

Organizational unit: **Year of report:** 2016

Title of evaluation report: UNFPA 6TH COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION: KINGDOM OF LESOTHO 2013-2017

Overall quality of report: Fair **Date of assessment:** 7 July 2017

Overall comments: The report is rated fair because of some limitations, especially in the design and findings. The structure and clarity of reporting is generally good, but there are problems with some labeling in sections. The design is generally sound, but lacks several key methods, including a description of how interviewees were selected as well as how the expected results to be measured were defined. The data were reliable, although gender was not part of disaggregation of data. The findings did not always show a clear cause-effect structure, including in determining contributory relations between outputs and outcomes. Despite this, the conclusions were well presented and clearly drew on the findings. The recommendations were generally consistent with norms, but an additional overly-large set of recommendations clouded the section. Gender equality and empowerment of women was only partially addressed.

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	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>		
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Fair	
<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	Comment: 1. While the report is written in accessible language, there are a number of grammatical, punctuation and spelling errors, i.e. "UNFPA support to strengthen government institutional capacity . . . Is not properly and carefully implementation". (Executive Summary p. xiv). Abbreviations are not consistently introduced with the full word/phrase the first time they are used, i.e. CP ET, IPs. Tables and Figures are not consistently referenced in text. It contains the required sections (although rather than conclusions it shows findings and lessons learned). 2. At 83 pages, the report is longer than desirable. 3. The report is structured according to UNFPA standards and makes clear distinctions between the sections. 4. The annexes are complete, although the information on the stakeholder consultation process is described only in terms of who was interviewed or consulted but not what the process was. 5. The Executive Summary is written as a stand-alone section and presents the findings, but not the conclusions of the evaluation. 6. The Executive Summary has a clear structure, but while presenting findings does not have a section on conclusions and does not include the intended audience. 7. At 6 pages it is only a page longer than desirable and therefore is relatively concise.	
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		
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		
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		
<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		
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)?	Partial		
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Partial		

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		Comment:	
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	No	1. The audience is not specified but presumably is those who would be familiar with much of the information provided.	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	2. The country context and constraints are described comprehensively although at 11 pages, provides more detail than what is likely needed for the intended audience and could have been made more concise.	
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	3. The UNFPA program and theory of change is provided by a thorough narrative description and a visual diagram. The evaluators describe how they propose to apply it and in doing so assess the theory's adequacy.	
<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	4. There is an evaluation matrix that follows UNFPA standards and includes indicators, data sources and methods. It is structured around the evaluation questions which address relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, strategic positioning, and added value. Within each assumptions to be assessed are shown, along with their indicators, sources of information and methods for data collection.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	5. The methods chosen appear appropriate. The interview protocols are provided. The list of evaluation questions for each group is very long (35 for partner organizations and more for staff) - too many for an individual interview and there is no indication for how they were prioritized or all covered. It is briefly noted that the data analysis process included content and contribution analysis, however more details should have been provided on the procedures used.	
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	6. There is no "stakeholder map", but the process of identifying them is described carefully and Annex 2 contains a list of the stakeholders consulted.	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	7. There is a description of how data should be analyzed.	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	8. The methodological limitations, including insufficient time for interviews, are noted.	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	No	9. There was no indication of a sampling strategy being applied. For example, the team visited 9 of 10 districts in the country but the basis for this selection was not addressed, and group interviews were held with beneficiaries but there were no details on who attended or why they were invited. The specific way in which youth and other informants were selected is not clear in the text. There were only 24 persons interviewed and it would have been useful to have why they were specifically selected clear in the text.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	10. The methodology appears to enable the collection/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)?	Yes	11. The methodology is appropriate for assessing cross-cutting issues and this was described in the evaluation matrix.	

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		Comment:	
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	1. The evaluation used triangulation and a mixed methods approach to obtaining data.	

2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Partial	obtaining data.
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	2. While there was quantitative data on outputs and interventions, quantitative data on outcomes were only obtained through secondary sources which limited their reliability since the causal connections of outcomes measured from these sources with the qualitative data describing the interventions are not easy to draw. 3. Limitations were stated and addressed for both qualitative and quantitative data.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	4. While it can be assumed that the data were collected with sensitivity given the methods used (including anonymity of informants), this is not described in the analysis.

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		Comment:
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Partial	<p>1. The section has a solid structure - for each program area the evaluation questions and a summary of findings are presented for each criterion, and a table of results compared to baseline is provided. However there is inconsistency between the summary and the explanatory text. In some cases, most notably in the Efficiency section, the paragraphs are listings of findings and it is difficult to determine the main themes. Some key issues in the explanatory text are not reflected in the summary and vice-versa - i.e. in the Efficiency Section (4.1.3), the challenges of staff turnover, shortage of commodities, gaps in project monitoring (which appear to be main concerns) are not mentioned in the summary, and in the Sustainability section, the summary and follow up text address different issues.</p> <p>2. The sources of data for each findings (documents, interviews) is clearly shown through footnotes.</p> <p>3. The analysis is structured according to the evaluation questions.</p> <p>4. The analysis clearly indicates where data were unavailable to provide clear findings (especially on gender-related outputs and targets (p. 48). Similarly, the analysis states that "Resultantly, narrative reports by stakeholders indicate that the level of knowledge on gender issues has improved" but the footnoed suggests that "There is no evidence available to back these statements up."</p> <p>5. As noted, cause and effect links were used primarily through interviews and observation. The analysis identified a number of unintended outcomes.</p> <p>6. The elements of the program being evaluated have different target groups (women, youth, midwives) and the differences were noted throughout.</p> <p>7. Contextual factors are always well-presented in the analysis leading to findings. The evaluators were scrupulous in providing this in the analysis.</p> <p>8. Cross-cutting issues have a discrete section in the findings (section 4.6) with an emphasis on gender mainstreaming.</p>
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
-----------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------------

<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		Comment:
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	1. Chapters 5 (Lessons Learned/Challenges) and 6 (Conclusions)

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	Complement one another in forming the overall set of conclusions. The conclusions at the strategic and operational as well as management levels are appropriate given the findings and are based on the analysis, although "expected changes or effects of the various interventions remain unclear or difficult to infer" [since]... measuring the indicators have not been conducted" (p 77) and therefore "it has not been possible to document changes in all the CP indicators" (p 78). 2. By placing the findings in context, the conclusions go beyond merely repeating the findings. 3. The conclusions clearly reflect an unbiased judgment.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		Comment:
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	<p>1. On the whole, the recommendations are connected to the conclusions and there are references to them.</p> <p>2. The level, specificity and clarity of recommendations is mixed. Some are very clear and others are not (i.e. 7.2.2 "continue to increase the effectiveness of the CP outputs, the scope and geographical spread of the interventions need to be thinned down"). There were a series of "further recommendations" that did not follow the standard order. Some of them were actually included in the correctly drafted recommendations. There are too many - 20 with some having sub-recommendations.</p> <p>3. There is no indication of how the consultations took place and whether they affected the recommendations. They were, however, balanced and unbiased.</p> <p>4. Almost all of the recommendations have a clear timeframe.</p> <p>5. The recommendations are appropriately prioritized, have a clearly indicated body to implement and provide a basis for follow-up.</p>
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3	Assessment Level:	Good
------------------	------------------	-------------------	-------------

<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		Comment:
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>1. Gender equality and reproductive rights have a central focus in the program and are addressed as a specific component and as a cross-cutting theme in the evaluation report.</p> <p>2. The evaluation questions are fully gender sensitive and gender was built into the program being evaluated.</p> <p>3. A key weakness is that the evaluation methodology as applied did not appear to be gender responsive - for example, respondents were not gender disaggregated.</p> <p>4. Gender was included in the findings, conclusions and recommendations.</p>
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?		
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	1	
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	2	

(*) 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

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	11	7	82	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report			Fair	
	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?

The fair rating is based on unevenness in the evaluation design and in its applications in terms of findings. While the weaknesses of the methods and findings need to be considered, the fact that the conclusions are strong and clearly expressed, suggests that the evaluation can be used to help design the next country program.

• What aspects to be cautious about?

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

Consideration of significant constraints

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

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

