

Organizational unit: UNFPA/CAM **Year of report:** 2020

Title of evaluation report: EVALUATION FINALE DU 7EME PROGRAMME DE COOPERATION CAMEROUN-UNFPA (2018-2020)

Overall quality of report: **Very Good** **Date of assessment:** 2020 JUNE

Overall comments: The Cameroun CPE evaluation report is a strong report that assesses the programme's performance and makes clear recommendations for improving and continuing programme implementation. It includes a brief executive summary that provides a clear overview of the entire report. The first chapter provides an overview of the evaluation process; and while most aspects of the methodology are covered, there could be a more explicit description of the audience for the evaluation. The second and third chapters provide the country context and the program overview/ theory of change, successfully in line with UNFPA standards. The findings section is clearly presented, particularly as the author uses a table that provides a quick shortcut to understanding performance for each criteria and evaluation question before providing a detailed explanation with supporting data. The findings employ solid use of data with high-level data visualization.. The recommendations and conclusions section are well done; the only weakness is related to the recommendations which do not have a clear timeline for performance or financial or human implications for their implementation. The recommendations are well formulated. Gender, while assessed in the report, could have been treated more intentionally and comprehensively.

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 color)*

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 easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?	Yes	The report is accessible and well written. It is clearly structured and the author presents the information and prose in easily accessible language with few errors.
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	The report is 68 pages excluding annexes fully adhering to the UNFPA requirements.
3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Yes	The report is logically structured with chapters following the UNFPA guidelines presenting the background, questions, methodology and proceeds to findings, conclusions and recommendations. A separate document which includes all relevant annexes is also provided.
4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process?	Yes	The annexes are comprehensive with all components, however, no focus group notes are included.

Executive summary

5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?	Yes	The executive summary is a standalone section that provides an overview of the entire report as a shortcut to understanding the content and main arguments of the report.
6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?	Yes	The executive summary is clearly structured with sections that cover all the core components of the report from purpose to recommendations in line with UNFPA and UNEG criterion.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is the appropriate length of 5 pages while also covering all report sections and key components.
2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Partial	The report highlights that UNFPA and program stakeholders will be able to use the report to better understand program performance, however, the precise target audience of the report is not described.
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	Chapter two of the report highlights the socio-political context addressing the institutional and social constraints confronting success and implementation of the CPE.
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	The third chapter of the report provides an overview of the programmatic objectives and alignment with UNFPA and SDGs priorities and a reconstruction of the intervention logic.
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>		
4. 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 comprehensively presented in chapter 1 and the methodology is clearly presented and justified. In addition, the evaluation matrix and data collection tools and all relevant information is provided in annex.
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools and approaches employed for the evaluation are justified and presented in chapter 1 of the report and annex of the report.
6. 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)?	Yes	The report articulates the consultation process in chapter 1 of the report and a detailed stakeholder mapping is provided in the annex to the report. Although stakeholders' participation in the constitution of recommendations is not clearly articulated, it can be assumed based on the methodology used for the evaluation.
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The author highlights and justifies the all methodologies employed in the evaluation.
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	Chapter one of the report has a section that explores the challenges and limitations experienced during the execution of the evaluation and these are implicit in the report.
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The author explains the sampling approach for the evaluation in chapter 1.3.5.

10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Partial	Gender and disaggregated collection was not explicitly set out as an aim in the sampling frame; the sampling focus was more on the types of intervention and volume of interventions. However, as GBV is a key intervention area of the CPE, gender is addressed.
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The evaluators use a mostly qualitative approach and a sampling frame that will allow for data to be gathered across relevant organizations and actors.
3. Reliability of Data		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The triangulation approach for the data usage in the report is clearly articulated in Section 1.3.6 and reflected in the findings section of the report.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The author uses an exhaustive amount of qualitative and quantitative data that is presented in the report through tables and direct citations that reflect both qualitative and quantitative data collected through primary and secondary sources.
3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The principal limitations mentioned were the lack of creation of reference group and that several respondents were unavailable for interviews.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	There is no evidence of discrimination. The data were collected with careful attention to UNEG ethical rules.
4. Analysis and Findings		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The report uses both qualitative and quantitative data to support the findings, and a substantial amount of data is employed in the report.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The author successfully uses data to justify and support findings and interpretations.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings section respects the evaluation criteria and CPE program design. The questions are provided for each criteria.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	Data sources are clearly presented.
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The author clearly articulates the factors that have positively or negatively impacted program performance across all criteria.

6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The author uses the program indicators and baseline vs actual data, to determine how the program performed across all program target areas and groups.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Chapter 2 of the report looks at implementation and socio-political factors and how they effect program performance and implementation.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Human rights, gender, GBV and youth are explored in the report as it relates to the program design and interventions.
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 and findings are both organized using the same criterion and thematic structure; as such the link between the two are clear.
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated?	Yes	The conclusions and the findings provide a clear understanding of the systemic and contextual factors that have influenced the CPE performance in Cameroun.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The reports relies on the data presented in the findings to interpret the program performance and this is consistent across the findings and 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?	Yes	The recommendations are clearly linked to the conclusions; the author highlights the conclusions that inspire the recommendation.
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The recommendations are clearly written and the target of the recommendation are clearly identified. The recommendations are not always clear enough to be actionable, for example recommending a coordination mechanism but not providing clear details about the who, timing and the how.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations are directed to the country office of UNFPA, but are clearly impartial and based on the conclusions, which are referenced in each recommendation..
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	The recommendations are prioritized but no definitive time-frame is provided for execution of the recommendations, although they are intended to be for the next country programme.
5. Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	The recommendations are prioritized according to high or medium and are presented in terms of the types of action needed to address the problems found in the conclusions.

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Good
To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)			
<p>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>		<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)</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)</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)</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)</p>	<p>2 Gender and human rights are included in the evaluation criteria and questions at various points. There was not a standalone gender section however human rights and youth are treated independently. The issues related to gender integration, youth and human rights and program performance are assessed in the report with associated conclusions and recommendations. As stated in the report, gender was included as "the object of a transversal analysis and integrated in the evaluation questions."</p>
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>		<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)</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)</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)</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)</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)</p>	<p>2 Gender is raised throughout the evaluation criteria and questions as outlined in the evaluation matrix. The evaluation does incorporate a mixed method approach but the sampling did not have a clear gender sensitivity outside of intervention type; the author should have considered respondent gender and other relevant factors as well. Ethical standards concerning gender were addressed.</p>

<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>		<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)</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)</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</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)</p> <p>2 Gender is fully explored in the country context section of the report where the author discusses the Cameroonian gender policy and the gender issues ongoing in country. The treatment of gender in the report is sufficient but it was not intentional in terms of triangulating voices. No unanticipated effects on HRGE were noted. The author does explore the human rights and gender issues as they relate to program performance and makes gender specific recommendations.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

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

0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.

1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.

2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.

3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

	Assessment Levels (*)			
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	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	69	20	11	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very Good			
	Very good very confident to use	Good confident to use	Fair use with caution	Unsatisfactory not confident to use

- (*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column.
(b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair').
(c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain

- How it can be used?

- What aspects to be cautious about?

Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory

Consideration of significant constraints

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

Yes No

If yes, please explain: