



Organizational unit: Zimbabwe Country Office **Year of report:** 2021

Title of evaluation report: Government of Zimbabwe/UNFPA 7th Country Programme 2016 – 2020 Evaluation

Overall quality of report: Good **Date of assessment:** 27 April 2021

Overall comments: This is primarily a summative evaluation of the UNFPA 7th Country Programme in Zimbabwe that will serve to inform the next Programme cycle. The evaluation assesses 4 criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and the cross cutting themes of gender and human rights and disability mainstreaming within the work of UNFPA. The evaluation objectives are achieved through a mixed-methods approach based on document review and remote data collection (KII). Due to the COVID 19 pandemic restrictions, interviews were conducted virtually. Findings are based on evidence from different data sources. Conclusions and recommendations derive appropriately from findings, however the latter are not prioritized. The evaluation was comprehensive in terms of the data collection and results, and included a thorough and useful set of recommendations. However, the report was missing key elements including articulation and assessment of the CP's overall theory of change, and reference to unintended results.

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:	Very 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)?	Yes	The structure of the report is logic and adequate. It is easy to understand and has a distinction between findings, conclusions and recommendations and his minimal spelling 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)	Partial	The report has a length of 75 pages, excluding Annexes.
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)?	Yes	The report includes all the necessary annexes.
<i>Executive summary</i>		
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)	Yes	The executive summary serves a stand alone section with all the requires subsections.
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is concise within the required page limit (5 pages).

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
----------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	-------------

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 country context is described in the report, specifically development challenges and national strategies relevant to the CP (Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights and HIV and AIDS; Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health, among other relevant institutional context).
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	No	The evaluation mentions the theory of change, and that the analysis of the Programme is based on the underpinning theory of change. However an overall ToC is not explicitly included in the report itself and it is not assessed, although the outcomes and outputs for each programme area are stated.

To ensure a rigorous design and methodology

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?	Yes	The evaluation matrix is included in Annex 1 and in addition to questions, it also integrates assumptions, indicators, courses of information and methods and tools for data collection.
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The report describes both quantitative and qualitative data collection: document review, interviews with KII, as well as monitoring data, surveys, etc.
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)?	Yes	The report includes in Annex 3 includes a stakeholder mapping by outcome. The stakeholder consultation process is described. The Evaluation Reference Group and UNFPA had the opportunity to comment on the draft report, and it is noted that the findings and recommendations were subsequently presented at a meeting with the ERG prior to finalization of the report.
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	The methods of analysis are generally described. The description broadly mentions comparison and data analysis was used to quantify the results achieved by the CP.
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The report includes 3 major limitations as well as the corresponding mitigation strategies to minimize their impact.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy describes the criteria for selecting provinces and districts for data collection. In addition the selection of key informants was based on a comprehensive mapping of stakeholders for all output areas of the CP.

9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology allowed collection of disaggregated data by sex, when available, and also by other sub-criterion such as urban/rural.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The design and methodology allowed the assessment of cross-cutting issues such as the inclusion of vulnerable groups such as the youth, and people with disabilities. Under the effectiveness criteria, the evaluation assessed the approach to gender integration and human rights within the CP.
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	Triangulation of evidence from all data sources is appropriate. The evaluators compared and complemented both document review and primary data collection.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluation identifies and uses reliable data sources, both qualitative and quantitative. The evaluators are explicit regarding the reliability of the data (for instance, the data from the Zimbabwe Demographic and Health Survey ZDHS).
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	The data collection methods took into account issues of discrimination and other ethical consideration through interviewing each key informant individually. For example, according to the report, evaluators conducted interviews in local languages for interviewees with low English proficiency and maintained confidentiality of the data collected.
4. Analysis and Findings		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings are based on evidence, both qualitative and quantitative, and there is explicit reference to data sources that substantiate each finding.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The description of the interpretation on how findings were determined is described either with citations, reference to documents or other sources.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are presented per evaluation questions and sub questions, based on the evaluation matrix.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	The cause-effect links are explained throughout. However, there are no unintended outcomes included in the analysis.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The analysis presents different outcomes per target group; for instance, women vs men, or urban vs rural, etc.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Findings include variables from the context of the CP that might have impacted the intended results.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The analysis takes into consideration cross-cutting themes of gender and human rights and disability.
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	Yes, conclusions refer to specific evaluation questions and its analysis from the findings section.
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?	Yes	Conclusions synthesize properly underlying issues of the CP. The section also incorporates cross-cutting issues (for instance the CP mainstreaming of gender not being comprehensive and systematic).
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	Conclusions are objective, based on findings and the evidence presented.
6. Recommendations		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Recommendations are comprehensive and derive logically from conclusions (and referring to the specific conclusion it is aligned to).
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	Recommendations are divided by type of recommendation (strategic or programmatic). They are not specifically directed to intended users, although it can be assumed all are for the country office since this is a CP evaluation. In most cases, the sub-recommendations include suggestions for operationalization.
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 objective. They also include cross cutting issues such as gender and humanitarian responses.

4. Are the recommendations prioritize?	No	Recommendations are separated by strategic and programmatic ones, but they are not prioritized. Prioritization would be particularly useful for this evaluation given the number of recommendations areas (7) and each having up to 8 sub-recommendations.
--	----	--

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 ^(**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
-----------	----------------------------------	-------------------	-----------

To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) ^(*)

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>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) HRGE is noted as a cross-cutting theme in the scope of assignment. =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) Both gender and human rights are included under the effectiveness criteria and assessed as cross cutting themes. =3</p> <p>3 c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) EQ2b integrates this issue. =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) The evaluation assesses the suitability of the CP to collect progress. =3</p>
--	--	--

2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?		<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) Although gender disaggregated data is presented, the methodology description is not specific about how the selected methodology would do this. =1</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) The methodology selected (qualitative and quantitative) was appropriate to evaluate GEEW considerations. =3</p> <p>2 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) The data sources were sufficiently diverse for these criteria to be met. =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) The pandemic is noted as a limitation for not collecting data directly from the range of rightsholders. However service providers were consulted that worked with the most vulnerable and marginalized (specific EQ1 and EQ6.) =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) Evaluators mention the use of ethical standards but are not specific in what ways the stakeholders groups managed to use</p>
--	--	--

3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		<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) The Country Context adequately addressed these issues. =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) Findings present disaggregated data when available and includes also citation from diverse stakeholder, however is not specific on the type of stakeholder voices used. =2</p> <p>2 c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) There are no mentioned of unintended effects on these issues. =0</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) Multiple recommendations address specific GEEW issues. =3</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).

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		
Total scoring points	36	64	

Overall assessment level of evaluation report

Good

The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality and human rights, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.

Example of DI mainstreaming: "The CP did not adequately integrate disability at the time of design. However, during implementation, interventions addressing the needs of persons with disability were introduced. For instance, young people with disability were represented in ASRH multi-stakeholder coordination meetings and FP forums. This representation brought out the needs and challenges of persons with disabilities which included infrastructure not being friendly and limited access to IEC materials. UNFPA, with support from Australian Embassy, revamped GBV shelters and the Hopley youth centre to make them disability friendly. HCWs were also trained on how to provide services to persons with disability while some IEC materials were developed in Braille. A disability module was also added to the second edition of the ICDS 2017 in line with the SDG data disaggregation requirements (Key informants). These efforts demonstrate the integration of disability in the CP during the course of implementation. The CP lacks a comprehensive analysis of persons with disability among its targeted populations and a comprehensive approach towards integrating disability in implementation approaches."

Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: Yes No

If yes, please explain:

The evaluation took place during the pandemic, with restrictions on travel and meetings which impacted data collection as focus group discussions could not be conducted. However mitigations strategies were taken into consideration to overcome or at least minimize them.