

**Organizational unit:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Year of report:** 2019

**Title of evaluation report:** Evaluation du 6eme programme pays UNFPA Guinee Bissau 2016-2020

**Overall quality of report:** **Very Good** **Date of assessment:** March 2020

**Overall comments:** The evaluation report is easy to read with minimal grammatical errors and is structured in a logical manner. The methodology is clearly described, with limitations and potential bias detailed (however mitigating measures could have been fleshed out further). The evaluation matrix integrated gender equality, and the subsequent data collection tools allowed the evaluators to analyze the interventions and results on disaggregated stakeholders, including children, youth and women. The findings were systematically grounded in well-triangulated data and conclusions were balanced and clearly flowed from the findings. The annexes are comprehensive and include, inter alia, the terms of reference, the evaluation matrix, the list of people interviewed.

**Assessment Levels**

<b>Very Good</b>	strong, above average, best practice	<b>Good</b>	satisfactory, respectable	<b>Fair</b>	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	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>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
--	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

*To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly*

<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. It is written in an accessible language for a french audience. It has minimal grammatical, spelling or 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 report is of a reasonable length. It is 70-page long, which is the recommended length for CPEs.
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	The report is structured in a logical way. There is a clear distinction in the text between analysis/findings and conclusions and recommendations.
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?	Partial	The annexes include the TORs, the bibliography, the list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix, as well as the tools used, but does not appear to discuss the stakeholder consultant process.

*Executive summary*

<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 included in the report. It is written as a stand-alone section and present 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)?	Yes	The executive summary has a clear structure. It has the purpose and intended audience, the objectives, methodology, main results and recommendations included, though could have included a brief description of the interventions under the country programme.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is 5.2-page long. It is nonetheless concise.

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

*To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context*

1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The target audience is described as the UNFPA country team and national counterparts.
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The development and institutional context of the evaluation is described in detail and the contextual constraints have been explained. Two that were specifically noted were: "Certaines contraintes majeures peuvent être signalées comme limites : la faible couverture de certaines parties du territoire, en particulier les sites insulaires ; l'indisponibilité des données nationales récentes."
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Partial	The evaluation report has reconstructed the intervention logic and the intervention logic is described in Figure 3.1, which is very detailed. The adequacy of the intervention logic is not assessed, and there is little description of the interventions themselves. As a result, it is difficult to understand how exactly UNFPA contributions will contribute to the expected changes.

*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	The evaluation matrix is in annex 4. It includes the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection. Under each question, the main findings have been synthesized.
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools for data collection are described in the evaluation report and their choice has been justified.
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	There is no comprehensive stakeholder map and the consultation process has not been clearly described. The lists of people interviewed and institutions visited are included in the annexes but this does not constitute a comprehensive stakeholder list involved in/related to programme implementation. The report does not indicate if and how the key stakeholders have been consulted on the draft recommendations specifically.
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methods for analysis have been described for the range of data types.
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Partial	The methodological limitations have been described and their effect on the evaluation acknowledged. For example, "les problèmes de rapportage et de tenue des archives/statistiques/données, par le Bureau pays et les IP, signalés dans le texte, ont induit des difficultés dans la vérifiabilité." However, mitigating measures/how the bias has been overcome is only partially described in the report. For example, on the limitation noted previously, the report only states: "Pour minimiser les effets de ces limites, les consultants ont mis en place des mesures correctives."
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy for both stakeholders and site visits is described in detail in the report. It is a sample stratified by location and type of programme.
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology that has been used enables the collection and 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	The design and methodology are appropriate for assessing cross-cutting issues, including gender equality and human rights. For example, question 2 states: "De manière dynamique, comment le Bureau pays s'est-il adapté à l'évolution des besoins des populations cibles (Adolescents/jeunes et femmes) dans la planification et la mise en oeuvre de toutes les interventions appuyées dans le cadre du Programme ?"

<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>		Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The evaluation triangulated data. Indeed, it indicates that the only technique that has been used to reduce the bias and constraints encountered was triangulation.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources. Official statistics and direct quotes from the have for example been used many times.	
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	The evaluation made explicit all the possible limitations but did not explain what was done to minimize those issues.	
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	The sampling strategy seems to have included representatives of all the program stakeholders. Each group of actors have been interviewed. Women and youth groups have been specifically identified and interviewed so the appropriate data have been collected.	

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings are substantiated by evidence, including by official statistics for example.	

2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretations has been carefully described. For example, for the questions on relevance, the report states: "L'analyse documentaire, les entretiens avec les parties prenantes et les FGD montrent que les interventions et produits du 6e programme sont pertinents et en cohérence avec les priorités nationales."
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is presented clearly against the evaluation criteria and questions.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The evaluation is transparent about the sources and quality of data. At the outset of the findings section, the evaluators state: "Les principales sources de données sont : la revue documentaire, les interviews, les ateliers/entretiens collectifs, les groupes de discussion dirigés et les observations directes ; soit cinq (05) principales sources. L'option de validation des données est qu'elles soient soutenues par des sources documentaires crédibles, et/ou (à défaut), confirmées par au moins deux sources primaires (entretiens, GDD, ateliers ou observations directes) dans différents sites et confirmées contradictoirement par le bureau-pays."
<b>5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Yes	Cause and effects links between interventions and their end results have been explained. There were no unintended outcomes noted, but there was no evidence that this was not considered in the evaluation.
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The analysis captures the extent to which there have been different outcomes for different target groups. For example, in terms of reproductive health, there are general findings, and findings specific to youth and adolescents.
<b>7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?</b>	Yes	The analysis has been presented against contextual factors in the report, such as, for example, the way in which political events in the county has affected the planning and implementation of the country programme..
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Yes, the analysis elaborated on cross-cutting issues such, including the extent to which the country programme advances gender equality and human rights. For example, in the assessment of the national plan, there is a section dedicated to gender and human rights.

<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 flow from and are grounded in the findings, and are linked to/structured by evaluation question.	
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 reflect on the findings, going beyond them, and providing a good understanding of the underlying issues of the programme.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The conclusions seem to convey the evaluators unbiased judgment. They are linked to the findings and analysis, and there is no evidence of bias.	

<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 flow logically 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	While the recommendation are clear, their intended users have not been identified. In addition, their human, financial and technical implications have not been assessed.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial.	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	In each case the time frame is suggested (either for the current programme or the next).	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	The recommendations have been prioritised.	

<b>7. Gender</b>	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	-------------

To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)	
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><b>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3)</b> There was not a gender specific objective. Score=0</p> <p><b>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3)</b> There is not a standalone criterion. Gender and human rights were mainstreamed to some degree into the regular criteria. Score=2</p> <p><b>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</b> There was no specific evaluation question, but gender was included in question 2 which looked at vulnerable populations. Score=2</p> <p><b>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation assessed the extent to which sufficient information on gender was collected (usually not enough). Score=3</p>
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	<p><b>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation was careful to include gender issues, for example in the individual interviews an effort was made to include women in different categories. Score=3</p> <p><b>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation uses a mixed method approach that is appropriate. Score =3</p> <p><b>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</b> There is the expected range of data sources. Score=3</p> <p><b>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3)</b> The sampling method was designed to address diversity. Score=3</p> <p><b>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</b> There is no evidence of maltreatment Score=2</p>
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<p><b>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3)</b> The background sections covers this aspect. In the section on reproductive health and problems encountered, there are detailed descriptions of how women are affected. Score=3</p> <p><b>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3)</b> There is triangulation throughout. Score=3</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</b> No unanticipated effects are noted. Score=1</p> <p><b>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3)</b> There are recommendations on these issues. Score =2</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 totaling 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		
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35</b>	
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Very Good</b>			
	<b>Very good</b> very confident to use	<b>Good</b> confident to use	<b>Fair</b> use with caution	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> 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 analysis was designed and was thorough, meriting a very good. It was less good in the recommendations which lacked detail about implementation.

**Consideration of significant constraints**

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

Yes  No

If yes, please explain: