

Organizational unit:	Bureau Regional Afrique de l'Oest et du Centre	Year of report:	2021
Title of evaluation report:	Rapport d'évaluation finale due programme regional 2018- 2021 due Bureau Regional Afrique de l'Oest et du Centre		
Overall quality of report:	Good	Date of assessment:	19 Novembre 2021
Overall comments:	<p>This was an adequate evaluation of the regional programme in light of data collection constraints encountered by the evaluation team. It was affected by COVID-19 which made field visits to country offices impossible and required the use of virtual methods, and by the year-end evaluation timeframe. There are still a number of ways in which it could have more closely met UNFPA evaluation standards. The methodology, which relied on review of documents, KIs and a survey/questionnaire, could have been more fully described, including ethical considerations. The basis for the evaluation, in the form of what UNFPA does in the region was sometimes very general. Data sources could have been more evident to show triangulation. The evaluators provided a solid set of conclusions but recommendations are only briefly stated and require more information to be actionable. Gender issues were assessed in findings, but to more closely meet UNSWAP criteria, it would have been helpful for GEEW to be more prominently featured in the evaluation design, and for the results of the gender analysis to be carried through to conclusions and recommendations. Other vulnerabilities, such as disability, were not addressed.</p>		
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 <i>assessment level</i> followed by main <i>comments</i> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)		
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 structured in a logical way? 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? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Yes	The report is written according to the UNFPA standards and makes the appropriate distinctions.	
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	At 70 pages it is within the expected length.	
3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?	Partial	The annexes do not include the data collection tools. The other required elements are present.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	No	The Executive Summary would better serve as a stand-alone document if it included a brief overview of the RP, a clearer description of the evaluation process, and the recommendations.	
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	It is 4.5 pages long.	
2. Design and Methodology			
	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	There is a discussion of the regional context, with constraining factors highlighted.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	The theory of change is found in the annexes, and the text in Chapter 3 covers the intervention logic. There is recommendation about improving the ToC but there is not a discussion on the shortcomings or reasons for this.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
3. 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 solid.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Partial	The main tools are document review and interviews with UNFPA staff and counterparts, and an online survey. These are only briefly described.	
5. 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)?	No	While the stakeholders are broadly described, there is no map as such and the consultation process is not described at all.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	No	Analysis processes are not discussed.	

7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The main limitations are those caused by COVID-19 and the timeframe of the evaluation (at year-end). These are described, as well as what was done to reduce the effect.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	No	The strategy is not described.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	When the documents contain disaggregated data, this is used.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Partial	The design seeks to address gender equality and some aspects of human rights. There is no discussion of disability.
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?	Partial	There is some but limited evidence of how triangulation was achieved.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The sources used, especially for interviews and for a survey, are reliable.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	No	The issue of ethical considerations is not discussed.
4. Analysis and Findings		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Partial	Although there are some references to programme documents, the report could be more precise about data sources. In the case of a quote in 4.2.1, there is no attribution to source.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	In each finding, the basis is described.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is organized around the evaluation questions.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	There is an effort to show the connections between the UNFPA regional interventions and the results observed. The discussion Effectiveness is focussed on output-level results with outcomes being more evident in the Valued Added section. There are no unintended outcomes mentioned although the section on Contribution does address the success of the RO in strategically positioning UNFPA to move agendas forward including in humanitarian situations.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Given that there are a number of main groups (youth, children, mothers, women generally), differences in outcomes are noted.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The evaluators are careful to show the connections with context.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	Gender equity and human rights are featured. Disability is not noted.
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	The conclusions flow from the findings, with the respective questions and criteria being noted for each conclusion.
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The conclusions, though very succinct, summarize findings and draw a larger vision.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions.
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?	Partial	Although the recommendations are carefully connected to the conclusions in terms of numbering, the logic is not always apparent. For example, Recommendation 4 addresses strengthening of the ToC but the associated conclusion does not indicate that there are any shortcomings.

2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The recommendations are targeted to the Regional and HQ management. However they are very briefly stated. They would be more actionable if more fully explained and if operational implications were provided.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	The recommendations are balanced and impartial but they do not address cross-cutting issues except generally.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The recommendations are prioritized.
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?		<p>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) Although not a specific objective, GEEW is noted in thematic scope = 2</p> <p>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) GEEW is explored under a section called "Value Added" = 3</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) There is a relevant sub question but the significance of gender seems to warrant this being an evaluation question = 1</p> <p>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) This is not apparent = 0</p>
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?		<p>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) There is no discussion about this = 0</p> <p>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) A mixed methods process was employed but sample size is not discussed = 1</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) The evaluators faced constraints due to covid and timeframe that limited access to a range of data sources, however more evidence of triangulation would still be expected = 1</p> <p>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) As above = 1</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) Ethical considerations were not addressed = 0</p>
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		<p>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) The discussion on Regional Context includes GEEW issues and there is some reference to instruments such as the ICPD = 2</p> <p>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) Voices of different groups are not apparent, in part due to limitations faced by the evaluators. There is some use of disaggregated data but this is not consistently done (i.e. in discussing RO staff numbers). However, the overall analysis of GEEW is adequate = 2</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) Although unexpected effects are not explicitly addressed, the Value Added section in the finding do reflect opportunities "seized by WCARO" that have helped to push gender issues forward in the region, such as the Gates Foundation matching fund = 2</p> <p>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) This is not done = 0</p>
<p>^(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.</p> <p>^(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment</p>		

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	67	22	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Good			
The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.				
Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)				
The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				
If yes, please explain:				