| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Organizational unit:** | **UNFPA** | **Year of report:** | **2016** |
| **Title of evaluation report:** | **EVALUATION INDEPENDANTE DU 7è PROGRAMME DE PAYS UNFPA/GUINEE** | | |
| **Overall quality of report:** | **Good** | **Date of assessment:** | **3 September 2017** |

**Overall comments:** The evaluation covers the 7th programme by focusing on a series of evaluation questions that are consistent with UNFPA standards.  The evaluation report is well written, though longer than normal, and the methodology has been clearly described. The report faces issues relating to sampling, but, through careful analysis is able to draw useful findings leading to valid conclusions.  The report could serve as a example of a good evaluation report if the report and the executive summary were shorter. While the conclusions and the recommendations are directly linked to the findings, recommendations lack prioritisation and implementation time-schedule. Additionally, they are not clearly targeted - the actor for whom it is more relevant when it comes to implementation have not been indicated. Nonetheless, it will be useful for the formulation and implementation of the next programme.

| **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<br>No<br>Partial | Assessment Level: | **Fair** |
| _To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly_ | | | |
| **1. 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?** | Yes | The report is  clear, and easy to read.  It is written in an accessible langage with minimal grammatical , spelling or punctuation 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) | No | At 125 pages, the report is too long and could have been reduced to a manageable size with editing. | |
| **3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?** | Yes | The report is appropriately structured in a logical way with a clear distinction between analysis/findings, conclusions and recommendations, although it contains a number of sections that could have been merged. | |
| 4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process? | Yes | The annexes are comprehensive and do contain the TORs,  the list of people who were interviewed. It does not include a stakeholder consultation process although that can be found in the main report. | |
| _Executive summary_ | | | |
| **5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?** | Yes | The executive summary is a stand-alone section and presents the main results of the evaluation. | |

| 6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)? | Yes | There is a clear structure of the executive summary. The purpose, intended audience, objectives and description of the intervention , methodology mains conclusions and recommendations are included. |
|---|---|---|
| 7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)? | No | The executive summary is almost 8 pages, which makes it unreasonably long as compared to the UNFPA standards. |

| 2. Design and Methodology | Yes No Partial | Assessment Level: | **Fair** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context* | | | |
| 1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation? | Yes | The report describes the target audience for the evaluation | |
| **2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?** | Yes | The context is well-described including, especially, the structure of the 7th country programme and its differences with the 6th as well as connections with the UNDAF. | |
| **3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?** | Yes | The report contains a clear description of the intervention logic. The report clearly describes the programme activities and expected results, It shows clearly what was expected to happen. | |
| *To ensure a rigorous design and methodology* | | | |
| **4. 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 thorough evaluation matrix in the annexes and the basis for the evaluation is fully described in the text. | |
| 5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified? | Partial | The basic tools (document review, interviews, focus groups and field visits) are described generally, but some key issues, like how the persons to be interviewed or participate in focus groups, was not described so that the representativeness of the data could be assessed. | |
| 6. 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)? | No | There is no comprehensive stakeholder map, although there is a list of who should be interviewed. | |
| 7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data? | Yes | The methodology and findings sections show how the data were analyzed. | |
| 8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?) | Yes | There is a section on methodological limiations and, generally, how they were addressed. | |
| 9. Is the sampling strategy described? | No | While the persons who were interviewed or participated in focus groups are described, how they were selected is not. Also, the reasons for selecting the locations to visit are not given. As a result, the representativeness of the findings is compromised. | |
| 10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data? | Yes | The methodology that was adopted does enable dissagregagetd data collection and reporting and the analysis used disaggregated data when necessary. | |
| 11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)? | Yes | The design and methodology are appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues, The evaluation used focus groups discussions for each type of beneficiaries, which allowed to collect disaggregated information oh how the cross cutting issues were handled for each group. | |

| 3. Reliability of Data | Yes<br>No<br>Partial | | Assessment Level: | **Fair** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes* | | | | |
| **1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?** | | Yes | The evaluation consultants triangulated data appropriately: "Besides a systematic triangulation of data sources and data collection methods and tools, the validation of data was sought through regular exchanges with the UNFPA programme staff" (p. 15). It is possible to find examples of triangulation in the text: "The interviews and desk studies show…" (p. 49), "Based on interviews with stakeholders as well as desk reviews and analysis of secondary data…" (p. 55). | |
| **2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?** | | Partial | Many of the findings used material from documents, but the evaluators were careful to indicate the limitations of the data, where necessary. Interviews were mainly used for process factors (why targets were not achieved, weaknesses in the delivery of output). The data collection from primary data sources was mainly qualitative , as indicated in the report. Most of the figures inluded in the report are from secondary data sources but the evaluators did not always indicate their sources or the reliability of those sources. | |
| **3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?** | | Yes | Limitations in the data were always indicated under the methodology section. | |
| 4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations? | | Yes | The evaluation report does partially indicate that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination (based on gender, ethnicities, age, or other issues). The interviews and focus groups were not presented with names, indicating a concern with ethical considerations. | |

| 4. Analysis and Findings | Yes<br>No<br>Partial | | Assessment Level: | **Good** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* | | | | |
| **1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?** | | Yes | The findings are substantiated by evidence. There is a constant reference to alternative sources as a proof to the findings statements, for example the evaluators agreed on the program relevance after comparing it to the DSRP, the UNDAF and the report of a needs assessment that was done prior to programme design; The evaluators concluded that not all needs were being covered by quoting the beneficiaries' interview notes and doing a direct observation on the type of services that were being provided. | |
| 2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described? | | Yes | The basis for interpretation has been well described. | |
| 3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions? | | Yes | In presenting the findings by evaluation questions, the data used for the finding is always shown clearly. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data? | Partial | In each finding, the data used are clear. For many, the main source is documents supplemented by interviews and observations. There is, however, no clear indication of the quality of data from non-documentary sources, given that the representativeness of the sample is not clear. |
| **5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?** | Yes | This evaluation is careful to show cause and effect links between the output of the programmes and projects and what was expected to happen (and what could be observed about that). Unintended outcomes were most of the time not mentioned. |
| 6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant? | Yes | The evaluation looks at key differences by location and by gender, as well as other factors like who was trained. |
| **7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?** | Yes | Contextual factors are always referenced in explaining the basis for findings. |
| 8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights? | Yes | Gender and other cross-cutting issues are dealt with both in specific questions and throughout. |

| **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 conclusions are structured around the questions, but combine them and summarize findings, both positive and negative, that give a good picture of how well the 7th country programme has worked. | |
| 2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated? | Yes | In each case, the conclusions add an understanding of the larger meaning of the findings. | |
| 3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement? | Yes | The conlusions also convey the evaluators unbiased judgment as they are all based on well-triangulated evidence. | |

| **6. Recommendations** | Yes No Partial | Assessment Level: | **Fair** |
|---|---|---|---|
| *To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations* | | | |
| **1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?** | Yes | The recommendations generally flow from the conclusions. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?** | Partial | While the evaluation states that there are 10 recommendations, number 1,3 and 5 are missing from the text.  It should be (from the Executive Summary): "(1) de renforcer le leadership de la coordination par une stratégie programmatique qui planifie les fonctions clé de cette composante et les suit avec des indicateurs smart, y compris le renforcement de l'institutionnalisation de l'unité S&E et du Programme P&D au sein du bureau pays de l'UNFPA", 3 should be "de renforcer les capacités à la gestion des données et des bases de données virtuelles et à la planification dans l'ensemble des secteurs du développement" and 5 should be "de mieux accompagner les PI dans le renforcement de leur système, particulièrement, de mettre en place une stratégie d'optimisation de la ressource humaines et de la compétence, le long de la pyramide d'intervention grâce à des renforcements de capacités, des partenariats et mécanismes incitatifs et de rationaliser l'utilisation/dispensation des intrants et de la logistique fournis"<br>Those that are there are clearly written, but since they do not include three of the recommendations, there is a flaw. In addition they are not targeted to the intended users and are not always action-oriented. |
| 3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial? | Yes | Those that are presented are balanced. |
| 4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed? | No | There is no timeframe given. |
| 5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation? | No | No priority is given. |

| 7. Gender | 0<br>1<br>2<br>3 | Assessment Level: | **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? | 2 | GEEW has not been included as an evaluation criteria but as an evaluation question in the TOR. | |
| 2. Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved? | 2 | The evaluation questions include gender factors, although not in all places where they could be shown.  The evaluation has used gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools as the evaluators were able, most of the time to derive the gender implication in their findings. | |
| 3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected? | 2 | The methodologies used were not particularly gender-friendly and gender was only analyzed in some questions. | |
| 4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis? | 3 | The findings, conclusions and recommenation have also , most of the time, reflected a gender analysis. | |

(\*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool, see Annex 7. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totalling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

**Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment**

| | **Assessment Levels (\*)** |
|---|---|

| Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*) | 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** | 11 | 47 | 42 | |
| **Overall assessment level of evaluation report** | | **Good** | | |
| | **Very good** very confident to use | **Good** confident to use | **Fair** use with caution | **Unsatisfactory** not confident to use |

**(\*)  (a)** Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column.
**(b)** Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair').
**(c)** Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain

• How it can be used?

• What aspects to be cautious about?

**Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory**

While there were some limitations to the methodology and the evaluation was much too long, its findings and conclusions were well done and presented.

**Consideration of significant constraints**

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:          ☐  Yes          ☑  No

If yes, please explain: