

**Organizational unit:**  **Year of report:** **2018**

**Title of evaluation report:** **Evaluation du huitieme programme pays - UNFPA Niger 2014 - 2018**

**Overall quality of report:** Good **Date of assessment:** **9 July 2018**

**Overall comments:** Overall, this is a good evaluation. Though there are a few weaknesses, they do not affect the validity of the conclusions or recommendations. The Executive Summary is concise and clear, though the intended audience is not readily identified, and the evaluation report itself is written in an accessible language. While the evaluation methodology is laid out, the evaluation does not provide a clear description of the interventions nor adequately reconstruct the program theory of change. The data collection was outlined and justified, the analysis was presented against the evaluation questions and criteria, and the evidence was well-triangulated to produce credible findings. While the conclusions flow directly from the findings, they did not provide enough description of the underlying issues of the programme. The recommendations are clearly linked to the conclusions and have been prioritized to facilitate implementation.

**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>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. It is well written and has minimal grammatical errors	
<b>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)</b>	Yes	The documents is 75-page long but the report itself is 68 pages which is a reasonable length for CPEs.	
<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 the analysis/findings section and the conclusions and recommendations sections.	
<b>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?</b>	Partial	The annexes are a separate file and include the ToRs, the list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix, the data collection tools and bibliography. They do not include information on stakeholder consultation process, however.	
<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 included in the main report. It is four-pages long. It is a stand-alone section and presents the results of the evaluation.	
<b>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)?</b>	Partial	While there is a clear structure to the executive summary, the intended audience(s) and the description of the interventions are not included. The purpose, objectives, methodology, main conclusions and recommendations are included.	

7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is concise - it is 4-pages long.
---	-----	--

<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	While the target audience is not indicated in the executive summary, the main report does describe the target audience for the evaluation (identified in the last row of table I.1 of the report).
---	-----	--

<b>2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	The development and institutional context of the evaluation is clearly described in the report. The constraints have also been identified (for example, the report notes gaps in data availability at the partner level as well as security issues which resulted in changes to the initial sample).
---	-----	--

<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>	Partial	The annexes include a representation of the result framework but they do not describe a reconstruction of the intervention logic/theory of change, nor was its adequacy assessed.
---	---------	---

*To ensure a rigorous design and methodology*

<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 has been clearly described in the text . The evaluation matrix has also established the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods of data collection.
---	-----	--

5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools for data collection have been described in the report under I.3.2 and their choice justified. The specific tools used are included in the annexes.
--	-----	--

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 a comprehensive stakeholder mapping. The consultation process has not been clearly described and the report does not indicate how the stakeholders were consulted for, for example, the validation of the draft recommendations.
--	---------	---

7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	Yes, the evaluation described the methods used to analyze the different types of data.
--	-----	--

8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	The methodological limitations have been acknowledged (i.e. security concerns, data gaps). and their effect on the evaluation have also been identified. Finally, the evaluation has also indicated how potential bias was overcome. For example, the evaluation notes data gaps and offers uses triangulation as a mitigating measure.
--	-----	---

9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy has clearly been described under the methodology section.
--	-----	---

10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology that was 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 that were used are appropriate for assessing gender and cross cutting issues such as human rights. For example, the sample included, 10 categories of people including youth, women, and men people living with HIV, and women living in rural settings (reflecting in certain cases vulnerable and marginalized populations)
--	-----	--

<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</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	The evaluation triangulated the data that was collected in an appropriate fashion.	
<b>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</b>	Yes	The evaluation identified and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources. Those sources are either direct stakeholders or official statistics.	
<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>	Yes	The evaluation did make explicit the possible limitations. Some challenges were noted and the evaluators indicated how they reduced their impact on the quality of the report. The gaps in the data were noted and the evaluation ensured that a similar data source was identified (the same was done when security challenges arose, requiring the evaluation to alter the original sample selected).	
<b>4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</b>	Partial	While it is reported that the data collectors were trained on how to collect information with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical issues, it is not explicit in the report how this was operationalized during data collection itself.	

<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 substantiated by well-triangulated data (from multiple sources and collection methods) and reflect an understanding of the context.	
<b>2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?</b>	Yes	The bias for interpretation has been described and the limitations of the evaluation have, as already noted, been identified from the outset.	
<b>3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?</b>	Yes	The analysis has been presented against the evaluation questions. All the evaluation criteria have been addressed.	
<b>4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?</b>	Yes	The analysis is transparent about the sources and quality of data.	
<b>5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Partial	The evaluators did establish links between the interventions and their end results. However, the evaluators did not consider the possibility of unintended outcomes.	
<b>6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?</b>	Yes	The target population for each component of the country programme as well as the results have been described and the evaluation report shows different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant.	
<b>7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?</b>	Yes	The analysis is presented against the contextual factors.	

8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The analysis does include information on how cross cutting issues such as equity, vulnerability, gender equality and human rights have been integrated. For example, one of the first evaluation questions (assessing in relevance) directly addressed this.
--	-----	--

<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
-----------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

*To assess the validity of conclusions*

<b>1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?</b>	Yes	The conclusions flow clearly from the findings. The evaluators draw one conclusion for each 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?	Partial	The conclusions go beyond the findings but they were not elaborate enough to show the underlying issues of the programme. For example conclusion #4 discusses the performance level for several indicators but does not provide the contextual factors that contribute to/offer an explanation for these performance levels. Similarly, conclusion #2, which discusses reactivity (to shifts in context), has identified the lack of funding and the lack of collaboration between actors to explain poorer performance but there is no further explanation/reflection regarding the context/situation that has lead to the stated lack of funding or collaboration.
--	---------	--

3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment?	Yes	The conclusions are logical and directly flow the findings. As such, they appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment.
---	-----	---

<b>6. Recommendations</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

*To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations*

<b>1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?</b>	Yes	The recommendations flow directly 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, though their intended users and financial implications were not included.
--	---------	--

3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial.
--	-----	--

4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Partial	They are all to be addressed in the formulation and implementation of the next country programme, but the specific timing for this is not given.
--	---------	--

5. Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	The recommendations have been prioritized to facilitate the management response and their implementation.
---	-----	---

<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?		GEEW was integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and some of the indicators selected allow GEEW-related data to be collected (not all indicators allow for the collection of gender disaggregated data). 2 The evaluation design was careful to identify gender-related issues in developing questions and the data sources to answer them.
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?		The evaluation questions (including for example the first two questions under effectiveness criteria) specifically address how GEEW has (or has not) been integrated into the planning and implementation of the interventions. 3
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?		The evaluation methodology does not clearly indicate how the tools and analysis techniques were gender-responsive, but gender has been considered in the report's analysis under many of the evaluations questions. 2
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations partially reflect a gender analysis, particularly for programmes that are targeting women. Not all the information that has been provided is gender-disaggregated, however, and the effects of UNFPA interventions have not always been disaggregated (i.e. examining whether men and women were differently impacted by the intervention). 2

(\*) 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>69</b>	<b>31</b>	
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>		<b>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 good. It was less good in the recommendations which lacked time-horizons and priorities.

**Consideration of significant constraints**

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: