

Title of evaluation report:

UNFPA COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION: UZBEKISTAN

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: The evaluation was thorough, methodologically sound in the context of limitations, and answered the questions posed in the terms of reference with solidly-based findings that clearly led to conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation was careful to consult stakeholders in the design phase and was able to demonstrate the extent to which UNFPA had responded to the political context in which it worked. The evaluators made a successful attempt to show the causal connections between UNFPA activities and output and the outcomes intended to be obtained (even taking into account that what were often called output in programming documents were actually outcomes). Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are not provided in the report. No summary disaggregation data by gender is present in the report. The recommendations made tended to be general, however.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. 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:</p> <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.	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The evaluation contains all of the required content and follows the sequence set out in the Handbook. Moreover, each section is carefully connected to the next so that the evaluation develops logically and completely. The annexes are thorough. Rather than having a single chapter on Findings/Analysis the findings are reported by programme focus in Chapter 4, in terms of strategic positioning in Chapter 5 and Cross-cutting aspects in Chapter 6. This does not detract from the order of the analysis, since the authors were careful to link findings with conclusions. There was no Transferable Lessons Learned chapter, but that is</p>			

<p>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):</p> <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. 	<p>not detrimental in this case.</p> <p><i>Good,</i> The executive summary covers all of the sections and flows logically. The most important aspects of the material in the main content of the sections of the report are all well covered in the executive summary, whose length is exactly as required at 4 pages.</p>
<p>3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> Minimum content and sequence:</p> <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. 	<p><i>Good</i> The methodology used is consistent with the possibilities in terms of time and resources. The choices made are clearly specified. For example, the methodological choice of a non-random sampling is explained in terms of the absence of data. Constraints in quantitative data are clearly explained. Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are not provided in the report: there is a reference to Design Report, but the Design Report is not included in the annexes. How cross-cutting issues were addressed is explained (as well as constraints in dealing with some, like youth). The evaluators were careful to focus on the performance indicators that were set up in programming documents, which were often better expressions of outcomes and output (which are actually outcomes).</p>
<p>4. Reliability of Data <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; 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><i>Good</i> The sources of data for findings and conclusions are always clearly indicated, as well as their limitations. This means that the evaluators were careful to indicate the credibility of the data. For example, on p. 5, it was noted that "all the other samples were purposive and not representative of the target populations of stakeholders and client/beneficiaries" (p.5, paragraph 3), or "some instances were found where planned indicators were not obtained or indicators may have not been sufficiently linked to evaluation questions"</p>

	<p>(p.5, paragraph 4). No summary disaggregation data by gender is present in the report, but Appendix 2 List of persons / institutions has information on the gender of interviewed persons. There are a few minor issues on how many people were interviewed: the evaluator states that “a total of 116 persons were interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire” (p.3, paragraph 1), and then “a total of 29 individual and group interviews were conducted with 122 former participants in UNFPA supported training events” (p.3, paragraph 2), but only 109 persons are listed in the Appendix 2 List of persons / institutions.</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><i>Good</i></p> <p>The findings are structured according to the questions set out in the ToR and are organized by programme area. In each, the indicators that were to be used are shown and the data on these indicators are presented in relation to the questions. The data show, to the extent that it can be measured, the causal connections between UNFPA activities and obtaining what are termed “output” and outcomes. The analysis is clear about outputs that are really <u>actually</u> outcomes. The assumptions are clearly stated and the contextual factors are identified. The analysis takes account of some political factors that affected the programme through the elimination of NGOs with which UNFPA worked, while being careful to avoid judgments on the government’s decisions. One problem has to do with outcomes which are probably more specific objectives than outcomes connected directly with UNFPA output. This has led in some cases to findings of causal connection between UNFPA work that are not clear because what were termed output were really outcomes. For example, “The Youth Output (R51) has clearly contributed to the MTSP 2012-13 Outcome 6” (p. 32, paragraph 2), but “it is not possible to accurately assess the extent to which the MTSP 2012-13 Outcome 6 has been achieved” (p. 32, paragraph 2).</p>

	<p>However, when a focus is on performance indicators (almost always what should be called outcomes), causal connections have been drawn.</p>
<p>6. Conclusions <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <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. 	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The conclusions were linked to findings in the findings chapters, structured according to the questions posed in the ToR, which set priorities for obtaining conclusions. Within that, the conclusions are clearly based on the findings. The conclusions are presented clearly and without bias. They do refer consistently to the causal connection between UNFPA activities and the outcomes obtained. In one case, however, Section 7.2 “Program Conclusions” is about program Effectiveness and Sustainability, including added value. The logic in the organization of these conclusions is not clear. It is not evident from the conclusions section if the conclusions are organized around project outcomes, because project outcomes are not mentioned here.</p>
<p>7. Recommendations <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <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; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p><i>Poor</i></p> <p>The recommendations were linked to the conclusions in the conclusions section and that was repeated in the recommendations what were clearly expressed. All recommendations are said to have high priority, so practically they are not prioritized. Some recommendations are not specific, e.g. “Recommendation 1: The CP3 and CP4 M&E indicators should be revised to refer to explicit denominators for estimated total numbers of specific health cadre or clients” (it is unclear what particular indicators should be revised and how it should be done) (p. 56, paragraph 1) or “Recommendation 2: UNFPA Uzbekistan should revise the CP3 approach and ensure future CP4 priority activities receive sufficient resources to achieve coverage for greater impact” (it is unclear how the approach should be revised and what activities should have sufficient funding) (p. 56, paragraph 1). There is no evidence that the</p>

	recommendations have been reviewed through stakeholder consultations.
8. Meeting Needs 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.	<i>Good</i> The evaluation report closely follows the ToR and was careful to both use and expand upon the results matrix in the ToR.

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		88	12	

(*) 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

