

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2014)

2015 Quality assessments (overall summaries) for country programme evaluations (2014)

All quality assessment reviews are published by the Evaluation Office in the UNFPA evaluation database at:
<http://web2.unfpa.org/public/about/oversight/evaluations/>

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Asia and the Pacific	Cambodia (2011-2015)	2014	Poor	The evaluation report is clearly structured, well-written and user-friendly. The executive summary stands alone and presents the main results of the evaluation, along with the purpose and methodology used. However, there is a lack of clarity regarding the use of results-based management terminology, affecting the overall quality of the evaluation. While the methodology is described adequately, data collection is deficiently developed and discussed. In terms of outlining the findings and their sources, the report gives scarce information on the manner and the sources of the primary information. The contribution of the UNFPA country programme to the country's development results is not demonstrated sufficiently clear. Conclusions are often weakly supported by findings. Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are both strategic and operationally feasible. Yet, there is a lack of prioritization thereof.
	China (2011-2014)	2014	Poor	The evaluation report uses an appropriate methodology and rigorous analysis of data to assess the extent to which the UNFPA country programme achieved the outputs and outcomes outlined in the CPAP and provides a satisfactory background of population trends in China. Still, in most cases, there is a lack of causal connection between the UNFPA activities and the results in terms of country programme outputs and outcomes. Contextual factors, such as the relative limited scope of programmes in middle-income countries for UNFPA and the size of the country are taken into consideration. Data collection from documents is thorough, and the numerous interviews are indicated in the report. However, there were limitations in relation to the range of site visits and as a result, the findings in terms of effectiveness are not well supported. Conclusions and recommendations are rather general and the recommendations are insufficiently strategic and operationally feasible.

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2014)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Asia and the Pacific	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (2011-2015/16)	2014	Good	The evaluation report is a thorough examination of the UNFPA country programme, taking carefully into account the contextual factors in the country. The report is clearly structured and contains the minimum information required as per UNFPA guidance. While the executive summary includes much of the required content and is clearly presented, it exceeds the maximum length requirements, including superfluous information. The methodological approach is broadly described but it falls short of identifying the instruments used. Sources and credibility of data used are largely identified, discussed, disaggregated, where possible, and limitations presented. Findings stem from data analysis, and are clearly presented and discussed, with limitations and contextual factors integrated into the discussion. The report presents complete findings that are based on a clear causal connection to UNFPA activities. While the conclusions are less specific than might be desirable, the recommendations are clear and practical but they are not sufficiently prioritized.
	Indonesia (2011-2015)	2014	Poor	The evaluation report, except for the section on gender findings, is mainly organized around “core programmes” as opposed to results. Thus, the evaluation is mainly assesses the implementation of these “core programmes”. The report contains a mix of data collection methods. Contextual factors, such as the size and complexity of the UNFPA country programme as well as its modification during the period, are reflected in the report. However, this has adversely affected its structure and readability. Stakeholder consultation is clearly indicated, but there is a lack of data to support findings. Findings are structured around an excessive number of evaluation questions, which make the evaluation dense and there is no clear sense of the main results of the programme. Conclusions are presented clearly. Recommendations, on the other side, are poorly presented, too numerous and could be more effectively prioritized.
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Armenia (2010-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report includes all relevant sections. The executive summary has relevant structure and length, contains all required parts, and functions as a brief and consistent report summary. The methodology section clearly describes the evaluation methodology that was developed fully in line with UNFPA guidance. Constraints and limitations of evaluation are clearly explained and mitigation measures are described. The evaluators created a solid logical framework that allowed to establish clear causal connections between UNFPA activities and their results in terms of CPAP products and outcomes. Findings are thorough. There is a clear linkage between findings, conclusion and recommendations. The latter are detailed and strategic.

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2014)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Azerbaijan (2011-2015)	2014	Good	<p>The evaluation report is structured in line with agreed standards and contains all minimum content chapters arranged in a relevant and logical sequence. The chapter on "Transferable Lessons Learned" however, is missing. The executive summary has relevant structure, contains all required parts, and presents a brief and consistent report summary. The methodology section clearly describes how the data were collected and the systematic triangulation of the evaluation findings. Findings are clear and well-presented and demonstrate the relevance of the country programme, the extent to which it has been effective in achieving results, and its efficiency and sustainability. However, the conclusions do not flow from the findings. Recommendations address issues for the next country programme, and are operationally-feasible.</p>
	Tajikistan (2010-2015)	2014	Good	<p>The evaluation report is structured according to the requirements and contains all required content. The executive summary has relevant structure, contains all required parts, and presents brief and consistent report résumé, but it exceeds the recommended length. Methodology section clearly describes the evaluation methodology, which was developed fully in line with UNFPA guidance. Systematic triangulation of the evaluation findings was performed. Primary and secondary data collected by the evaluation team are thorough and the sources of the information are found in the relevant annexes. Evaluation limitations associated with security issues and language limitations are explained. Data disaggregation was performed, where necessary. The data analysis is thorough and extensive. Findings are detailed, and contextual factors and causal connection clear, although the section could be more succinct. Conclusions are based on the findings and are organized in a logical order. Recommendations are logically connected with appropriate conclusions, although some lack sufficient specificity.</p>

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2014)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Turkmenistan (2010-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report is prepared according to the requirements outlined in the terms of reference. The report structure is designed as recommended, and the executive summary is a stand-alone document and contains all required information. The design and methodology chapter provides clear and detailed explanation of evaluation approach to ensure reliable data collection processes and data quality. Evaluation design and methodology, the reliability of data, as well as the findings and analysis derived from the data are strengths of the report. The evaluators conducted rigorous data analysis, including document review and interviews with stakeholders. The conclusions are divided into Strategic and Programmatic categories and are based on findings. Recommendations are clearly based on the conclusions and are presented in priority order.
	Uzbekistan (2010-2014)	2014	Good	The evaluation report is 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 team 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 operates. The evaluators showed successfully the causal connections between UNFPA activities and outputs and the intended outcomes despite the fact that what was referred to as outputs in programming documents as opposed to outcomes. Yet, details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process as well as a summary of disaggregation data by gender are not provided in the report. Recommendations tended to be rather general.
East and Southern Africa	Angola (2009-2014)	2014	Good	The evaluation report is a thorough examination of the sixth UNFPA country programme from 2009-2014 and clearly shows to what extent progress was obtained, particularly in areas of sexual and reproductive health and gender equality. It also showed that there had been issues in the implementation of the population and development part of the programme. The data collection was carefully designed and was mostly qualitative. The evaluators suggested in a number of places where there was an absence of credible quantitative data. Findings were thorough and structured according to the questions asked in the ToR. The recommendations, mostly directed to the UNFPA country office, were practical and organized by priority.

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2014)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
East and Southern Africa	Swaziland (2011-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report is clearly written and logically structured. The content on methodology is well-explained, though more detail could have been provided. However, it does not include a stand-alone methodology section, which undermines the overall clarity of reporting. The discussion of data quality is light on detail regarding credibility but otherwise consistent with evaluation criteria. The findings clearly derived from the data being used and were clearly expressed. Conclusions and recommendations are grounded in a clear discussion of findings and analysis, and arranged in a presentable and user-friendly manner.
	Zimbabwe (2012-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report is presented in a user-friendly manner and is well written. In its design and methodology, the report is careful to define results so that the UNFPA contributions are made visible. Its findings show the extent to which UNFPA supported activities have contributed to the achievement of country programme outputs. Findings are based on evidence, including that gathered by the evaluators own data collection techniques. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations are well organized. The conclusions are consistent with the findings, and the evaluation team has been careful and cautious not to extend their conclusions beyond what the findings permit and by so doing clearly convey an unbiased judgment of the intervention. The recommendations are strategic, targeted and operational.
Latin America and the Caribbean	El Salvador (2012-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report meets all of the minimum requirements in terms of structure but there are some issues with clarity of reporting. The executive summary does not function as summative, stand-alone document. The report provides a clear explanation of methodological choice, including a clear discussion of constraints and limitations, such as the focus of the results matrix on activities and outputs. Findings stem from analysis of the data collected by the evaluation team and cause and effect links between the intervention and its results are explained in detail. The conclusions are directly linked to targeted and operationally-feasible recommendations.
	Panama (2012-2015)	2014	Poor	The evaluation report is well structured with the exception of the executive summary. The evaluation is based on a limited number of questions covering the main areas of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and also draws lessons learned. There are some good elements of design and although the evaluators used a combination of data sources, they lack key details. The evaluators note the difficulty in determining results and hence, one of the main recommendations for the next programme is to connect activities with expected results more clearly and collect results data more systematically. Contextual factors are identified in the findings but overall the findings lack analysis. Despite limitations with the findings, there are clear connections with both conclusions and recommendations.

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2014)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Latin America and the Caribbean	Uruguay (2011-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report covers a UNFPA programme that is a Delivering as One pilot, rather than a standard country programme evaluation. With a sound structure and good design, the findings are expressed clearly, and there is an effort to connect the UNFPA activities with intended results. Nevertheless, regarding certain findings, the data on which the findings are based is at times missing from the main report and is needs to be looked up the annexes. As a result, the conclusions are rather general, but the recommendations are specific and operational and address some of the problems in terms of data availability that has affected the findings and analysis.
West and Central Africa	Burkina Faso (2011-2015)	2014	Good	The evaluation report covers the UNFPA country programme for the period 2011-2015. The evaluation questions were clearly spelled out in the terms of reference and were followed by the evaluators, who additionally set up a clear evaluation matrix. Data collection measures were mainly based on reviews of a large number of documents, but there were also a large number of interviews. The evaluation was affected by political developments in the country that delayed and constrained field work. However, the data led to thorough and well-substantiated findings and derivative conclusions. The recommendations were practical and addressed to the country office.