implications (if there are any) are described.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	There are specific recommendations relating to cross cutting issues, especially gender equality.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	Most of the recommendations, that are divided between strategic and programme levels, are high priority, but in each case there is at least one medium priority.

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
-----------	-----------------------	-------------------	-----------

To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)

1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	3	<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) Yes, GEEW and disability are considered as x-cutting themes. score=3</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3) These issues are mainstreamed. score=3</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) Yes, score=3</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?(Score: 0-3) Yes, as part of a question under Efficiency. score=3</p>
--	---	--

2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	3	<p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) There was substantial effort to ensure that gender issues were addressed in an appropriate way i.e., discussions being held in safe and private spaces at convenient times of day. However, the # of evaluation participants was not gender disaggregated. Score=2</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation uses mixed methods and was careful to ensure that GEEW considerations were addressed, including through selection of key informants and how documents were analyzed. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) There is diversity of data sources, especially relating to SRHS and VAW concerns. Score=3</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3) The methods and sampling frame address the diversity question. Score=3</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) The evaluators showed concern for ethical considerations. This was well covered. Score=3</p>
--	---	--

3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3	<p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation shows how gender is important as well as connections to normative instruments. Score = 3</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3) There are specific findings on gender as well as an integration of gender in other findings. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) There are references to unanticipated effects. Score=3</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3) There are specific recommendations on GEEW. Score=3</p>
---	---	---

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)		7		
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			
3. Reliability of data (11)	11			
4. Analysis and findings (40)	40			
5. Conclusions (11)	11			
6. Recommendations (11)	11			
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			

Total scoring points	93	7		
<i>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</i>	Very good			