

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

**Title of evaluation report:** Evaluation finale du sixeme programme de cooperation Togo-UNFPA 2014-2018

**Overall quality of report:** Good **Date of assessment:** 3 November 2017

**Overall comments:** Overall this is a good report. The consultants did a good job describing the contextual factors and connecting their findings with those factors to find credible explanations. They identify the mitigation measures that were used to minimize the impacts of the limits of the report. The consultants made use of both primary data sources for the qualitative information and secondary data sources for the quantitative one. The findings are based on evidence and directly connected to the conclusions which are connected to the recommendations, although the recommendations have not been prioritized and their human , financial and technical implications have not been identified.

**Assessment Levels**

	<span style="background-color: #17a2b8; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Very Good</span>	strong, above average, best practice	<span style="background-color: #6c757d; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Good</span>	satisfactory, respectable	<span style="background-color: #ffc107; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Fair</span>	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	<span style="background-color: #dc3545; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Unsatisfactory</span>	weak, does not meet minimal quality standards
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------	---	--	---	---

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>		
<b>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
<b>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?</b>	Yes	The report is easy to read and understand. The structure is clear. It is written in an accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling and 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)	Yes	The length of the report is reasonable. It is 71 pages excluding the annexes though it appears longer due to formatting.	
<b>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)?</b>	Yes	The report is structured in a logical way. There is a clear distinction between analysis/findings, conclusions and recommendations sections.	
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 complete, and include the TORs, the bibliography, the list of interviewees, the tools as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
<b>5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?</b>	Yes	The Executive Summary is written as a stand-alone document and 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)?	Partial	The executive summary has a clear structure but does not include a 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 4 pages.	

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<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 evaluation was designed for colleagues in UNFPA country office and counterparts to feed into/influence the next country programme.	
<b>2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	The development and institutional context is clearly described and most of the constraints explained.	
<b>3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?</b>	Yes	A results framework is included in the report itself (as Fig 3,1) but the full theory of change is presented in the results matrix in the Annexes.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
<b>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?</b>	Yes	The evaluation framework is described in the text and in the evaluation matrix. The evaluation matrix in the annexes include the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools that have been used are included in the annexes and have been described in the report under the methodology section.	
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)?	Yes	The stakeholder mapping exercise is described in the report under the methodology section. The consultation process has also been described and included the setting up of a GRE (a reference group for the evaluation) to monitor the process. Phase 4 under "presentation du processus" makes reference to the consultation of the stakeholders on the draft results and recommendations.	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methods for analysis for all types of data have been described. While the primary data that was collected was mainly qualitative, the evaluators did use secondary data sources for the quantitative information.	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Partial	Methodological limitations and bias are clearly explained but mitigation measures are not described in the report. Therefore, we cannot say to what extent the limits have impacted the quality of the report.	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy has been described for the collection of the qualitative data. It was done in such a way that all the regions were included and each type of actor in each component interviewed.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology that has been used does enable collection of gender disaggregated data but the report does not draw on disaggregated data. For example, under effectiveness, there is no gender disaggregation of the data reported.	
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The methodology is appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and human rights.	

<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			

<b>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</b>	Yes	How the data has been triangulated is described in the report. The evaluators triangulated their qualitative findings with the quantitative information from secondary sources.
<b>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</b>	Yes	The evaluators identified and made use of both qualitative and quantitative data sources. While the qualitative data comes from interviews and direct observations, the quantitative information comes from secondary data sources.
<b>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?</b>	Partial	The data limitations are clearly indicated but the mitigating measures have not been described.
<b>4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</b>	No	While the terms of reference indicate that the data should be collected with sensitivity to UNEG norms, the evaluators do not produce evidence of sensitivity.

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
<b>1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?</b>	Yes	The findings are in general substantiated by evidence. The report includes several footnotes that provide more detail regarding the findings.	
<b>2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?</b>	Yes	The evaluators were careful, in each case, to show the basis for their findings, drawing on the most relevant information available.	
<b>3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?</b>	Yes	The analysis is presented according to the evaluation questions which are mentioned in the title of each sub-chapter. All the analysis has been done against the evaluation questions.	
<b>4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?</b>	Partial	The analysis is transparent about the sources. There is a little bit less transparency when it comes to the quality of the quantitative data.	
<b>5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Yes	In the design as well as in the analysis, a careful effort has been made to show the causal connection between the project's activities and what has happened as a consequence. This is especially clear with regard to effectiveness, where causal connections are most important. While little was said about unintended outcomes this is because none were observed and reported.	
<b>6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?</b>	Yes	The results for different target groups are shown. The evaluators look at the results on a county-by-county basis as well as per program beneficiaries (midwives, mothers, children, adolescents, and youth.). For example, the Sexual and Reproductive Health program has been successful in the achievement of the Output 1 in the six high maternal mortality burden counties of Isiolo, Lamu, Mandera, Marsabit, Migori, and Wajir (p. 27).	
<b>7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?</b>	Yes	The analysis has been presented against contextual factors. The report does make reference to several contextual factors to explain some findings. For example, in the analysis of efficiency, the overall reduction in development assistance funds for Togo is clearly shown as a major contextual factor.	

8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report elaborates on cross cutting issues such as gender equality and human rights and vulnerability. For example, in a review of clubs to which youth are brought, reference is made to the effect on young leaders of learning how to prevent violence against young girls.
--	-----	---

<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
<b>1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?</b>	Yes	The conclusions are organized by evaluation criterion and in each case are linked to the finding.
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 provide additional understanding of the underlying issues. They all seem to give additional details regarding the activities of the country program and the achieved results.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment?	Yes	Conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment. The evaluators provide objective arguments, such as, for instance, when they back their conclusions with data from secondary sources, which they have done extensively.

<b>6. Recommendations</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
<b>1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?</b>	Yes	The recommendations all flow from the conclusions.
<b>2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?</b>	Partial	The recommendations are clear but they do not identify the targeted audience and are not always action-oriented. The human, financial and technical implications have not been assessed.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations (as with the conclusions) appear unbiased and transparent, grounded in the findings/analysis.
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	The timeframe is the next country programme, as well as the final year of the current programme.
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Partial	Priority levels are clear for each recommendation (Medium or High). But no other indication has been given to facilitate their implementation.

<b>7. Gender</b>	0 1 2 3	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<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?	2	GEEW is one of the programme areas being evaluated and in the others gender is a clear factor. There are clear references in the design.

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	GEEW is not included in the evaluation criteria but there is one GEEW-related "sub question" under effectiveness. The evaluator is asked to analyze how the different interventions impacted the different beneficiary groups according to their gender (Question 3 under effectiveness). The evaluation questions/criteria do not call for an analysis of how gender has been integrated in program design, planning and implementation. The evaluator tried to obtain gender-disaggregated information where possible. In addition, the report has tried to assess the status of gender and human rights in the country and how they were integrated in the interventions.
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2	The methodology and methods are gender responsive. An example is the use of gender analysis in the section on gender and human rights where it is noted that "La valorisation de la position sociale et du potentiel de la femme dans la famille et dans la communauté a connu une régression" based on a review of gender indicators.
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	2	Depending on the program being evaluated, the findings usually reflect a gender analysis, especially in key areas, like youth and reproductive health. There is a whole section for gender and human rights in the report. The analysis and recommendations has some disaggregation by gender, although the recommendations do not show how their implementation will impact different groups.

(\*) 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		
<b>Total scoring points</b>	11	60	29	
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>		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 approach to obtaining and analyzing data on results is at a high standard.

**Consideration of significant constraints**

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: