

Title: Somalia Independent Country Programme Evaluation: 2011-2015

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good (98 score)

Summary: The Somalia Independent Country Programme Evaluation report meets the needs of UNFPA as outlined in the Terms of Reference, the challenges faced by the evaluators in Somalia notwithstanding. The report addresses the respective evaluation questions and criteria, presenting the findings in terms of the intervention of three programme components and several cross-cutting issues. The Evaluation Findings (Section 4) focus on activities, outputs and the contribution toward achievements of the outcomes, which were addressed to a lesser degree due to the weak linkages between the outputs and outcomes which delimited the effective measurement of programme results. The absence of an explicit set of key lessons learned, a specific objective of the evaluation, lessens the robustness of the conclusions and recommendations sections in providing a basis for advancing options for the next programme.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</p> <p><i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i></p> <p>Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used. 	<p>Good.</p> <p>The evaluation report includes all of the required report elements, with one notable exception. Given 1 of the 5 Specific Objectives of the evaluation was to “draw key lessons from past and current implementation arrangements to provide a set of clear and forward looking options leading to strategic and actionable recommendations for the next country programme cycle” (p. 1), the fact that those key lessons learned were not clearly and specifically identified in the report is an important omission.</p> <p>In addition to the minimum content in terms of structure, the report includes most required Annexes. Annexes include: ToR, Summary of Findings of UNFPA Somalia 2nd CP Implementation Results, Evaluation Matrix, List of Persons Interviewed, and Evaluation Data Collection Tools. A bibliography is not included as an annex, however sources are adequately referenced in footnotes throughout the report.</p>			

	<p>A list of acronyms is included, however acronyms are not always introduced in the text when first used, specifically in the Executive Summary, which is supposed to serve as a standalone document.</p>
<p>2. Executive Summary</p> <p><i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i></p> <p>Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Poor.</p> <p>The Executive Summary covers most of the required elements of the evaluation report, but is presented in a manner that does not follow the organization of the main findings of Section 4 (Evaluation Findings) nor the two subsequent sections of the report (Section 5: Conclusions and 6: Recommendations). For example, there is an imbalance of findings for each of the three programme components - with Population and Development receiving minimal attention, Gender an expanded attention, and reproductive health and rights a moderate amount of attention – which is notable given 4 of the 10 CPE questions place emphasis on the effectiveness of the program as indicated in the Introduction and the ToR (Annex 1). The conclusions are not clearly organized nor do they consistently reflect the strategic and programmatic groupings used in the Conclusions Section (5). The Recommendations include only 10 of the 15 recommendations in Section 6, without an explanation of why this was so.</p> <p>In addition, the Summary does not provide a brief description of the intervention, only listing technical areas in which UNFPA works (Gender, Population and Development and Reproductive Health and Rights). The Interventions are clearly described in the ‘Findings’ section of the report. The intended audience of the report is also not specified beyond ‘stakeholders’.</p>

	<p>Though it is largely not the case in the body of the report, the use of incorrect sentence structures inhibits the clarity of the Executive Summary. Clarity is particularly important in the Executive Summary, which is intended to serve as a standalone document.</p> <p>Taken together this results in less clarity in the presentation of the Summary and, therefore, it is not adequate as a stand-alone section that clearly presents the main results of the evaluation. In addition, at 5 pages, it is over the maximum page limit of 3-4 pages.</p>
<p>3. Design and Methodology</p> <p><i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i></p> <p>Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations; • Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner; • Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation; • Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided; • Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation. 	<p>Good.</p> <p>The report provided a clear explanation of methodological choice, including limitations and constraints. Treatment of the participatory consultation process and how cross-cutting issues were addressed were more cursory than detailed. The Evaluation matrix in Annex 3 which links the evaluation questions with the methodological approach is a good supplement to the Introduction (Section 1).</p> <p>Considering the key constraint of insecurity in the country, the evaluation team did well to gain almost equal representation from the three areas in Somalia (Puntland, Somaliland and South Central Somalia) in their interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) despite the conflict in South Central Somalia. Overall, based on the table on page 6, the evaluation team conducted 63 interviews and 12 FGDs. However, it is unclear how many participants were in each focus group.</p>

<p>4. Reliability of Data</p> <p><i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; • Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit; • Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary. 	<p>Good.</p> <p>Data sources are identified and well documented throughout the report. The overall credibility of primary and secondary data and limitations are established in the methodology section of the Introduction and noted in the text appropriately. Disaggregated data by gender was interwoven appropriately in the relevant text.</p>
<p>5. Findings and Analysis</p> <p><i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; • Contextual factors are identified. • Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained. 	<p>Good.</p> <p>The Findings and Analysis section was clearly structured around UNFPA's key programmatic areas as well as connected to the evaluation questions. In terms of the programme components, each of the three programmes were presented in an organized and thorough manner that addressed the evaluation questions and the respective evaluation criteria. Given that "most of the baseline data were missing in the CP documents ...[which] made it difficult to assess the level of achievement of CP results" (p. 6), the report does includes examples and instances of UNFPA programme contributions based on qualitative information from interviews and desk reviews and quantitative data gathered from programme documents in an effort to minimize "the weak linkages between the indicators, outputs and outcomes which affected effective measurement of the results of the pogramme" (p. 85). Evaluation of the Reproductive Health and Rights component was particularly well done and the Population and Development subsection was treated more substantially in this section than in the Executive Summary.</p> <p>Contextual factors are identified in why an outcome/output was, or was not, achieved. For example, the evaluators noted that despite achieving the target for the number of community midwives trained, progress towards the</p>

	<p>outcome of 'increased demand for, access to, and utilisation of equitable, improved reproductive health services, including in settlements for internally displaced people' was hindered as rural women are still not receiving care as many of the trained midwives moved to cities to obtain paid employment upon training completion.</p> <p>Two features of the evaluation report that positively complemented the findings section were (i) a summary at the end of the three programme components elements covering the evaluation questions and UNFPA assessment criteria; and (ii) Annex 2 summary of findings of implementation results for each of the three programme components. There is often a lack of quantitative data to support claims of output achievement in the body of the report, however 'Annex 2: Summary of Findings of UNFPA Somalia 2nd CP Implementation Results (2011-2015)' provides all of the information which appears missing from the 'Findings' section. The results matrix is clear and helpful, but could have been enhanced with qualified notional statements, based on the limited data in hand, about the extent to which outputs contributed to the achievement of outcomes for each of the programme components.</p> <p>In terms of the cross cutting issues, each of the three issues was dealt with in an organized manner that addressed the respective evaluation question(s) and concluded with a summary of findings for each that set the stage for the conclusions and recommendations.</p>
--	---

<p>6. Conclusions</p> <p><i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. 	<p>Good.</p> <p>The conclusions are presented in subsections at both strategic and programme levels, with clear cross-reference to the relevant evaluation question(s) and the associated Recommendation in the subsequent section (6) of the report. The conclusions are clear and are based on the findings. They are not, however, organized in priority order.</p>
<p>7. Recommendations</p> <p><i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations flow logically from conclusions; • Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible; • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p>Good.</p> <p>Recommendations are also not organized in priority order, though they flow logically from the conclusions. They are well stated, and are appropriate for a CP evaluation of this nature, particularly in the context of the evaluation questions. Additional clarity could be provided if the recommendations were connected back to the specific conclusions they are drawn from.</p>
<p>8. Meeting Needs</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Good.</p> <p>The evaluation responds to the ToR, with the caveat that the report does not include a lessons learned feature, which was a specific objective of the evaluation. Given that the Recommendations in Section 6 of the report was "informed by the lessons learnt" (p. 93), this would have helped the report better meet the needs of the target audience.</p>

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		
TOTAL		98	2	

(*) 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.