



Organizational unit: **Equatorial Guinea** Year of report: **2022**

Title of evaluation report: **Evaluación del Programa País para Guinea Ecuatorial**

Overall quality of report: **Fair** Date of assessment: **23 May 2023**

**Overall comments:** The UNFPA Country Programme in Equatorial Guinea presents some strengths as well as areas of improvements, which should be considered by decision-makers. The methodology uses a mixed methods approach with a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. However, while several duty bearers are consulted (i.e. governments, UNFPA, implementing partners), the evaluation team did not consult with any beneficiaries as requested in the evaluation ToR. A stakeholder map is not included and the sampling strategy is not explained, which makes it difficult to see the extent to which those consulted were representative of all stakeholders. In addition, the methodology confirms the use of contribution analysis and a theory-based approach; however, the report does not present the theory of change (either the existing or reconstructed ToC) – although, the findings do draw on the results framework. In addition, findings do not systematically identify KII data, which makes it difficult to understand the triangulation process and how data from the internal monitoring system was verified independently by the evaluation team. This said, the findings provide a good analysis of cross-cutting issues, underlying areas for improvement to address drivers of gender inequalities and support gender-transformative approaches. Overall, the conclusions are of good quality and address cross-cutting issues (including disability). The report does contain a number of typos and formatting issues which affect readability. It is also missing any mention of ethical considerations in the conduct of the evaluation.

**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 assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)

**1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting** Yes No Partial Assessment Level: **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)?** Partial The report is structured in a logical way, with the purpose, methodology, and context sections presented before the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Overall, the report is easy to understand and written in a language that is appropriate for the intended audience. However, there are a number of typos and punctuation errors, as well as formatting issues (e.g. there are instances where several words are merged together).

**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 51 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes, the evaluation report complies with length requirements.

**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 include: an evaluation matrix, a list of consulted stakeholders, data collection tools, and additional data analysis. However, the ToR and a bibliography are missing. The ToR was provided to the reviewers separately but is expected to be included as part of the evaluation report.

*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 reads as a standalone document and includes all of the required elements, including the intended audience (although the intended audience, as noted below, is not specified in the main report).

**5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?** Yes At 4 pages, the executive summary is within length requirements.

**2. Design and Methodology** Yes No Partial Assessment Level: **Fair**

*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 context section provides a good overview of key demographic and socio-economic issues in Guinea Equatorial. The context section also includes a thorough gender analysis and presents a situational analysis of maternal health in the country. As well, it presents the legislative and institutional frameworks linked to development and maternal health.

**2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?** Partial The section describing the programme clearly outlines the four results area of the UNFPA Country Programme (2018-2022), though this is not accompanied by a narrative describing the results chain linking activities to outputs and outcomes. This said, the findings on effectiveness do present outputs and indicators associated to each results area. However, the CP does not include a theory of change, even though the methodology confirms the use of a theory-based evaluation, as requested by the ToR.

*To ensure a rigorous design and methodology*

<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The report clearly specifies the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. Annex 6.1 presents an evaluation matrix which includes evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and data collection methods. However, the assumptions are more statements of the evaluation questions, rather than assumptions. For example, the assumptions linked to the effectiveness criterion are: 1) "The UNFPA has delivered results as planned"; 2) "the products achieved have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes of the CP". In addition, the evaluation matrix does not include a summary of findings, which is now a requirement for UNFPA evaluations.</p>
<p>4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Section 1.3.3 clearly outlines the data collection methods (i.e. desk review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, questionnaire). The report clearly explains the rationale for selecting most methods. However, the report provides very limited information on FGDs, in that it mentions that FGDs were used to "collect qualitative data from a small group of individuals", but does not explain which stakeholders were involved and what type of information was collected.</p>
<p>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)?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The section describing the Country Programme does not include a description of the key partners or their roles in the implementation of the CP (and the annexes do not include a stakeholder map either). The methodology does include a section entitled 'stakeholder mapping'; however, this section only identifies general stakeholder groups that were consulted (e.g. 'government partner'; 'CSO'; 'development partner', and no further information beyond the list of those interviewed which is found in the appendix). It appears that beneficiaries were not consulted, and it is unclear how the organizations that were consulted represent marginalized groups. Finally, the report does not specify whether stakeholders were consulted for the development of recommendations.</p>
<p>6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The analysis methods for quantitative and qualitative data are described. For qualitative data these include, among others, content analysis and contribution analysis.</p>
<p>7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The methodology describes the limitations and corresponding mitigation strategies.</p>
<p>8. Is the sampling strategy described?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The report does not describe the sampling strategy. The report confirms the number of stakeholder consulted per group. However, the methodology does not specify whether a random or purposeful strategy was used. In addition, considering the lack of a comprehensive stakeholder map, it is not possible to determine whether the sample proposed is representative. In addition, it is unclear if the Evaluation Team conducted site visits (despite this being requested by the ToR), nor are criteria for potential site visits specified.</p>
<p>9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The findings present some sex-disaggregated data (e.g. see Figure 9, elaborated from CERF data regarding the response to 7M in Bata). However, sex-disaggregated data is not presented systematically and the methodology does not comment on the availability of disaggregated data.</p>
<p>10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The methodology states that it has systematically integrated issues of gender equality and human rights, though it does not detail how this was done. The evaluation matrix does include a specific question on gender equality, and also addresses gender equality</p>
<p><b>3. Reliability of Data</b></p>	<p>Yes No Partial</p>	<p>Assessment Level: <b>Unsatisfactory</b></p>
<p><i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i></p>		
<p>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The triangulation process is clear for some, but not all findings, especially in the effectiveness section. For example, findings 4 to 8 present data from the internal monitoring system but do not discuss KII data, and it is therefore difficult for the reader to understand how data was triangulated and verified independently by the evaluation team.</p>
<p>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Data sources are explained. For qualitative data collection, the Evaluation Team consulted with 37 individuals, including: 27 government representatives; 3 CSOs; 2 development partners; and 5 UNFPA staff. This number is limited for a country portfolio evaluation and the fact that no rights holders were consulted as part of primary data collection is a gap, especially that their participation in data collection was requested by the ToR. Quantitative data sources are explained (i.e. internal monitoring data - including baseline data - was used.) However, while the findings cite documentary sources, KII data is not consistently referenced, and the basis for interpretation is not always clear.</p>
<p>3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The report does not discuss ethical considerations and the interview guides do not include information on informed consent, confidentiality, or the safety of participants.</p>

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
<b>1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?</b>	Partial	The evaluation provides sufficient evidence to support the finding statements in several, but not all cases. For example, for Finding 5, the report provides very little evidence for how UNFPA has contributed to the development of supply chain management tools for the procurement of medicine. Similarly, no evidence is provided to support Finding 8.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	As mentioned above, the findings are supported by a sufficient evidence base. In addition, the findings provide an explanation that goes beyond just stating the data points.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are presented according to the evaluation questions, which makes it easy for the reader to understand how these were answered.	
<b>4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Partial	The evaluation reports draws on the results framework, indicators, and baseline/endline data. To explain the cause and effects links, the methodology had confirmed the use of contribution analysis based on the theory of change. However, the application of this methodology in the findings is not clear as the report does not present said theory of change. In addition, the findings do not consistently describe the contribution of outputs to outcomes, with a stronger emphasis on the former. For instance, in a number of instances, the findings report on the delivery of training or kits (outputs) without explaining how this has contributed to outcome level results. Finally, the findings do not discuss unintended results, even though the scope of the methodology mentions that this would be examined.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The findings discuss contribution to outcomes for different target groups, including adolescents, women living with HIV, women with disabilities, rural populations, and marginalized groups affected by the 7M explosions in Bata.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Key contextual factors are identified. For instance, the report identifies as factors hindering effectiveness including the lack of funding (both from UNFPA and the government), staffing, and the Covid-19 crisis.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The findings include a separate section on gender equality, human rights, and the leave no one behind principle. For example, the findings note that, due to funding shortages, the CP did not address the root causes of gender inequalities and discrimination. The findings make mention of disability inclusion and they present disaggregated data, although only in the findings related to coverage.	
<b>5. Conclusions</b>			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Partial	Most conclusions derive from the findings; however, new information not discussed in the findings is also introduced. For example, Conclusion 2 underlines as a key factor the vacancy of the position of Resident Representative, though this is not discussed in the findings.	
<b>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?</b>	Yes	The conclusions provide an understanding of key issues underlined by the evaluation, and also provide analytical concluding thoughts. For example, the conclusions underline the that private sector can be an important financial partner in the development of policies. The conclusions also address cross-cutting issues of gender equality, equity, human rights and disability inclusion.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The findings appear to convey the evaluators unbiased judgement.	
<b>6. Recommendations</b>			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Recommendation are explicitly linked to their corresponding conclusion(s).	
<b>2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?</b>	Partial	Recommendations are implicitly targeted at the UNFPA Country Office for consideration in the next CP. Recommendations include some concrete actions, but human, financial and technical implications are not discussed.	
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 appear balanced and impartial. One recommendation specifically addresses gender and transformative approaches, and another address equity issues (through a focus on youth).	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Partial	The level of prioritization of recommendations is not specified and it is not clear if recommendations are presented in order of priority, although it can be assumed that all should be addressed in the design of the next country programme.	

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?	2	<p><b>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)</b> The evaluation does not include a specific objective on human rights and gender equality. (0)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation includes a standalone section on gender equality and human rights, and GEWE. It is adequately mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria, including relevance, effectiveness, coordination, and coverage. (3)</p> <p><b>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</b> Under effectiveness, the evaluation includes a specific question on gender equality, inclusion and human rights. Issues of gender equality, with a specific focus on women's health and sexual reproductive rights, are also integrated in several other evaluation questions. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The methodology does not include an assessment of data availability (and of disaggregated data) to evaluate progress on gender equality and human rights (0).</p>	
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	1	<p><b>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)</b> The methodology states that it integrates cross-cutting issues such as gender equality; however, it does not explain how it is gender-responsive. In addition, the use of disaggregated data is not specified in the methodology. (1)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The methodology employed a mixed-methods approach using both qualitative and quantitative data analysis. (3)</p> <p><b>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation consulted with 37 individuals, mostly government, UNFPA and development partners. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The sampling frame does not explain how vulnerable groups were included. In addition, the evaluation team did not consult with rights holders and it is not clear how the voices of marginalized groups were considered. (0)</p> <p><b>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</b> The report does not describe ethical safeguards. (0)</p>	
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	2	<p><b>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)</b> The background section includes a good gender analysis explaining driving factors of early pregnancies, etc. It also includes an intersectional analysis describing how vulnerable groups, like adolescent girls or women living with HIV, are affected by the situation. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The report addresses specific groups (i.e. women living in rural areas, youth, women living with HIV, etc.). Disaggregated data is presented in the coverage section, but not under other criteria. (2)</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</b> Unanticipated results are not discussed. (0)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation proposes a specific recommendation on GEEW and transformative approaches. (3)</p>	
<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).</p>			

**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		
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Fair</b>			
<b>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.</b>				
<p>The evaluation includes a question on disability inclusion. However, the findings provide little information on disability inclusion beyond stating that persons with disabilities were not included in the response to the 7M crisis in Bata, which is one part but not the entire CP (see Table 9). In addition, even though the ToR request the inclusion of persons with disabilities in data collection, the evaluation did not consult with rights holders and it is unclear the extent to which organizations that represent them were consulted.</p>				
<b>Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)</b>				
<p>The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>				
<p>If yes, please explain:</p>				