Organizational unit:		**Year of report:**	**2017**
Title of evaluation report:	Evaluation finale du sixieme programme de cooperation Comores UNFPA 2015 - 2018		
Overall quality of report:	**Good**	**Date of assessment:**	**4 February 2018**

Overall comments: The report is longer than recommended for a CPE. Its executive summary is too long (10 pages as opposed to the recommended 5 pages). While the challenges encountered during the evaluation were listed, the evaluators did not explain the measures they took to mitigate the limitations' impacts on the quality of the findings. The evaluators did not describe the target audience nor did they reconstruct the intervention logic/theory of change. The evaluators did a good job triangulating data from different sources, though evaluators did not always test the quality of secondary data (in most cases their secondary data sources were recognized statistics, however. Though the evaluators only partially established a cause and effect link between the interventions and the results, their conclusions were unbiased and flowed directly from the findings. Likewise the recommendations flow from the conclusions and their intended users were identified along with priority level. Gender equality and empowerment of women was included in the evaluation scope and the evaluators applied gender analysis well in the report.

Assessment Levels

Very Good	strong, above average, best practice	**Good**	satisfactory, respectable	**Fair**	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	**Unsatisfactory**	weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria		*Insert* <u>*assessment level*</u> *followed by main* <u>*comments*</u> *. (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?	Yes	The report is easy to read and understand. It is written in an accessible language with mnimal 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)	Partial	The main report is over 80 pages including the Executive Summary but not including lists of tables and other introductory material.	
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 between the different sections, namely analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations. It also includes a lessons learned section.	
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 are included in the report, they include the TORs, the list of interviewees, the data collection tools, as well as the interviewees and the evaluation matrix. While the report notes that an evaluation reference group was put in place, the TORs does not describe how they were involved in the process or how the other stakeholder were involved in this evaluation.	
Executive summary			
5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?	Yes	The executive summary included in the report is written as a stand-alone section. It presents 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)?	Partial	The structure of the executive summary is partially clear, though it does not include elements of methodology or the intended audience.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	No	The executive summary is not concise enough. It is 10-pages long, which makes it too expansive.

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	The target audience refers generally to the stakeholders of the program, but does not specify who they are.	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Partial	The development and institutional context of the evaluation has clearly and extensively been described. While the constraints were identified no explanation was given as to how they impact the evaluation findings.	
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 report makes reference to the targets for the program and there is an evaluation matrix in the annex, with an effort to present the intervention logic, but it does not describe the intervention logic clearly because what are called "products" are actually outcomes and the connection with outputs is not clear.	
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 framework is clearly described in the report and in the annexes. The evaluation questions, data sources methods for data collection have all been included in the report or in the annexes.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools for data collection have been described in the report and their choice justified, The tools 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	No stakeholder mapping exercise has taken place during the evaluation, based on the report. An evaluation reference group was put in place but no indication was given regarding their involvement in the evaluation process.	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	The methods for data analysis are not always described. For example the consultant did not explain how they analyzed the data from the different interviews.	
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 not been acknowledged. While the evaluation mentions challenges that they face during the process but did not make a determination on the effect these would have on the quality of the report or what they did to mitigate.	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The groups from which interviewees were selected are noted (and there is a list of interviewees in the Annex) but how they were selected (i.e. the sampling approach itself) and the number interviewed in each category of stakeholder was not provided.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology that has been used by the evaluators does enable the collection and analayis 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, there was a question on gender in the interview protocol.	

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Fair**
To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes				
I. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The evaluation triangulated data collected as appropriate. Secondary data has, for example, been compared to the findings from primary data sources. In addition the data from interviews was regularly triangulated with other data sources.		
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluators did use multiple data sources of recognized quality. Most of their secondary sources are governement statistics. The primary sources are mostly people who were interviewed by the evaluation team.		
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?	No	No, the evaluation did not make explicit the possible limitations. Some challenges were noted but no indication was given regarding their impact on the report.		
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	There is evidence that data has been collected with sensitivity to discrimination and other ethical issues. The evaluators mentionned the UNEG code of conduct and seem to have applied them throughout the evaluation.		

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Good**
To ensure sound analysis and credible findings				
I. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings are substantiated by evidence. The report cited several references from secondary or primary sources to substantiate the findings.		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretation was described in the report, particularly for effectiveness.		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis has been presented against the evaluation questions.		
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The analysis has been transparent about the sources of data and was careful about its quality, noting limitations where they occurred.		
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	The evaluation has made an effort to show a cause-effect link between UNFPA interventions and end results. For some, there is a clear link between intervention and end results but for others, the connection with UNFPA output is not clear. Untintended outcomes have not been explained.		
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The report does show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant. Each programme being evaluated has different targets and this is maintained in the analysis of results.		
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The analysis was presented against contextual factors. Not only did the evaluators explain the context extensively but they tried to link the contextual factors to the findings in most cases.		
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report does elaborate on cross cutting issues such as gender and human rights. There is a section on these in the findings about effectiveness, particularly focusing on violence against women. Vulnerability, including in the context of violence, has also been adressed in the report.		

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Good**
To assess the validity of conclusions				
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The conclusions flow clearly from the findings.		
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 are presented as statements. They include limited indication that the underlying issues have been extensively analyzed. For example, conclusion 2 states: "D'une manière générale, le taux de mortalité maternelle et néonatale est en baisse: 517 décès maternels pour 100.000 naissances vivantes en 1990 à 172 décès maternels pour 100.000 naissances vivantes en 2012. Mais la situation peut encore s'améliorer." This is in the effectiveness area, but does not indicate the role or contribution of UNFPA in changing the situation.		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The conclusions are logical and seem to come directly from the findings. As such, they appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement.		

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations				
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations flow directly from the conclusions. The report includes a table that links directly the conclusions to the recommendations.		
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The recommendations are straightforward. Their intended users are identified. For some, the human, financial and technical implications are included (e.g. creating a P-3 post in the country office), but in others they are more general/not included.		
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial since they can be backed by the conclusions that were made.		
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	The timeframe is the next plan or UNDAF period.		
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 to facilitate appropriate management respose and their implementation. For each recommendation, a set of actions have been identified.		

7. Gender	0 1 2 3		Assessment Level:	**Good**
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?	3	GEEW was integrated in the evaluation scope and analysis of indicators. GEEW-related data was collected and reported.		
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?	1	Other than in the section of gender and human rights, the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions do not specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved of the other areas.		
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2	The evaluation methodology was not described enough to explain how gender was integrated. The tools make reference to women's issues, including a specific questionnaire on gender, but the evaluators did not describe the analysis techniques that were selected to address them.		

4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis that was done, with particular reference to violence against women, which was a major programme priority. There is also some analysis of gender in the population and development activities .
	3	

(*) 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).

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		
Total scoring points	11	58	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

Consideration of significant constraints

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: ☐ Yes ☑ No

If yes, please explain: