

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

Title of evaluation report: Evaluation finale du 7ème Programme de Coopération entre Madagascar et l'UNFPA 2015 – 2019 : Madagascar

Overall quality of report: Very Good **Date of assessment:** January 11 2019

Overall comments: The evaluation was able to effectively analyze the country programme in a context where the country itself was emerging from a political crisis. The methodological design and analysis presented were particularly strong, and the primary reason the evaluation report received a "very good" overall rating. The evaluation elaborates well on cross cutting issues such as gender and human rights, as well as vulnerability, providing a thorough analysis that revealed that the country programme did not adequately address all the needs of vulnerable groups.

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	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>		
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
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 minimal grammatical 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 report is 72 pages long (excluding the Executive summary and the annexes), slightly longer than the 70-designated pages 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 between the different sections, namely analysis/findings, conclusions, 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 are included in the report, they include the TORs, the list of interviewees, the data collection tools, as well as the evaluation matrix. While the annexes (in the ToR) mention that an evaluation reference group was put in place, they do not describe how the reference group was involved in the evaluation or the overall stakeholder consultation process (though this was noted in the report itself).	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
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	While the purpose, methodology, findings and recommendations are detailed, the executive summary does not include the intended audience nor does it provide a brief description of the interventions under evaluation.	
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is concise. It includes a brief section about the evaluation methodology, main findings and recommendations. It is 5-pages long.	

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The target audience is described in the introduction. There is a broad target audience, made up of UNFPA offices, the government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that work with directly with rights holders/beneficiaries.	

2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The development and institutional context in which the evaluation is conducted is described and the constraints have been explained. Of particular note are the issues arising from the political crisis that the country experienced since 2009.
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	The evaluation described the reconstruction of the intervention logic/theory of change and its adequacy has been assessed.
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>		
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?	Partial	The evaluation framework is clearly described in the report and within the annexes. The evaluation matrix in Annex 2 includes the evaluation questions, data sources and methods of data collection. The assumptions, however, were not explicitly included/listed in the evaluation matrix.
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 used are listed 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)?	Yes	The stakeholders have been mapped out under annex 5. The evaluation included the Groupe de Reference that included both UNFPA, government and NGO members. The evaluation noted that the reference group was continuously involved in the evaluation via an iterative process on the validation of the findings and recommendations.
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methods for analysis have been described for all types of data. Descriptive statistics have been used for quantitative data while content analysis has been used to analyze data from the various interviews. The evaluation used triangulation to cross check and improve validity.
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	Yes, for example, the evaluation noted that certain individuals/groups were unavailable for interview, that there was a delay in obtaining some program documents and the lack of a control group as key limitations. The change in government leadership during the evaluation period was also included as a key limitation. The limitations were mitigated by careful triangulation with other data sources.
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy is described in the evaluation report; the evaluation used a stratified sample to gather information from various stakeholder groups.
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology enables the collection and analysis of disaggregated data. The evaluators indicated that homogeneous, disaggregated groups were set up for interviews, for example, which allowed the evaluators to get the views of each group separately.
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, target vulnerable groups were disaggregated and the evaluation included separate discussions with each: youth, pregnant women, and GBV survivors. This help to ensure confidentiality and contributed to mitigating the effects of power relations.

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<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 collected as appropriate, including through the use of secondary data.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluators used multiple reliable data sources that are both qualitative and quantitative. For example, the program performance reports as well as data extracted from the interviews with the different stakeholder groups were used.	
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 identified three possible limitations/data gaps but did not indicate what was done to minimize them.	
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. For example, the evaluators chose to interview homogeneous groups to avoid members of groups being influenced by more powerful people.	

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings have been substantiated by evidence. The evidence came directly from the interviews that were conducted or from secondary data sources used for triangulation.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretation has been carefully described. The methodology is detailed and it is possible to verify that it was followed throughout the report.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is presented against the evaluation questions. The presentation of each finding starts with a brief summary of the response to the evaluation question.	
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The evaluation is transparent about the sources.	
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The cause and effect links between the interventions and their end results have been explained starting from the reconstruction of the theory of change. There were no unintended outcomes noted in the report.	
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The analysis shows different outcomes for different target groups as relevant. Data collection allowed for this as, for example, interviews were conducted in a way to capture the views of different groups separately to ensure their unique unbiased views were reflected.	
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The analysis is presented against the contextual factors which have been extensively described throughout the report.	
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report elaborates on cross cutting issues such as gender and human rights. Vulnerability has also been addressed in the report. The evaluation's thorough analysis led to the conclusion that the country program did not adequately address all the needs of vulnerable groups.	

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	All the conclusions presented in the report 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?	Yes	The conclusions provide a thorough understanding of the program interventions and issues to be addressed. In most cases, the conclusion is based on more than one finding and are grounded in the analysis (including of the root causes for challenges seen in the country) presented in the report.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment?	Yes	The conclusions are clear and show no bias.	

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations flow logically from the conclusions. All recommendations are tied to specific conclusions in the report.	
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The target is shown (either the field office or the field office and the regional office) with a general sense of time (mostly relating to the next country programme period). The specific actions to take are shown, but there is little information on the human, financial or technical implications.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations are justified. They appear to be balanced and impartial.	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Partial	While most are directed to the next country programme period, some are not specified as such.	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	All the recommendations have been prioritised. Also the evaluators identified the operational implications for implementation.	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>			
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?		1	GEEW was not integrated in the evaluation scope and analysis of indicators but 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	The evaluation criteria and evaluation questions do not specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention or the results achieved.
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?		3	The evaluators used gender-responsive methods, tools and analysis techniques. The sampling tried to gather the perspectives of vulnerable women and youth. The group discussions that were done were homogeneous for that purpose. The content analyses of those discussions specifically pulled out the perspective of each of the groups.
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		3	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The evaluators tried to identify the problems that are related to each of the target groups, particularly those experienced by women, youth and other vulnerable groups such as GBV survivors and women suffering from fistulas. The conclusions flow directly from the findings and the recommendations are also related to the conclusion and target the needs of these groups.

(*) 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	51	14	35	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very 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

The analysis was very well designed and was thorough, meriting an overall score of "very good". The evaluation however could improve on detailing the technical, financial and human resource implications in the recommendations.

Consideration of significant constraints

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: