

Organizational unit: UNFPA Burundi Country Office **Year of report:** 2016

Title of evaluation report: EVALUATION FINALE DU 7ème PROGRAMME DE COOPERATION BURUNDI – UNFPA 2010 – 2015

Overall quality of report: **Good** **Date of assessment:** 9 December 2016

Overall comments: The evaluation is rated good and covers the country programme. While its presentation is stylistically different and there are some weaknesses in how the methodology was designed and implemented, the findings are solid and are based on clearly expressed evidence, the conclusions flow from this and the recommendations to the country office for the next planning period are clear. There are several innovations, like a well-designed SWOT analysis that provides a good technique.

Assessment Levels

Very Good (blue box)	strong, above average, best practice	Good (green box)	satisfactory, respectable	Fair (yellow box)	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	Unsatisfactory (red box)	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 No 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?	Partial	<p>Comment: The evaluation has the expected content and is the required length. It is drafted, however, in a way that is like an outline. For example, the Executive Summary is the correct length, but is not a self-standing text since it is structured almost like an outline, where all of the requested sections are present but are not in an easy-to-read format. There is a reference to the intended audience ("Le rapport pourrait être utilisé comme document de référence par les principales parties prenantes du programme (UNFPA, partenaires nationaux, autres partenaires techniques et financiers (PTF).") The annexes include the expected material, although the list of documents used and sites consulted is said not to be inclusive.</p>
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	
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?	Partial	
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	

7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes
--	-----

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?	Partial	<p>Comment: The evaluation's purpose and context are well-expressed, and the target is probably the country office. In different parts, it reconstructs the intervention logic and it indicates constraints. However, it does not clearly describe the data collection process, other than that it would be based on the menu of documents, interviews and focus groups. The persons who were interviewed or are in the focus groups are listed in the annex, but are not shown in the text and the basis for selection (other than that they are in one or another office, like UNFPA) is not described. Other than the list of persons interviewed, the stakeholders are not clearly described. Most of the limitation of the data collection process are described and there is appropriate consideration of gender and human rights.</p>
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	

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
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Partial
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

7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	No	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	
3. Reliability of Data		Assessment Level: Fair
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		Comment: The evaluators state that they triangulated the data and there is indication of this. They used both quantitative and qualitative data. In some areas, especially relating to effectiveness, the causal connection with UNFPA work is not clear. For example, the evaluators report that "Le nombre de structures sanitaires assurantes les fonctions SONUB est passé de 5 en 2010 à 19 en 2015 au niveau national. La disponibilité de l'offre par fonction SONUC était de 17 en 2010 et de 46 en 2015 (Enquête SPSR de 2015) « but the connection of UNFPA advice or other output to this result is not clear and this limitation is not noted. The evaluators noted that they used UNEG standards on discrimination and ethical considerations.
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	
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?	Partial	
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	
4. Analysis and Findings		Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		Comment: The information is presented by evaluation question and generally indicates findings supported by data. The focus is on whether the government programme being assisted can demonstrate results. However, in a number of cases in effectiveness the connection between the observed result and the UNFPA output expected to make the result happen is not obvious. For example, the evaluators report that "Le nombre de structures sanitaires assurantes les fonctions SONUB est passé de 5 en 2010 à 19 en 2015 au niveau national. La disponibilité de l'offre par fonction SONUC était de 17 en 2010 et de 46 en 2015 (Enquête SPSR de 2015) « but the connection of UNFPA advice or other output to this result is not clear. In other sections, however, the causal connections are clear and the findings well-supported and balanced, by showing that UNFPA-supported training, for example, improved participation of women in political processes. The sources of data are consistently shown, but their quality is not always indicated. Gender generally is a major issue and is well-addressed in the analysis and findings. The findings reflect different perspectives of stakeholders in the presentation. Contextual factors are consistently taken into account.
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	
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?	Partial	
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	
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		Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		Comment: Although it is drafted in an outline style which makes its reading somewhat difficult, the conclusions flow directly from the findings and show clearly what the evaluation has found out about the programme. There is a very effective SWOT table that covers the main areas and shows clearly what has worked and what has been less effective. There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions as drafted.
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	
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	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good	
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		Comment: Again, the formatting is unusual (completely tabular in this case), but the recommendations are shown clearly to flow from the conclusions and are assigned a priority. All are addressed to the country office and are intended to affect the next country programme.		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes			
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes			
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:	Very good	
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		Comment: : The programme gives a high importance to gender and it is built carefully into UNFPA work. The evaluation criteria include determining how effective UNFPA support has been and the methodology used acquires good information about gender. The findings lead to a series of key recommendations for improvement.		
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	3			
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			
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2			
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3			
<p>(*) 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).</p> <p>(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).</p> <p>0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.</p> <p>1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.</p>				
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	29	40	31	
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 issues in the methodology and in the way in which the evaluation was presented, its findings were sound, led to excellent conclusions and recommendations that can be taken into account in the preparation of the next country programme.

Consideration of significant constraints

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain:

