

Title of evaluation report: Rapport Evaluation Finale du 4ième Programme de Cooperation UNFPA Congo (2009-2013)

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Poor

Summary: The evaluation incorporates a large amount of data from various of sources into a coherent analysis. However, the organization of the report, which separates the pertinence and implementation of the program from the main analysis and findings section, impedes its ability to draw logically-supported findings from the data. The evaluators also omitted a standard Conclusions section, choosing instead to include a combined section on Lessons Learned and Recommendations and a section on Priority Areas for the next country programme.

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>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>While containing most of the required sections, the organization of the report has major deficiencies that impede its ability to clearly address the evaluation questions and link evidence to findings and conclusions. The first problem, which stems in part from the requirements listed in the ToR, is that the “conclusions” section has been replaced with a two-page section on “lessons learned and recommendations.” The evaluators modified the proposed structure of the report to replace a “lessons learned” section with a section on “lessons learned and recommendations” and added a section on priorities in the 5th programme.</p> <p>Second, they have added two long sections on the design and relevance of the programme and the implementation of the programme. The first of these two sections includes one page on the national context and a long discussion of the formulation of the CPAP products. The second provides important information about the organisation of the programme that should be better integrated into the analysis to support the findings and conclusions of the report.</p> <p>Not all minimum required annexes are included, particularly the methodological</p>			

	instruments used. The lack of questionnaires or forms used during interviews, stakeholder consultations, or field visits is a deficiency.
<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>Poor</p> <p>The executive summary is unable to function as a stand-alone document and is missing many components. It does not clearly identify the intended audience. The executive summary does provide a clear view of the objectives of the program and the key outputs of the components. The methodology and conclusions are not mentioned. Instead, the evaluators list the outputs of the programme components. The executive summary ends on more than a page of recommendations for future programme focus areas. At four pages long, the summary is an appropriate length.</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>Poor</p> <p>The methodology section in the introduction (pp 10-11) discusses the different sources of data uses in the report and how they were generally collected and analysed. The discussion of limitations focuses only on problems with the implementation of their chosen methodology (the rainy season, lack of administrative data) rather than more general limitations of document review and purposive sampling.</p> <p>At several points the evaluators mention specific tools for data collection such as a stakeholder questionnaire (p 10), but these are not included as annexes.</p> <p>The evaluators mention general sources of data when discussing some findings, but generally do not include sufficient information on the source of different information to judge whether they have effectively used triangulation. For example, they generally cite that they draw findings from document review and stakeholder consultations (p 35) without linking specific sources to specific findings.</p> <p>The evaluation mentions stakeholders' consultations and provides a list of structures visited and people met as Annex 2 (pp 61-62). However, the questionnaire is not included and most discussions of the results of the stakeholder consultations remain superficial. For example, the evaluators conclude on the basis</p>

	<p>of the stakeholder consultations that “there appears to be a unanimity on the fact that a transfer of capacity effectively took place” (p 33). Cross-cutting issues are taken into account throughout the evaluation.</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>Good</p> <p>The evaluation covers the relevant secondary sources, including annual country programme reviews and workplans and government policy documents on relevant topics such as HIV. Care has been taken to collect quantitative information and some limitations of this information (mainly the lack of availability) are mentioned (pp 10-11). There is no discussion of the limitations of various sources, in general or for specific documents or interviews. The list of persons interviewed includes stakeholders in UNFPA, the government, local and international NGOs, and target beneficiaries. In some cases data is disaggregated by gender.</p>
<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><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>Poor</p> <p>The findings stem from rigorous data analysis and are supported by strong evidence, particularly changes in key indicators from survey data, which are usually discussed with information about the source. It is not clear, however, how or when the evaluators analyse or draw findings from document review or stakeholder interviews. In some sections, the findings are not detailed enough (for example, the discussion of findings for CPAP product 2 of the Gender component does not include any information about the number of people sensitized or events organised). The findings are presented in a very clear manner, organized by programme component and product and discussed parsimoniously. The evaluators include a very useful “performance matrix” as an annex that outlines the strategies, activities, interventions, outputs, and indicators.</p> <p>There is no discussion of the assumptions that are required to make cause and effect links between UNFPA interventions and end results. For example, there is no discussion of the assumptions required to find that the change in the maternal</p>

	<p>mortality rate is attributable to the UNFPA intervention (p26). Contextual factors that affected the programme positively and negatively are elaborated (pp 33-34). The cause and effect links between and intervention and its end results are typically clearly explained.</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>Poor</p> <p>The conclusions are written as “lessons learned” and are more focused on general principles for the design of the next country programme than evaluating the last programme (for example, the importance of consensus on the definition of access, equity, etc) (pp 36-37). This follows from the requirements outlined in the ToR, which proposes a structure that includes a section on “lessons learned” rather than a “conclusions”. Not all conclusions can be linked to specific findings.</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>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>The recommendations are structured as two sections on “lessons learned and recommendations” and “priorities for the 5th programme”. Some recommendations are targeted on the government or UNFPA's implementing partners. These recommendations that are not directed at UNFPA are not appropriately targeted and are impossible for UNFPA to carry out.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Poor</p> <p>The evaluation report generally corresponds to the requirements of the ToR, particularly on the methodology specified. However, there are major deviations in the structure of the report from the structure outlined in the ToR, such as the addition of sections on the design and pertinence and implementation of the program. The evaluation questions on efficiency are not adequately addressed.</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		5	81	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