

Organizational unit:		Year of report:	2021
Title of evaluation report:	UNFPA Country Programme Evaluation: Republic of Moldova		
Overall quality of report:	Very good	Date of assessment:	6 December 2021
Overall comments:	<p>This is a very detailed evaluation of the country programme. It makes solid use of a wide variety of documents that provide a solid quantitative basis for findings, conclusions and recommendations that are elaborated with solid evidence from qualitative source. Despite COVID-19 that provided some limitations, the evaluation was able to work around these and ensure that the evaluation was solidly based. The recommendations were based on findings and conclusions, and are forward-looking. As highlighted by the evaluation team, special attention was paid to integration of the gender, human rights and disability inclusion considerations in the context analysis, evaluation questions, evaluation methods, data collection and analysis and reporting. The context section is notable for its subsection on gender that describes the challenges faced by different vulnerable groups including women with disabilities. The methodology includes a specific subsection describes how these issues, including disability, were taken into account. The report can be used as an example of good practice in this regard. One shortcoming is the very granular presentation of Effectiveness which makes the report unnecessarily long especially as much of the detail is also found in the evaluation matrix. However, the evaluators do well in presenting a succinct Executive Summary and set of Conclusions and Recommendations that appear very useful for decision makers.</p>		
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 <i>assessment level</i> followed by <i>main comments</i> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)	
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
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)?	Yes	The report is correctly structured. It appears to be well edited with no noticeable errors.	
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) <i>Note: YES - the report is within the indicated maximum page length. PARTIAL - the report exceeds the maximum page limit by 1- 5 pages. NO - the report exceeds the maximum page limit beyond 5 pages.</i>	No	The main text of the report is 100 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 required annexes are present.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
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)	Yes	The summary is a stand-alone and includes all of the required sections.	
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)? <i>Note: YES - the executive summary is within the indicated maximum page limit. PARTIAL - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit by 1 to 2 pages. NO - the executive summary exceeds the maximum page limit beyond 2 pages.</i>	Yes	The evaluators do well in providing a succinct presentation of a detailed study. The summary is 4 pages.	

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The context is well-explained and very detailed. Table 3 usefully highlights vulnerable groups and the main issues faced in relation to the UNFPA mandate. This includes specific issues faced by women with disabilities.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	The original theory of change is shown as well as a revised version that was used in the evaluation. The revised version is a chart that shows activities related to CP outputs and the titles of SP Outcome areas but does not capture the actual intended outcomes.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
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	The framework is well-described. The evaluation matrix includes all dimensions, as well as the data obtained for each question.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	Tools are clearly described (document review, online individual and group interviews, and online focus groups) and their choice shown.	
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)? <i>Remember: Please address all three aspects of this sub-criteria in the comment: 1) is a comprehensive stakeholder map included (in either the report itself or the annexes) 2) Is the overall stakeholder consultation process described and 3) within the consultation process were key stakeholders consulted on the recommendations specifically? 4) does the evaluation stakeholder mapping and data collection methods involve vulnerable and marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities and their</i>	Yes	There is a map (Annex 2 - a detailed table that sets out the many stakeholders involved by outcome area along with their role and the aspect of the programs they engage with). The stakeholders were reflected in the Evaluation Reference Group. The report describes the role of the ERG including their input on the recommendations.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data? <i>Remember: This sub-criteria is asking about the data analysis methods used and whether they are clearly described - was contribution analysis used, or qualitative comparative analysis, for example, or descriptive statistics? Triangulation is not a method of analysis; it is a validation technique.</i>	Partial	There is a section on analysis methods that describes a general process (with a graphic from the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook). Presumably some sort of coding and content analysis was used but this was not explicitly defined.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	Two limitations are noted and mitigation measures described.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described? <i>This criteria is asking whether the methodological approach to determining the sample of stakeholders consulted and the sample of site visits is described.</i> <i>Reviewers should examine whether the evaluation report includes information on how the universe was</i>	Partial	The composition of the sample was described (table 2 provides a useful infographic shows the disaggregation of the sample by stakeholder group, gender and adults/children) and was drawn from the stakeholder map.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data? <i>Remember: The default should be to disaggregate by sex. Whenever possible, this sub-criterion is also</i>	Yes	Disaggregated data were found and used.	
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The methodology allows the assessment of cross-cutting issues. A specific subsection describes how these issues, including disability, were taken into account. This is an example of good practice.	
3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good

To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	There was consistent triangulation.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The sources were identified and were reliable.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	Ethical considerations are well described; one of which was the decision to not use illustrative quotes to protect the identity of respondents.
4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
To ensure sound analysis and credible findings		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	In each case the evidence is shown clearly in the main report. The annexed evaluation matrix also includes a very detailed accounting of data collected for each question with much of this text then being copied into the main report.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Partial	The basis for interpretation is described but in more granular detail than needed particularly under Effectiveness which spans 40 pages.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are clearly structured by questions, and each key finding is numbered and bolded.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The cause and effect links are shown, Although unintended outcomes were not fully addressed - the ToRs (p 10) highlighted the need to do this - there is brief reference to an unexpected outcome mentioned by evaluation participants regarding the national network of youth centers (p 58).
<i>Remember: Please address both parts of the sub-criteria in the comment, namely: are the cause/effect</i>		
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Partial	Group differences are presented in some cases, but at the output level (table 12 shows # of pregnant adolescent girls targeted by region in 2016 and 2018). There is reference to UNFPA's work to push for differentiated outcome level data to be collected at the national level (table 16 shows national level targets for birth rates amongst adolescents in urban and rural areas for 2022, 2026 and 2030).
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors are consistently described.
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 described. An example is the discussion on Coordination noting UNFPA's work with OHCHR on developing a project to support elderly and disabled people during the pandemic.
5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
To assess the validity of conclusions		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The relevant findings and criteria are shown for each conclusion.
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 place the findings in a broader context. Conclusion 4 specifically addresses cross-cutting issues, explaining how gender, human rights and disability considerations are strategically integrated in many UNFPA interventions.
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	Each recommendation is linked to respective conclusions.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The target of each recommendation is shown, and the suggested steps to operationalize these are presented in detail.	
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	They are balanced and impartial. Cross-cutting issues are addressed.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	They are prioritized as high or medium and by strategic and programmatic recommendations.	
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</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><i>Remember: Ensure that the reviewer does not confuse the content of the country programme with the approach to the evaluation. This question is asking whether the evaluation criteria and questions are gender responsive and inclusion of GEWE dimensions in its scope of analysis (i.e. in the objectives for example) or the indicators the evaluation selects against which data will be collected so that the evaluation is able to assess whether the country programme is gender responsive.</i></p> <p><i>A general note on UNFPA programming: While there may be evidence of gender being referred to as a cornerstone of UNFPA programming - in the sense that most UNFPA programmes target women and girls - this does not necessarily mean that UNFPA's work is gender/human rights responsive. GEEW is about</i></p>	2	<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) GEEW considerations are not specifically mentioned in scope or objectives. Score=0</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) It is considered under Effectiveness 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) Gender equality is considered under a question that includes other types of vulnerabilities. Score=2</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) To the extent there were limitations, they are shown. Score=3</p>	
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p> <p><i>Remember: Ensure that the reviewer does not confuse the content of the country programme with the approach to the evaluation. This sub-criteria is asking whether the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions (i.e. the evaluation itself) are gender responsive; in other words, are the criteria interpreted/operationalized and evaluations questions developed in a way that is able to capture whether (or not) gender equality/human rights/the empowerment of women has been integrated into UNFPA's country programmelsupport (in the design/planning, implementation and results)?</i></p>	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 is a subsection on how gender and disability issues were incorporated. Score=3</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) It employs a mixed method approach. 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) Triangulation is used. 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 address the diversity. 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) Ethical standards were used and described. Particular attention was paid to confidentiality, and especially for youth participants. Score=3</p>	

3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<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 required section is included. It has a detailed section on gender that describes the challenges faced by different vulnerable groups including women with disabilities. Table 3 is an example of good practice in highlighting these issues. 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) Quantified data is used as required. The perspectives of different stakeholder groups including youth are clearly brought out. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) These are not specifically investigated. Score=0</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 is a specific conclusion on cross-cutting issues and gender dimensions are reflected in several recommendations. 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	100			

Overall assessment level of evaluation report

Very good

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.

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: