

Organizational unit: _____ **Year of report:** 2017

Title of evaluation report: Evaluation du quatrieme programme pays RDC-UNFPA (2013-2017)

Overall quality of report: **Good** **Date of assessment:** November 25th, 2017

Overall comments: The report is easy-to-read-although it is longer than the maximum expected from a country programme evaluation (97 pages instead of 70 pages). It includes a description of the methodology, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation used an appropriate design to collect data that could help respond to the evaluation questions although the evaluators reported that they did not have enough data to analyze all cross-cutting issues. The contextual factors have extensively been described and the report used triangulation to support most of the findings. The conclusions are directly linked to the findings and the recommendations to the conclusions. It is nonetheless worth noting that the recommendations are not immediately actionable because the report did not identify their intended users, the timeframe, the financial and technical implications if they were to be implemented.

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 <u>assessment level</u> followed by <u>main comments</u> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)		
I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
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 easy to read and understand. It is written in an accessible language with minimal grammatical and lexical 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)	Partial	The main report is 97-page long excluding the annexes. It goes beyond the 70-page recommendation for country program evaluations	
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 structured in a logical way: there is a clear distinction between the different sections, namely analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations, although it does not have a lessons learned section.	
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 included in the report, they include the TORs, the list of interviewees, the methodological tools as well as the interviewees and the evaluation matrix. An evaluation reference group has been put in place and consulted throughout the process as indicated in various parts in the report. In addition the UNFPA staff has been consulted with regard to the process and was given a chance to provide comments when the first on the draft version of the report.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
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 included in the report is written as a stand-alone section. It 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	The structure of the executive summary is clear. The purpose is included as well as the methodology, main conclusion and recommendations. The summary includes the intended audience, the objectives and a brief description of the interventions.	
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is reasonably concise. It is 5-page long and is written in a clear language.	

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The target audience has been described in the evaluation report. They are named in the introduction chapter as " le Conseil d'Administration de l'UNFPA, les décideurs de UNFPA (Bureau pays, bureau régional pour l'Afrique Australe et Orientale, les divisions du siège), le Gouvernement de la RDC, les autres partenaires nationaux et les partenaires au développement"	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The development and institutional context of the evaluation has clearly and extensively been described and constraints explained in the report.	
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 evaluation report did describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic. The theory of change of the different thematic area has been reconstructed with the help from the programme staff and the evaluators did assess their adequacy. The evaluators note that the theory of change still has to be better defined by the program (p. 18).	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
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	The evaluation framework is clearly described in the report and in the annexes, The evaluation questions , data sources methods for data collection have all been included either in the report or in the annexes.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools for data collection have been extensively described in the report and their choice justified, and shown in detail in the Annexes.	
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)?	Partial	There is a comprehensive stakeholder map but the consultation process has only been partially described. There is no evidence that key stakeholders have been consulted on the draft recommendations.	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methods for analysis have clearly been described for all types of data.	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	The methodological limitations have been acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy has been described in the report. The strategy is to create an illustrative sample, including all of the main elements of the programme in terms of stakeholders and types of location.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology that has been used by the evaluators does enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data.	
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Partial	The design sought to assess the cross-cutting issues such as gender and human rights. The samples were done to include both men and women and have a significant representation of vulnerable people. The consultants tried to analyze the data and make conclusions but could not do so because of the insufficient data on gender. That has been explained under point 1.3.6.	

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	The evaluation did triangulate data collected as appropriate. Secondary data has for example been compared to the findings from primary data sources,	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluation did identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources. Most of the references were from known sources such as performance reports and national statistics.	

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	The evaluation did identify the possible limitations (bias and data gaps) in primary and secondary data sources and did explain, in most cases, what was done to minimize such issues. For example, they noted the absence of annual workplans in the partners' offices and the reliance on other appropriate sources of information.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	There is evidence that data has been collected with sensitivity to discrimination and other ethical issues. Point 1.3.8 clarifies all the steps that the consultants followed to streamline ethical issues during data collection.

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No 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. The report cited several references from secondary or primary sources to substantiate the findings.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretation has been described in the report.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis has been done against the evaluation questions.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The analysis has been transparent about the sources and the quality of data.
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	This evaluation has made a model effort to show causal connections in determining the relationship between programme outputs and the expected results. The report often showed the link between cause and effect of the intervention in terms of output but not always in terms of outcome. For example, on p47: "La baisse du nombre de décès maternels évités est certainement le fait du volume des produits SR/PF etc." The evidence for this is not clear. Moreover, graph 10 is about the "number of maternal deaths avoided", and shows a continuous decrease from 2014 to 2016. Success would be in a decrease in the number of MDs and/or an increase in the number of MDs avoided. There was no discussion of unintended effects.
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The report does show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant. Each programme being evaluated has different targets and this is maintained in the analysis of results.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The analysis in the report has been done against contextual factors. The report does extensively describe the context at the beginning and tried to make reference to them to explain the findings in many parts.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report includes sections on gender equality and reproductive rights as well as on vulnerability and risks in humanitarian crises. These were analyzed in the findings in terms of the broad categories of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, particularly showing the causal connections between UNFPA output and changes that were observed in issues such as violence against women. They also noted that there was close work with the gender ministry and sub-national gender offices. The analysis has extensively made reference to those themes although the consultants have themselves recognized that they were not able to collect enough data for a more comprehensive analysis.

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 flow clearly from the findings. Each conclusion has been clearly linked to the analysis under an evaluation question,
--------------------------------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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	The conclusions go beyond the findings and in many cases, they provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues being evaluated.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment?	Yes	The conclusions are logical and seem to come directly from the findings. As such, they appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment.

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations flow directly from the conclusions. The report include under the conclusion section tables that links the conclusions to the findings and the recommendations to 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	The recommendations are straightforward but the report failed to identify the intended users. In addition, they do not include a human, financial and technical analysis if they were to be implemented.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial since they can be backed by the conclusions that were made.	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	No	No timeframe for implementation has ben proposed.	
5. Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	The recommendations have been prioritized to facilitate appropriate management response and their implementation. For each recommendation, a set of actions have been identified.	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>			
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	1	The evaluation question number 7 makes reference to empowerment of youth and women. But the report indicated that there was not enough data to do a detailed gender analysis but the methodology that was adopted ensured , when possible, that GEEW-related data were collected.	
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?	1	The evaluation criteria and evaluation questions do not specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.	
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2	The methodology that was used to collect and analyze the data is somewhat gender-responsive. In many cases, the report was able to identify the results of the interventions on the lives of women. In the list of interviewees, the consultants mentioned the people they interviewed to obtain their opinions on gender and reproductive rights, and gender-based violence, They also sought to have a fair representation of both men and women in that list but they recognized in the report that they were not able to collect enough gender data to make a good analysis.	

4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis that was done. Conclusions 9,10,11,13,14 and the associated findings and recommendations do reflect a gender perspective in the way the analysis was done. The consultants went as far as undertaking an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the programming with regard to gender. The consultants identified the positive role UNFPA was doing in the country with regard to gender and SGBV, although they found some weaknesses here. They did not elaborate sufficiently on what actions could be taken and what the implications in terms of resources would be, if UNFPA wanted to improve and scale up its work in the DRC.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(*) 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 totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

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	22	60	18	
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

The analysis was designed and was thorough, meriting a good. It was less good in the recommendations which lacked time-horizons and priorities.

Consideration of significant constraints

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

Yes No

If yes, please explain: