

EQA for UNFPA Azerbaijan 3rd Country Programme

Evaluation (2011-2015)



Title of Evaluation Report: UNFPA Country Programme Evaluation: Azerbaijan Third country programme, 2011-2015

Overall Quality Rating: Good

Overall Assessment: The report structure is in line with agreed standards, and contains all minimum content chapters arranged in a relevant and logical sequence, although there is no chapter on Transferable Lessons Learned. The Executive Summary has relevant structure, contains all required parts, and presents a brief and consistent report summary. The methodology section clearly describes how the data were collected and the systematic triangulation of the evaluation findings. The findings are clear and well-presented and demonstrate the relevance of the country programme, the extent to which it has been effective in achieving results, and its efficiency and sustainability. However, the conclusions do not flow from the findings. The recommendations address issues for the next country programme, and are operationally-feasible.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
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: <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. 	Good The report structure is designed as required although the material on “Methodology including Approach and Limitations” is included into Introduction and there is no chapter “Transferable Lessons Learned” that is required by the TOR. Conclusions and recommendations are presented in a combined chapter “Conclusions and Recommendations”.			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
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): <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. 	Poor The summary is the correct length at three pages. While it covers all of the material, it is not easy to read, with too much detail on the objectives of the evaluation and description of the intervention, and lacks sufficient text on the methodology. The findings are clearly expressed but there are no clear conclusions e.g. “UNFPA has made impressive contributions to the United Nations Gender Theme Group and UNCT coordination.” The recommendations are presented in two paragraphs and have been rephrased and condensed and are now very general, and do not present the fuller recommendations from the main report effectively.			
3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> Minimum content and sequence: <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. 	Good The methodological choices are explained together with constraints and limitations. The tools, especially the use of the “World Café” method for focus groups, are explained. However, while interviewees are listed (in Annex 4), why and how they were selected was not explained (although all were stakeholders) nor is it explained in the report why specific sites outside Baku were chosen for visits other than they had UNFPA projects. Triangulation was applied and stakeholder consultation, including particularly a final workshop involving 27 stakeholders composed of youth, women and male beneficiaries, was explained. Cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were specifically addressed in the design of the evaluation: “Testimonials were gathered on how the programme has made a difference in the lives of participating youth, women and men. This was done through the semi-structured interviews whenever possible and salient quotes were used in the final report to help illuminate the findings.”			
4. Reliability of Data <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; 	Good The primary sources of data were interviews with key stakeholders and a review of key documents. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data are provided in the Annex 2: List of documents and Annex 4: List of			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>persons/Institutions met. These were all identified in the analysis and are credible. Other evidence was obtained from an innovative workshop at the end of the data acquisition period.</p> <p>The evaluators also interviewed beneficiaries who used UNFPA-supported activities like training and a refuge for women who had experienced violence. Statements in the report indicate measures taken to ensure the credibility of data e.g. “The report findings were shared with the UNFPA’s programmatic team leaders to ensure credibility of the data. The country office, reference groups and key stakeholders participated in the stakeholder workshop. Finally a debriefing workshop at the end of the field mission was an opportunity for reference group members and UNFPA to provide suggestions and feedback on the preliminary findings.” Data were disaggregated by gender where appropriate.</p>			
<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</p> <p>The findings are structured according to the evaluation questions and presented in two places in the reports: narrative text and annex (7.Evaluation matrix). The findings are clear and well-presented and supporting evidence is provided. The evaluators clearly noted the connection between UNFPA-funded or delivered activities and what were termed outputs in the CPAP, and this was made very clear in the evaluation matrix in the Appendix. In this sense, the evaluators were careful to show causal links and when this was not possible, to note that fact in terms of the extent to which outputs and outcomes were obtained.</p> <p>Contextual factors are identified. Occasionally cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are not clearly explained because of evaluation limitations, which are acknowledged by the evaluation team: “It is simply difficult to pronounce oneself with specificity on the outputs and outcomes given the general nature of some of the indicators and lack of some baseline data which do not entirely correspond to the given output or outcome.” The reference is to the output</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
	and outcomes found in the CPAP, which are outcomes to the UNFPA interventions, but the findings about the effectiveness of UNFPA interventions are sound.			
6. Conclusions <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i> <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. 	Poor <p>The conclusions flowed directly from the findings and were presented together with the recommendations.</p> <p>The conclusions were presented in priority order but as all but one were assigned high priority, there is in effect no prioritisation. The links between conclusions and findings are not shown in the chapter "Conclusions," but annexed evaluation matrix includes concluding remarks and findings in description of some evaluation questions. These links could have been discussed in the "Conclusions" section to strengthen this section.</p> <p>Also, some conclusions include recommendations that lack arguments or include personal opinions such as "UNFPA should continue its efforts to advocate in these key areas and in particular place emphasis on a number of laws that still require legislation with regards to reproductive health and gender based violence," "Family planning efforts also need to be stepped up and the reproductive health rights and options of women and men need to be more aggressively explored," "Women should not be burdened with the responsibility of reproduction and abortion should be used for unwanted and high-risk pregnancies rather than as a contraception measure." The basis for the conclusions is not always clear.</p>			
7. Recommendations <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i> <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; 	Good <p>The recommendations are directly linked to the conclusions (and were presented in terms of the evaluation questions) with all but one given high priority, so in effect are not prioritised. An effort has been made to show how these recommendations could be operationalized in practical terms.</p> <p>Nevertheless, some recommendations could be more precise. For example, "The next country programme should place an increased focus on advocacy</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p>especially with regards to a number of important laws touching reproductive health and domestic violence and place increased emphasis on rural and vulnerable populations.” More detail is needed on the nature of the focus and the laws that could be advocated, which would help make the recommendation more precise.</p> <p>Operational implications could be more precise as well. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “UNFPA has successfully supported evidence based research and policy-making and has helped push boundaries on important and neglected issues.” It is not clear which UNFPA supported research is being referred to and what element of this support is considered to be successful and it is not clear how UNFPA helped to push boundaries. “UNFPA support has not been enough in the practical implementation of the National Reproductive Health Strategy. While a policy exists, measures need to be taken to ensure its practical application”. What ‘enough’ means is not clear nor is the kind of measures to be taken clear. <p>The findings, conclusions and recommendations were all reviewed at an end-of-evaluation workshop.</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 requirements of ToR. Nevertheless, there is no chapter “Transferable Lessons Learned” that is required by TOR.</p>			

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		86	14	

(*) 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