

EQA for UNFPA Tajikistan Country Programme Evaluation



Title of Evaluation Report: UNFPA Tajikistan Country Programme 2010-2015 Evaluation Report

Overall Quality Rating: Good

Overall Assessment: The report structure meets requirements and contains all required content. The Executive Summary has relevant structure, contains all required parts, and presents brief and consistent report resume, but it is longer than recommended. Methodology section clearly describes the evaluation methodology which was developed fully in line with UNFPA methodological guidance. Data collection included documents review, interviews and focus groups with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and direct observations. Systematic triangulation of the evaluation findings was performed. Primary and secondary data collected by the evaluation team are thorough and the evaluators clearly explain sources of the information in the relevant annexes. Evaluation limitations associated with security issues and language limitations are explained. Data disaggregation was performed where necessary. The data analysis is thorough and extensive. The findings are detailed, and contextual factors and causal connection clear, although the section would have benefitted from efforts to make it more succinct. The conclusions are based on the findings and are organized in a logical order. Recommendations are logically connected with appropriate conclusions, although some lack sufficient specificity.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i> 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 The report structure meets requirements and contains all minimum content chapters arranged in the relevant and logical sequence. A Transferable Lessons Learned chapter is absent, but this chapter is not applicable here. The table of contents does not contain a list of Annexes but all necessary Annexes are included in the report, except Methodological instruments used.</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>2. Executive Summary <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i> 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>Good The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that contains all required parts, and presents a thorough discussion of the findings, conclusions and brief and consistent report resume. However, it is 2 pages longer than the recommended length.</p>			
<p>3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> 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 Methodology section clearly describes the evaluation methodology that was developed fully in line with UNFPA methodological guidance. The questions were derived from the ToR and an effort was made to collect data on all of them. Data collection was organized using document review, interviews and focus groups with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and direct observations. The selection of persons to interview was carefully defined and over 300 people were interviewed. The structure of data collection allowed systematic triangulation. The details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process were not provided, but it is clear that consultation occurred.</p>			
<p>4. Reliability of Data <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 Primary and secondary data collected by the evaluation team were well defined and the sources clearly explained and detailed in the relevant annexes. Evaluation limitations associated with security issues and language limitations are also explained and details provided on how this was addressed. Data disaggregation was performed where necessary. On the whole, the data were collected reliably and are therefore credible.</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i> <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 The findings are complex, but complete. There are 65 individual findings, structured according to the evaluation questions and supporting data for the findings is provided. The findings are numbered so that they can be connected with the conclusions. The evaluation team has taken effort to identify contextual factors. The findings are also very explicit but it might have aided the reader for some to be combined to make the findings section more succinct, particularly the findings on relevance which at times do not provide adequate detail on UNFPA. The section on effectiveness is particularly well done, since it shows, in each case, the evident causal connection between what UNFPA produced or its support and the result. Tajikistan has a fairly large and complex UNFPA programme, yet the evaluation team has ensured that the findings cover the programme.</p>			
<p>6. Conclusions <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 Conclusions are based on credible findings and organized in priority order (divided in Strategic and Programmatic). They clearly derive from the many findings under each category, although the specific finding is not always fully described: e.g. "the evaluation team concludes that UNFPA has been effective" (p.80, paragraph 2). However, overall the conclusions are detailed. Conclusions about achievement of the planned programme outcomes are presented in the section on Programmatic Conclusions, and are clearly derived from the findings. Occasionally conclusions sound like recommendations: e.g., "UNFPA should advocate for an increase in the national budget and more ODA to cover costs of investments in buildings and facilities" (p.81, paragraph 3). This, however, is not a major flaw.</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<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 logically connected with appropriate conclusions and prioritized as strategic and programmatic. The majority of the recommendations are specific: e.g., "A2: UNFPA CO to ensure continued senior-level involvement in UNDAF preparation process with regular consultation of CO technical staff" (p.85, paragraph 2). Sometimes the recommendations are more general. For example, one recommendation states that "SRH9: UNFPA and MoHSP to scale up the effective perinatal care programme in rural areas" (p. 86, paragraph 10), and it is not clear where and how the scaling up should be done.</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 Report is prepared according to requirements for ToR. The ToR conforms with UNFPA country programme evaluation methodology.</p>			

N.B The Terms of Reference for this evaluation were submitted to the UNFPA Evaluation Office for approval, in line with the 2014 revised UNFPA evaluation policy.

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		100		

(*) 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

OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Good