

Organizational unit:

Year of report:

2019

Title of evaluation report:

UNFPA Country Programme Evaluation Tajikistan CP Period: 2016-2020

Overall quality of report:

Very Good

Date of assessment:

Overall comments:

This was a solid evaluation of a fairly complex country programme. It shows well what was achieved and why. The collection of data, using a mixed-method approach, allowed detailed findings from which good conclusions and recommendations could be derived, all of which were directed to the UNFPA country team. The main, albeit minor, weaknesses of the evaluation had to do with a lack of: 1) clear description of data analysis techniques and 2) clear description of how the findings and recommendations were commented on by the evaluation review group.

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 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 writing is easy to understand and there are almost no 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 text excluding annexes and the executive summary is 69 pages long.

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 expected structure was followed.

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 include the ToR, Stakeholder Map, List of consulted persons, list of documents and data collection instruments (in Russian). It has a 33 page evaluation matrix that summarizes the results data in considerable detail.

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 complete. In particular, its conclusions are very well-expressed.
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 structure was followed. The section on methodology was short, but the findings, conclusions and recommendations were clear.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary was 4 pages.
2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Fair
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>		
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The target audience is given as "The primary users of this evaluation are the decision-makers within the UNFPA country office in Tajikistan and organization as a whole, government counterparts in the country, the UNFPA Executive Board, and other development partners. The UNFPA Regional Office for Eastern Europe and Central Asia and UNFPA Headquarters divisions, branches and offices will also use the evaluation as an objective basis for programme performance review and decision-making."
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The context is clear. It is an evaluation of the country programme in its context, including constraints.
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 evaluators reconstructed the intervention logic and show it in Figure 2.
<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 framework is described in the text, with the evaluation questions shown in Table 1. Additionally the 33 page annex 5 with the evaluation matrix also shows the framework.
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools are described on page 21 and consist of most methods except a survey. In each case, the reasons for selection, having to do with the kinds of questions to answer, are clear.
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	There is a stakeholder map in Annex 2, and the stakeholders who were reached by the evaluators are shown in Table 3. There is also an evaluation reference group. The evaluation notes that "Further analysis of the evaluation findings in consultation with the CO staff and members of the ERG informed evaluation conclusions and recommendations" but how this was done is not explained.
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	While the methods of analysis are described when the findings are shown, they are not described in specifics. What is said is that "Analysis of the collected data was conducted in line with the recommendations provided in the UNFPA Evaluation Handbook (Fig. 4). Data analysis involved several stages. During the data collection stage members of the evaluation team held regular debriefing meetings that were used to compare and validate data from interviews and involved preliminary analysis of the topics and themes emerging from the data."

8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	The limitations, loss of organizational memory as a result of staff mobility in the UN System and limited access to final beneficiaries in some cases were described, and in each case what was done to mitigate was also described. For example, "To some extent the evaluation team managed to mitigate this limitation, e.g. by asking teachers and students who were stakeholders of the Adolescents and Youth component about their experiences with the SRH services."
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling was illustrative, but why sites to visit were chosen is described in detail on pp.19-20.
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Much of the data can be disaggregated, while other quantitative data is less flexible.
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The evaluators have made a point to ensure that cross-cutting issues are addressed. This is described on pp. 22-23.
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	In each of the findings, different sources of data were used, mostly more than one. Triangulation was consistent.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The quantitative data are mostly from documents, whose quality is noted. The qualitative data is from interviews, focus groups and site visits and in each case they are identified and their reliability noted.
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	In the methodology section the limitations were given and mitigation measures noted. In the findings, when data was not strong, this was noted.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	In the ethics section of methodology, the detailed means by which data were collected, including how anonymity was guaranteed and how this was applied to focus groups also explained.
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	In each case, based on criteria and the questions within them, the findings are based on the evidence collected.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	In each case, how the interpretations followed from the data were explained.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	All findings are in terms of the evaluation questions.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	In each findings, the data basis for the finding is clearly explained.

5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	In the findings, what UNFPA has done and how this has affected the results observed is shown clearly. However, unanticipated or unintended outcomes were not noted or observed. The focus was only on intended results.
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	There are different beneficiary groups, ranging from governmental officials, non-governmental organizations, individuals with different circumstances, and the different outcomes are shown. For example, one programme had to do with providing support to sex workers who were victims of violence and this was described.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	In each case, the contextual factors that affected the outcomes are shown. For example, one issue in training was the turnover of staff.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues are dealt with throughout.
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 are linked in the text to the evaluation questions around which the findings were organized.
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 are expressed in a way that goes beyond the individual findings to the broader issues to be dealt with.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias (by the evaluators) in the text of the conclusions.
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	Each recommendation is linked to a conclusions or set of conclusions.
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	All of the recommendations are directed to the UNFPA Country Office, but they are clear and have detailed implications that are expressed.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	There is no evidence of partiality.
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Partial	The evaluation is supposed to be used for the next country programme, but there is no specific timetable for specific recommendations.

5. Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	While almost all are considered high priority, there is one that is medium priority (#11). The recommendations are drafted clearly and can lead to an appropriate management response.
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		
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) Gender equality and human rights are mainstreamed with all three objectives; scope of exercise looks at mandate area of gender equality and youth. (Score=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) Gender and human rights are part of most of the evaluation questions (Score=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) Gender is part of most of the questions. (Score=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 whether progress can or was measured (Score=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) The gender of the respondents is clearly indicated in Table 3. The data, when they were available, also indicates gender (Score=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) The evaluation uses a consistent mixed-method approach that, especially in interviews and focus groups, that has GEEW considerations (Score=3)</p> <p>3 c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) There are four types of data sources and processes, including triangulation to guarantee inclusion and credibility. (Score =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 method and sampling address diversity and gender. (Score=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) Ethical standards were considered and used throughout. (Score=3)</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 background section contains this information. (Score=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) The different social role groups, where relevant, are included in the analysis. (Score=2)</p> <p>2 c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) No unanticipated effects were noted (Score=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) Recommendations 5, 9 and 10 are specific about GEEW. (Score=3)</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	76	11	13	
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

The evaluation on the whole was very solid, in terms of structure, methodology, content, data collection and analysis. Thus, the overall assessment of "Very Good" was warranted.

Consideration of significant constraints

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

Yes No

If yes, please explain: