

# EQA for UNFPA Cambodia Country Programme Evaluation (2011-2015)



**Title of Evaluation Report: UNFPA Cambodia Country Programme Evaluation: Fourth Programme Cycle, 2011-2015**

**Overall Quality Rating: Poor**

**Overall Assessment:** The report is clearly structured and well-written, and user-friendly. The executive summary is standalone and presents the main results of the evaluation, along with the purpose and methodology used. However, in the report, there is a lack of clarity on results-based management terminology that affects the overall quality of the evaluation: outputs, outcomes and impacts are frequently confused with each other. This weakness in correctly identifying the logical chain makes it hard for the evaluators to make credible claims on the achievements of the programme. Moreover, while the evaluation team described the methodology adequately, they do not discuss or develop sufficiently how data is collected. In terms of describing findings, the report hardly mentions where or how the primary information was collected from. They also do not demonstrate the contribution of UNFPA to the country’s development results. Conclusions are often weakly supported by credible findings. Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are both strategic and operationally feasible; however, they are not prioritized, and could have been more targeted.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>  <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i>                      Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• i) Acronyms; ii) Exec Summary; iii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned (where applicable)</li> <li>• Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>                      Report is comprehensive and logically structured. Formatting is clear and user-friendly. The content includes most of the minimum requirements of the evaluation criteria in the structure specified: ‘Abbreviations and Acronyms’; ‘Executive Summary’; ‘Introduction’, ‘Country Context’; ‘Evaluation Findings’; ‘Conclusions’; ‘Recommendations’. The annex also includes all minimum requirements: ‘Terms of Reference for the Evaluation’; ‘References’; ‘List of persons contacted...’; ‘Details of Methodology’. However, methodology is included under the Introduction rather than as a separate/standalone section but this does not undermine the overall quality of the report.</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>2. Executive Summary</b>  <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i>            Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para); iii) Methodology (1 para); iv) Main Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>            The report includes a standalone Executive Summary section which covers most of the requirements specified by the evaluation criteria: purpose, audience; methodology; discussion of findings and conclusions (although it does not have a clear conclusion section); identification of main recommendations. The Executive Summary does not explicitly/clearly discuss objectives, but rather includes these within a brief description of the intervention itself. At four (4) pages in total, the Executive Summary is within the maximum recommended length.</p>			
<p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b>  <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i>            Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;</li> <li>Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;</li> <li>Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;</li> <li>Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided;</li> <li>Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>            The evaluation process/approach was described in detail, with specific attention given to each 'phase' in the evaluation. The report provides an explanation of the methodological choice of appreciative inquiry over a problem-oriented approach, weighing the benefits of the choice as well as the limitations. The basic steps involved in data collection (techniques and tools) are described, including a desk review, focus groups, systematic observations, and other forms of stakeholder consultation. The criteria governing the selection of stakeholders and sites/locations was also discussed in detail. Triangulation of data sources/points is identified as part of the methodological approach and explained (p5). The report also discusses the participatory nature of the data collection/stakeholder consultation process (p5). Cross-cutting issues, such as ethical considerations, are also discussed.</p>			
<p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b>  <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;</li> <li>Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b>            The report provides a broad overview of data collected. Adequate attention is given to identifying the sources of qualitative and quantitative data throughout the report, with regards both to secondary citation and primary data collected. The report does not include explicit discussion of the credibility of primary and secondary data, though some discussion</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>made explicit;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.</li> </ul>	<p>regarding selection of primary data respondents is included in the methodological approach. Though secondary sources of data are identified throughout the report, discussion of their credibility could have been more detailed. Disaggregation by gender has been used where appropriate.</p>			
<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b>  <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>  <u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;</li> <li>Findings are substantiated by evidence;</li> <li>Findings are presented in a clear manner</li> </ul> <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;</li> <li>Contextual factors are identified.</li> <li>Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <p>Findings are presented for each criterion used in the evaluation process. It is not always clear that findings stem from rigorous data analysis; findings for initial outcomes (p27, p28) present a discussion of context, alignment with UNFPA, and activities but do not connect discussion with rigorous data analysis, and there is a presentation of outputs (completion of activities, and enumerated outputs from intervention); for example a listing of trained anesthetists and doctors (p29).</p> <p>There is a clear presentation of analysis and evidence in the form of a results framework (p37) that compares baseline data with end-line data, remarking on limitations and contextual factors regarding results/objectives and completion of activities/outputs. The data presented in the results framework is at the country-level, where outputs and outcomes are often confused, which makes it harder to establish a logical connection between UNFPA work and country-level outcomes.</p> <p>There is some discussion of cause and effect links in the narrative, but more detail is required to effectively establish the links and more explicit discussion could have been provided (as well as more detail and explanation of unintended results).</p> <p>The report does well to identify limitations within findings, for example stating when certain types of data were not available for analysis (and why) (p36). A visually clear color coding scheme is used to identify achievement of targets relative to baseline (p38 and p60) but an objective criterion for such classification is not laid out.</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b>  <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are based on credible findings;</li> <li>• Conclusions are organized in priority order;</li> <li>• Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b>  Conclusions are based on findings; however, as with the findings upon which the conclusions are based, attribution/cause and effect links between the intervention and end results are not adequately explained and should include further detail/analysis. For example, the conclusions state “considerable results have been achieved in terms of increased access and use of quality services...as evidenced by the reduction of MMR” but do not link to any evidence of UNFPA contribution to this result. Conclusions are organized in a structured (if not explicitly priority) order: ‘Strategic’, ‘Programmatic’.</p>			
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b>  <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;</li> <li>• Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible;</li> <li>• Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial;</li> <li>• Recommendations should be presented in priority order</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b>  Recommendations are not explicitly organized/ordered by priority; rather they are arranged by Country Programme Level and Strategic Level. Their arrangement (e.g. use of sub-numbering) also lacks prioritization and clear focus. The detail of recommendations varies at different levels (e.g. 2b is phrased as an overarching title whereas 1a) is [phrased more as a recommendation). The presentation and lack of prioritization makes it difficult to ascertain the total number of recommendations.  These recommendations flow from content in the Conclusions section, and are strategic and operationally-feasible. Though the steps involved in a given recommendation are explicit and clearly presented, more attention could have been given to targeting recommendations towards those actors provisionally responsible for implementation, representing a weaknesses for the Recommendations section overall. For example, despite listing recommendations under ‘Country Programme Level’, recommendations like “Integrate a number of evaluative assessments in the annual M&amp;E plan” do not specify individual actors/divisions/groups responsible or involved in that process/step. Stakeholder considerations are taken into account, for example recommending continuing support for the SMART girl programme mentioned in previous sections (p77).</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<b>8. Meeting Needs</b> To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the report). In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.	<b>Good</b> The report meets the needs stated in the Terms of Reference, which are annexed to the report. Outcomes and Outputs as discussed in report are consistent with ToR, as are purpose/objectives.			

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)		2		
2. Executive summary (2)		2		
3. Design and methodology (5)		5		
4. Reliability of data (5)			5	
5. Findings and analysis (50)			50	
6. Conclusions (12)			12	
7. Recommendations (12)			12	
8. Meeting needs (12)		12		
<b>TOTAL</b>		21	79	

(\*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. - if “Finding and Analysis” has been assessed as “good”, please enter the number 50 into the “Good” column. The Assessment level scoring the higher number of points will determine the overall quality of the Report

**OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Poor**