

Organizational unit:	UNFPA Cote d'Ivoire Country Office	Year of report:	2020
Title of evaluation report:	ÉVALUATION INDÉPENDANTE DU 7e PROGRAMME DE COOPÉRATION COTE D'IVOIRE-UNFPA 2017-2020		
Overall quality of report:	Very Good	Date of assessment:	
Overall comments:	<p>The UNFPA Country Program for Cote D'Ivoire Evaluation Report is a solid treatment of the evaluation of a complex program. It includes a strong 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, ethical consideration applied, and data analysis processes used. 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 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. Lastly, gender and cross-cutting themes were successfully treated in the design of the evaluation, criteria, matrix and data collection tools, and were addressed in both the conclusions and the recommendations sections of the report.</p>		

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	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding color)</i>		
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
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 easy to read. The very few grammatical issues do not detract from its quality. The report is appropriate for intended audience, with summarized responses to key questions.	
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 just over 70 pages excluding annexes, in alignment with the Country Program Evaluation guidelines.	
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 clearly and logically organized.	

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 complete and include the lists of documents consulted, evaluation matrix, data collection tools and list of persons interviewed.
<i>Executive summary</i>		
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 ES serves as a standalone section, providing a summary overview of the entire 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 report covers all the key components. Based on the terms of reference, it notes that the intended audience is those entities preparing the 8th country programme.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The ES is 5 pages in line with the UNFPA guidelines.
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?	Partial	Reference is made to a UNFPA and UNCT, but no explicit discussion is made relative to defining the stakeholders and audience for the evaluation.
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The program context is fully explained in chapter 2 Country Context.
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 full logic of the program design, complete with the ToC and logical framework, is presented in chapter 3. The framework is somewhat difficult to read due to the type-size.
<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 introduction of the report and the evaluation matrix clearly highlight the criteria and the questions that lead the evaluation; as well as the indicators and other key components of the process followed.
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	This is fully treated in the evaluation matrix and the introductory chapter of the report. There is a table that explains the questions, project components to explore, and the criteria that will cover this.
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 annex has a mapping of the program stakeholders and the introduction chapter explains the evaluation process including how the evaluation was to be validated, including the reference group and the associated validation workshop. The process for consultations on the recommendations is detailed in the annex of the report.
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	No	The data analysis approach for the evaluation is not outlined in the report, the report does not meet the UNFPA standards in this regard.
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	There is an evaluability, constraints and challenges section that explores the issues that have effected the conduct of the data collection and the limits of the report.

9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling approach for evaluation is covered in chapter 1 of the report; in addition there is annex (5B) dedicated to the mapping of the program stakeholders and the link to sampling.
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology uses mostly qualitative approaches to data collection but also some quantitative data that is appropriate for this purpose. The findings present data that is disaggregated by theme and gender as relevant.
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Gender is fully addressed in the report as required by the content and design of the program; the design treats the issue of crosscutting themes in the evaluation matrix and data collection tools and in the report findings section.
3. Reliability of Data		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The report uses multiple sources and inputs across data sources to respond to all evaluation questions as presented in the ToRs.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluation matrix and report methodology section explain the approach presented in the report; the methodology principally uses qualitative methods. The evaluation matrix, list of persons interviewed and list of documents reviewed all highlight the qualitative and quantitative data 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 limitation section of the report does discuss challenges of accessing non-program beneficiaries and program stakeholders to participate in the evaluation.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	Ethical considerations are not discussed in regards to the conduct of the evaluation; confidentiality is mentioned but not fully explained as it relates to ethical practices used.
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 employs sufficient qualitative and quantitative data to respond to the evaluation questions.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The report explains the basis upon which the findings and assertions are made, with clear use of the data to justify and explain findings and conclusions.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings section is organized by criteria and evaluation question.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The report analysis does highlight data sources.

5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The factors that influence success and challenges experienced during the implementation of the country program are explored and highlighted. The program performance across indicators and outcomes are fully employed in the report.
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Data disaggregated by sex, themes and program components is provided as required to illustrate how the program performs across target groups and outcomes.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The report looks at issues including budget, 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	Gender and cross cutting themes are fully explored throughout the report.
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 link between the conclusions and the findings are clearly articulated as they are both organized by evaluation criteria. It is also clear that the conclusions are informed by the findings.
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 serve to highlight what worked well in the program, what did not work well and how that impacted program success and implementation.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The conclusions and the findings are both informed by the data and evidence highlighted in the report. As such, they seem to be impartial and well substantiated.
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 conclusions are clearly aligned with the findings section; they are both structured by criteria and as a result, the alignment between the two is more evident. Also, the content and nature of the findings clearly inform the conclusions for each criteria.
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 however, the human, financial and technical implications are not explored.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations appear impartial and the author demonstrates this by linking each recommendation to the related conclusions.
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	The recommendations refer to the next country programme, its design and administration.

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.	
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (***)	Assessment Level:	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 and human rights are not raised as part of the objectives for the evaluation = 0</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 was considered both as a standalone criterium and crosscutting theme in the evaluation framework = 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) There are gender specific questions in the evaluation matrix= 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) There is a discussion of the weaknesses of data due to the quality of the program's M&E systems = 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) This is fully explored in the evaluation matrix and data collection tools = 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) Mixed methods are employed and these seem appropriate = 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) The report uses multiple sources and forms of data to explore gender and human rights = 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 sampling frame does not specifically discuss gender but a diversity of stakeholders are included as respondents = 1</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) Gender and ethical considerations were not discussed beyond confidentiality being noted during data collection processes = 1</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) Gender is fully explored in the context and background section = 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) Data includes qualitative and quantitative data and, where possible, the data is disaggregated by relevant gender and social characteristics = 3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) Challenges and successes as they arise are described in the findings section = 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) Gender specific recommendations are made in the report = 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

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	58	18	24	
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 color.

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: