

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Organizational unit: | UNFPA | Year of report: | 2022 |
| Title of evaluation report: | Final evaluation of the 7th TOGO - UNFPA Cooperation Program 2019-2023 | | |
| Overall quality of report: | Good | Date of assessment: | 28 June 2022 |
| Overall comments: | <p>This evaluation provides a comprehensive review of the seventh UNFPA program in Togo for 2019-2023. Data collection was extensive in spite of the limitations of the pandemic. Document review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and direct observation were used as research techniques to gather information from a wide range of stakeholder groups in multiple locations, including rightsholders. The methodological approach appeared to be solid except that more information could have been provided on data analysis and on ethical considerations adhered to by evaluators. The findings are clearly presented with the evaluators clearly attending to the extent that the CP was disability inclusive and its reach to vulnerable groups. The need for the next CP to place more attention on disability issues was brought out in conclusions and recommendations. Gender issues were also thoroughly addressed. The Recommendations provide useful information but could be more consistently formulated so that each recommendation provides overall direction and operational guidance. Report performance could also have been improved by more closely meeting the page length requirements (in part by placing longer tables in the annexes), describing the consultation process with key stakeholders on the development of recommendations, and analyzing unexpected results.</p> | | |
| Assessment Levels | <div> <div>Very Good</div> <div>strong, above average, best practice</div> </div> <div> <div>Good</div> <div>satisfactory, respectable</div> </div> <div> <div>Fair</div> <div>with some weaknesses, still acceptable</div> </div> <div> <div>Unsatisfactory</div> <div>weak, does not meet minimal quality standards</div> </div> | | |

| 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: | Very good |
| To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly | | | |
| 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 structured in a logical way with a clear distinctions made between sections. The writing is clear and visual aids are used to convey key information. | |
| 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) | No | The report is beyond the preferred length at 78 pages, including the Executive Summary. Several of the tables are large and could have been more appropriately placed in the annexes. | |
| 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)? | Yes | The annexes of the report contains all the required information including the ToR, bibliography, list of interviewees, evaluation matrix, methodological and data collection tools. The evaluation matrix in the annex also contains findings. | |
| Executive summary | | | |
| 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? | Yes | The executive summary is written as a stand-alone section and includes the required elements: purpose and objective of the evaluation, methodology (with a detailed description), conclusions, and recommendations. | |
| 5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)? | Yes | The executive summary is written in five pages. | |
| | | | |
| 2. Design and Methodology | Yes No Partial | Assessment Level: | Very good |
| To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context | | | |
| 1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained? | Yes | The country context is clearly described and includes development challenges and national challenges related to the reproductive health, GEEV, and population and development. The role of foreign aid in development assistance is also discussed. | |
| 2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change? | Yes | The theory of change and intervention logic is analyzed by the program outputs. | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| To ensure a rigorous design and methodology | | | |
| 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 framework is described in the text and included in the appendix 2. It contains evaluation questions, valuation assumptions, indicators, source of information/data sources, and data collection methods. Findings and recommendations are included for each evaluation criteria. | |
| 4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified? | Yes | Data collection methods are described and justified; they included documentary reviews, individual semi-structured interviews, group interviews, and direct observations. | |
| 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)? | Partial | The report includes a stakeholder map in Annex 6 that shows stakeholders by programme type in each region, as well as which ones were included in the sample. However, stakeholder consultation in regards to the conduct of the evaluation process and development of recommendations is not explicitly described. | |
| 6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data? | Partial | The use of content analysis is mentioned in the section 1.3.2., where it is stated that "The data collected from the various interviews (individual and group) were the subject of a content analysis to identify the main trends and strong ideas." However, there was no further mention of how this was done and how other types of data were analyzed. | |
| 7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues? | Yes | Limitations are clearly described in the report which mostly related to technical issues and Covid-19 restrictions. The limitations and the mitigations are described in 1.3.5. For example, linguistic problems were solved by engaging an interpreter, and quality of data available was addressed by triangulation and guided by the TOR and UNFPA evaluation guidance. | |
| 8. Is the sampling strategy described? | Partial | The sampling strategy is described as based on a precise indication of regions and health districts of implementation. The process of how cases were chosen within the strata was not described. | |
| 9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data? | Yes | Where relevant and when data were available, disaggregation of data was used, particularly relating to gender. | |
| 10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)? | Yes | The evaluation questions address the inclusion of cross-cutting issues. For example, vulnerable and marginalized groups, people with disabilities, and women are mentioned in the EQ1a, EQ1b. Disability issues are also discussed in the findings on EQ2. Evaluators did not explicitly address whether vulnerable and marginalized groups were involved but youth organization representatives and other rights holders are included in the interviewees and FGD lists. | |
| | | | |
| 3. Reliability of Data | Yes No Partial | Assessment Level: | Good |
| To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes | | | |
| 1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate? | Yes | Triangulation is discussed in the report and is shown in the evaluation matrix. Findings referenced multiple data sources such as interviews and desk reviews. For example, explanation of Finding #1 incorporated data from interviews and analysis of planning and review meeting reports to determine the involvement of implementing partners. | |
| 2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources? | Partial | It is clear that qualitative data was obtained from a wide range of sources, and these seemed appropriate. The quantitative data utilized by the evaluators in the evaluation are not identified. The reliability of source is not explicitly addressed. | |
| 3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations? | Partial | Ethical considerations are not discussed in the report and are not apparent in the data collection protocols. The only evidence of sensitivity is that FGDs were held separately for girls, women, boys and men. The list of evaluation participants met includes phone numbers and email addresses. Good practice would be to not include such contact information for privacy reasons. | |
| | | | |
| 4. Analysis and Findings | Yes No Partial | Assessment Level: | Good |
| To ensure sound analysis and credible findings | | | |
| 1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence? | Yes | Findings are accompanied by substantial evidence obtained from primary sources. Documentary sources are also cited, although less frequently. | |
| 2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described? | Yes | Each result is well described. The perspectives of different stakeholder groups are made clear and are backed up by verbatim quotes. | |
| 3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions? | Yes | The evaluation questions for each criterion are listed and used to structure the analysis. | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted? | Partial | Causal linkages are consistently provided and explained; an example is the discussion on the underperformance of the activities involving men. However, there does not appear to have been a specific investigation of unintended outcomes. | |
| 5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant? | Yes | The analysis shows different outcomes for different target groups. People who lived in remote and landlocked areas, vulnerable, and marginalized people are addressed in the analysis. | |
| 6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors? | Yes | The analysis is presented against contextual factors particularly on national policies and involvement of international/foreign aid. The effects of Covid-19 are also included in the discussion, specifically as part of Relevance but also under other criteria. | |
| 7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights? | Yes | The analysis addresses cross-cutting issues including the extent to which vulnerable and marginalized groups are reached. One finding is that people with disabilities are not specifically taken into account in the programme. | |
| | | | |
| 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 are clearly based on the findings and are organized by the evaluation questions and criteria. | |
| 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? | Partial | The conclusions give a complete overview of the strengths and weaker areas of the CP and, where applicable, address cross-cutting issues. However, some of the content reflects findings data (such as specifying the number of the indicators that were considered to not be relevant) and could be framed at a higher-level. | |
| 3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement? | Yes | The conclusions do not appear to convey biased judgment from the evaluators. | |
| | | | |
| 6. Recommendations | Yes No Partial | Assessment Level: | Good |
| To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations | | | |
| 1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions? | Yes | Each recommendation references the conclusions on which is was based. | |
| 2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)? | Partial | The target users are clear as the introduction to this section states that all recommendations are directed to the CO. However this section could be better framed. There is a mixture of very general recommendations (such as #1 which recommends strengthening advocacy but does not suggest operational steps) and very specific ones (such as #2 which is about mobilizing actors involved to conduct a survey). | |
| 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? | Yes | Recommendations appeared to be balanced and impartial. Gender equality is discussed in strategic level recommendations while people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups are addressed in the programmatic level ones. | |
| 4. Are the recommendations prioritized? | Yes | Each recommendation contains a priority level and timeframe. | |
| | | | |
| 7. Gender | 0 1 2 3 ^(*) | Assessment Level: | Very 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 | 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) The assessment of HRGE was included as part of the evaluation scope. (3) 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) Gender and/or human rights are not included as separate/distinctive criteria in the evaluation framework, but were mainstreamed. (3) c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) This is covered under evaluation question 2(b). (3) 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 also covered under EQ2b: "To what extent has UNFPA succeeded in integrating human rights and gender equality perspectives into the design, implementation and monitoring of the country programme?" (3) | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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) The methodology does not specify how gender issues were addressed in the evaluation, and the total number of evaluation participants was not gender-disaggregated. (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) The beginning of the discussion on methodology states that a mixed methods approach was used that was compliant with the principles of GE, however no further details are provided on, for example, ensuring appropriate sample size. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. (2)</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) A diverse range of data sources are indicated. Triangulation is mentioned and incorporated to ensure validity of the data as reflected in the findings and evaluation matrix. (3)</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) The evaluation methods and sampling frame addresses stakeholders based from different geographical area. The annexed list of stakeholders participating in FGDs shows that a range of beneficiaries were involved. (3)</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) There is not a description of ethical considerations although the FGDs were held with same sex groups. (1)</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) Intersectional analysis of specific social groups is incorporated into the background discussion on development challenges and national strategies. (3)</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) The voices of different social groups are brought out, including through the use of quotes from participants in the focus groups. (3)</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) This is done to some extent in the discussions on UNFPA's covid response. (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) Specific GEEW recommendations focus on monitoring systems for collecting gender-related data (R2) and GBV (R4). (3)</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

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 | 27 | 73 | | |
| 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:

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain: