

<b>Organizational unit:</b>	Gambia CO	<b>Year of report:</b>	2021	
<b>Title of evaluation report:</b>	Government of the Gambia/UNFPA 8th Country Programme (2017-2021) Final Evaluation Report			
<b>Overall quality of report:</b>	Fair	<b>Date of assessment:</b>	25 February 2022	
<b>Overall comments:</b>	<p>This evaluation of the Government of the Gambia UNFPA 8th Country Programme provides useful information for decision makers on programme performance and ways forward, however there are a number of ways in which it could more closely align with UNFPA evaluation standards. The main limitations are that the methodology could be more fully described and that evaluation findings are not always well-substantiated or clearly based on multiple data sources. The cause-and-effect links and basis for interpretation of findings are not fully explained, and so it is difficult to understand the full scope of the CPs achievements. The evaluation adequately integrates cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion in the evaluation findings, however the findings are not well-substantiated in terms of outcome-level results in this regard. The methodology could also be more explicit in how it mainstreamed gender and human rights considerations, and the ethical safeguards that were followed. However, despite these limitations, the report provides appropriate recommendations which are derived from the evidence that is presented. In respect to disability inclusion, although well covered in the findings, there was not an evaluation question that explicitly addressed people with disabilities (PWD), nor was this evident in the evaluation matrix. Although the conclusions note that more attention needs to be given to PWD, they do not reflect the substantial amount of work that has been done by the CP. There is a recommendation related to PWD.</p>			
<b>Assessment Levels</b>	<span style="background-color: #008000; color: white; padding: 2px;">Very Good</span> strong, above average, best practice	<span style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;">Good</span> satisfactory, respectable	<span style="background-color: #FFD700; padding: 2px;">Fair</span> with some weaknesses, still acceptable	<span style="background-color: #FF0000; padding: 2px;">Unsatisfactory</span> weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria		<i>Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>	
<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
<b>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)?</b>	Partial	The report is mostly structured in a logical way with few spelling and grammatical errors. However, there is extensive use of acronyms, which are not always fully introduced before their use. There is not always a clear and consistent flow to the discussion of findings, which are presented in paragraphs though sometimes written more as 'bulleted' sentences without clear links between them. The formatting is not always clear, especially in the annexes, and the font sizes and paragraph spacing varies. Good practice is to ensure reports are copy-edited and quality assured before final submission.	
<b>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)</b>	Yes	The report is within the denoted page limitations.	
<b>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)?</b>	Yes	All of these elements are present or annexed in the report.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
<b>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?</b>	Partial	The executive summary includes most of the required elements, except the intended audience is not made explicit. In addition, the sentence structure and flow of the executive summary is not always fluid or coherent, especially the recommendations, limiting its use as a stand-alone document that facilitates decision-making.	
<b>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</b>	Yes	The executive summary is within the 5-page limit.	
<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
<b>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	The key facts tables at the beginning of the report provide an overarching view of the development context in The Gambia, which is then further described in Chapter 2 on the country context. The role of external assistance in The Gambia is also explained.	
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>	Partial	It was noted in the ToR that the evaluation was intended to be theory-based, and that the evaluation should review and refine the theory of change underlying the CP, which was noted to be included in Annex A of the ToR. However, the evaluation report simultaneously notes that there is no Theory of Change for the Country Programme and this was a primary limitation of the evaluation. A theory of change is then provided in section 3.5; however, if this is indeed reconstructed from a previous theory, the limits and changes made to the previous theory should have been more clearly stated/assessed. The outcomes in the presented ToC are also vague, describing the general thematic area of the outcome but not what was expected to be achieved in the area of sexual and reproductive health, for example.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			

<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The evaluation framework is adequately described in the text of the report, including the evaluation questions, general approaches. The evaluation matrix is provided within Annex 2 and includes the evaluation questions by criteria, the assumptions to be assessed, the indicators, data sources and methods for data collection. However, it is poorly formatted and not always clear and specific; for example, sometimes it notes key informant interviews as the data source as well as data collection method, without noting which stakeholder group the interview will be conducted with.</p>
<p>4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The tools for data collection are noted with a brief justification for their choice.</p>
<p>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)?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>A table is provided which maps the selected sites for field visits to the stakeholders represented in each area. A more detailed stakeholder map organized by the strategic plan outcome areas is also provided in Annex 4. Marginalized groups are incorporated into each, and include women and girls, persons living with HIV, out of school youth, and persons living with disability. The stakeholder consultation process is briefly described, but does not include any discussion of their consultation on draft recommendations except in that a validation meeting was held.</p>
<p>6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>There is a specific section on data analysis, which mostly describes the process for triangulating and validating data. It is noted that 'content' analysis was conducted.</p>
<p>7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>There were two limitations noted in Table 3, which includes the absence of a Theory of Change and the use of online interviews. However, this table does not describe why online interviews were a limitation to understand whether the mitigation strategy was appropriate. The mitigation strategy mostly included a description of more online methods. It is good practice to more clearly describe the effects of these methodological limitations on the evaluation, and how the mitigation methods were, or were not, able to address them.</p>
<p>8. Is the sampling strategy described?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The sampling strategy described is purposeful and based on the locations with UNFPA-supported interventions. Four regions were selected and any intervention with a national focus was included in the sampling frame. However, there is no discussion of which stakeholders were not included and why, which was a requirement of the Terms of Reference. In addition, the numbers reached through the various data collection methods are not noted, so it is not possible to assess whether the sample size was sufficient.</p>
<p>9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The methodology was largely qualitative, conducting interviews, focus groups and in-depth document review/analysis. While these methods should allow for the collection and analysis of disaggregated data, it is not clear the extent to which this was done. For example, there is an indicator in the evaluation matrix which seeks to gather evidence of data disaggregation through a gender lens, but none of the actual indicators in the evaluation matrix itself demand the disaggregation of data by vulnerable groups.</p>
<p>10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluation question on relevance specifically seeks to assess the extent to which the country programme adapted to emerging needs of vulnerable groups and focus groups were conducted with adolescents. As such, the design should allow for the appropriate assessment of cross-cutting issues.</p>
<p><b>3. Reliability of Data</b></p>	<p>Yes No Partial</p>	<p>Assessment Level: <b>Fair</b></p>
<p><i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i></p>		
<p>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Though triangulation was evident, it did not appear systematic across the discussion of findings.</p>
<p>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Both qualitative and quantitative sources are used.</p>
<p>3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Under the discussion of the evaluation process, it is noted that the 'design report' included a section on the integration of gender and human rights considerations in the evaluation methodology. This would have been useful to incorporate into the final report, as except for the brief discussion of ethics, which mostly covered informed consent, and the inclusion of vulnerable groups in the stakeholder analysis, there is not clarity in how the design and methodology was sensitive to issues of discrimination and other ethical concerns. It is also problematic that the names of evaluation participants, including of students, were provided in the annexed list of evaluation participants.</p>
<p><b>4. Analysis and Findings</b></p>	<p>Yes No Partial</p>	<p>Assessment Level: <b>Fair</b></p>
<p><i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p>		
<p>1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Findings clearly note the reports and interviews cited; However, some findings are not substantiated by sufficient levels of evidence and triangulated data. For example, seventeen health facilities were supported on emergency obstetric and neonatal care, though the evidence provided mostly reflects the situation at one hospital. There are also cases where some findings are substantiated by one large quotation by an interview respondent, instead of triangulated against multiple sources.</p>
<p>2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The basis for interpretations are not always clearly described. For example, the report says the use of women's economic empowerment as an entry point to sexual and reproductive health information resulted in 256 deliveries at one specific health facility, however no further information is provided on the economic empowerment programming and its goals, or how the information distributed would have brought more women to the delivery room.</p>

3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is presented against the evaluation questions under each evaluated criteria.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	Under the discussion of effectiveness, the evaluation report describes the achievement of results, as measured by output indicators at baseline and end line. However, the expected outcomes of these output level results are not made explicit and clear, either in the theory of change or in the discussion of the results achieved. There is no clear analysis of the causal links between what UNFPA did and the end results; instead the evaluation lists some activities, notes the proportion of output indicators achieved (though not always referencing what these outputs were), and then cites longer-term development outcomes from the Gambia Demographic and Health Survey. The causal pathways could be more clearly described. There is a sub-section on Unintended Effects.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Partial	There are some instances in which the findings note differential results for target groups, though this is not done systematically.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	There are some instances in which the analysis is presented against contextual factors, especially within the discussion on Effectiveness. A section on challenges provides further exploration of possible contextual factors affecting the CP achievements.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	There is a section on the advancement of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls, however there is insufficient data presented in this section to fully understand the results achieved in this area. The section mostly notes that the 8th CP focuses on SDG 5 and integrates a human rights based approach, but it does not describe in which ways. In addition, it says the UNFPA CO contributed to the elimination of all forms of GBV, but there is little evidence provided to support this claim beyond mention of outputs. The same lack of evidence exists for assessing disability inclusion; though disability is covered, the findings are not fully substantiated and triangulated in all cases, though this section is more fully developed than the discussion on gender.
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The conclusions are clearly linked to the findings.
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?	Partial	The conclusions extend over 5.5 pages and do not move substantially beyond the findings. However, in some cases, they do reflect additional analysis and understanding of cross-cutting issues and contextual factors. An exception is that they do not highlight the work and accomplishments of the CP related to disability inclusion.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions presented.
<b>6. Recommendations</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations are cross-referenced to clearly show alignment with the many conclusions presented.
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The recommendations assign a target audience and define the operational implications to make them action-oriented. However, the financial and technical implications, and possible limits, of recommendations are not assessed or clearly described to make them fully operational or action-oriented. The large number of recommendations - 15 - also affects actionability particularly as most are identified as high priority.
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	The recommendations consider cross-cutting issues and are balanced and impartial.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	Recommendations are prioritized, though most are considered 'high' priority and only two related to coordination are 'medium' priority.
<b>7. Gender</b>	0 1 2 3 <sup>(iii)</sup>	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) <sup>(*)</sup></i>		

<p>1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?</p>	<p><b>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) 2</b> - There is not a specific gender and human rights objective but the assessment of GEEW is included in the scope.</p> <p><b>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) 3</b> - Gender, disability and human rights were considered cross-cutting areas to be addressed.</p> <p><b>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) 3</b> - GEEW is focus of EQ4 under the Effectiveness criterion.</p> <p><b>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) 0</b> - There is one relevant indicator in the evaluation matrix - "Evidence of gender lens applied in monitoring, data disaggregation and data use" - however, this was not addressed in the analysis. Annex 5 is an assessment grid for the M&amp;E system, and although it is quite comprehensive, there is no reference to whether gender disaggregated data is collected.</p>
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>	<p><b>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) 1</b> - The evaluation notes that adolescents were consulted during focus groups, though there is not any other explanation of how gender considerations were integrated into the methodology and there was minimal presentation of disaggregated data.</p> <p><b>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) 1</b> - The evaluation employed a primarily qualitative approach though did present national statistical data. The stakeholder list in the annexes was not sex disaggregated to show adequate representation of both women and men, girls and boys, in interviews and focus groups.</p> <p><b>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) 2</b>- Diverse sources were consulted, and triangulation was applied, though not systematically.</p> <p><b>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) 2</b> Youth were consulted as part of FGDs and sampling for site visits took into account the poorest region with a Youth Center (table 2). However, it is difficult to assess whether representativeness was achieved as the numbers participating from each region are not provided.</p> <p><b>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) 0</b> - There was limited discussion of ethical safeguards. Ethical considerations should be have been more carefully explained, particularly as FGDs involved students. It is also problematic for confidentiality reasons that the names of evaluation participants, including of students, are provided in the annexed list of stakeholders consulted.</p>
<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p><b>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) 3</b> - The background section is sufficient.</p> <p><b>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) 1</b> - Quotations are used from interview sources, including from government and implementing partners. Data is disaggregated only when it is available at the national level.</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) 1</b> - This is apparent to some degree in that the unintended effects subsection notes the delay and cancellation of GBV-related activities due to the pandemic.</p> <p><b>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) 3</b> - There is a relevant recommendation.</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		
<b>Total scoring points</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>64</b>	

**Overall assessment level of evaluation report** **Fair**

The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.

The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion in the evaluation findings, however the findings are not well-substantiated in this regard and the methodology could be more explicit in how it mainstreamed gender and human rights considerations.

**Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)**

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

Yes  No

If yes, please explain:

Text input area for explanation.