

**Annex IV: Quality assessment (2015)**

**2016 Quality assessments (overall summaries) for country programme evaluations (2015)**

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

<b>Region</b>	<b>Country Programme</b>	<b>Year of evaluation</b>	<b>Quality rating</b>	<b>Quality Assessment Summary</b>
Asia and the Pacific	<b>Viet Nam (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and includes all of the recommended annexes, except the guide for semi-structured interviews. The executive summary is a clearly structured stand-alone document that contains the essence of the main evaluation results. The methodology is well designed, particularly the evaluation matrix, and provides details on methodological choices, techniques and tools for data collection and triangulation. Credibility of primary and secondary data is established and limitations are made explicit. Gender disaggregated data is utilized. Findings stem from rigorous data analysis and are fully substantiated by evidence. Conclusions are linked to the findings and are organised in priority order. Recommendations flow logically from conclusions. They are strategic, targeted and are presented in either medium or high priority.
Arab States	<b>Morocco (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation report is clearly organized and consistently well written, with a standalone executive summary. Most of the methodology is presented in sufficient detail, with the exception of the description of the evaluators' strategy for sampling field sites to visit and stakeholders to interview. The evaluators use both qualitative and quantitative data from their document review, interviews, and field visits. However, data is inconsistently cited across sections. The lack of citations makes it difficult to assess whether triangulation was consistently used and how credible the data presented is. Appropriate attention is paid to disaggregate data by gender, which is one of the main programme areas. The data analysis appears rigorous and thorough, and findings are substantiated with multiple types of evidence, mostly through the document analysis. Findings are nuanced and presented in a clear manner. This is limited by the fact that there is no clear results matrix for the programmes, in part because of changes in the strategies during the period being evaluated. As a result, the evaluation is primarily focused on the activity level and the evaluators did not attempt to define outcomes based on the activities or the UNDAF goals. Conclusions and recommendations are shown in the same section. While the recommendations are prioritized and flow logically from conclusions, they are almost all "high priority" and are not presented in priority order.

**Annex IV: Quality assessment (2015)**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Country Programme</b>	<b>Year of evaluation</b>	<b>Quality rating</b>	<b>Quality Assessment Summary</b>
Arab States	<b>Somalia (2011-2015)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report meets the needs of UNFPA as outlined in the terms of reference, despite the challenges faced by the evaluators in Somalia. The report addresses the respective evaluation questions and criteria, presenting the findings in terms of the intervention of three programme components and several cross-cutting issues. The evaluation findings (Section 4) focus on activities, outputs and the contribution toward achievements of the outcomes, which were addressed to a lesser degree due to the weak linkages between the outputs and outcomes which delimited the effective measurement of programme results. The absence of an explicit set of key lessons learned, a specific objective of the evaluation, lessens the robustness of the conclusions and recommendations sections in providing a basis for advancing options for the next programme.
	<b>Sudan (2013-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is well written. The executive summary provides a concise overview of the report. There is a clear explanation of all methods used and the sampling strategy. Primary data was collected from a wide range of stakeholders. Findings are clearly presented. The report does an excellent job of showing the connection between activities undertaken or funded by UNFPA and the expected outputs. However, the connections between outputs and broader outcomes is less clear. The report draws clear conclusions and makes operational recommendations.
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	<b>Albania (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is clearly presented with the required structure and content as per the evaluation criteria. The executive summary is standalone and presents the objectives, methodology, and findings. The design and methodology are explained clearly, with limitations defined and methodological choices outlined. However, the non-random sampling used in data collection undermines the credibility of findings and conclusions of the report. The evaluators conducted rigorous data analysis, including documents review and interviews with stakeholders. Triangulation was used. Recommendations are strategic, targeted and operationally feasible but are also undermined by the non-random and non-representative sampling used in data collection, especially given the tone used in the report which implies causation and strong evidence.
East and Southern Africa	<b>Botswana (2010-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and clearly drafted. The executive summary is thorough and self-standing. The report explains the methodological choices, including constraints and limitations. Triangulation is systematically applied throughout the evaluation. Credibility of primary and secondary data is established and limitations were made explicit. Evidence was weighted and systematically triangulated from the various sources to ensure robustness. Findings are organized by evaluation question and are clear. Conclusions are, however, of rather poor quality. And consequently the recommendations were unclear on certain points.

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2015)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Latin America and the Caribbean	<b>Haiti (2013-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and includes the recommended annexes. The executive summary is a stand-alone document that contains all of the required information. The methodology is well-described and follows UNFPA standards. Data reliability is poor, the data collection tools are presented but the methodology lacks a more thorough discussion on constraints and credibility of data. Credibility of data is, however, established through annex 4 containing the evaluation matrix. Findings stem from data analysis of the various sources, and are clearly structured and succinctly presented. Conclusions are based on findings and are organized around the evaluation questions. Recommendations are targeted, but are often not achievable, and it is not clear to what extent they reflect stakeholder consultations.
	<b>Honduras (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and includes all of the recommended annexes. In addition, it has an innovative lessons learned section that expands on these issues, and draws conclusions and recommendations on how to improve effectiveness in the next period. Methodological choices are described and explained in detail. Constraints and limitations of the methodology are described where appropriate. The evaluation has a carefully defined results matrix that guides the collection and analysis of data. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data, however, have not been systematically identified (included in footnotes) across the findings section of the report. Findings are structured around the evaluation questions and are derived from the analysis of data collected. Conclusions are organized by focus (strategic, operational and transversal) and are directly supported by finding. Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are given two levels of priority.
	<b>Peru (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards, includes the recommended annexes and is clearly drafted. The executive summary is a stand-alone document that contains all of the required information. The methodology is well designed and the evaluation questions are succinct. The evaluators noted weaknesses in the CO results framework and successfully amended the framework. Credibility of data sources is established and gender disaggregation is used as required. Findings are clear, structured around the evaluation questions and are thoroughly based on evidence. The information sources, however, are not always easily identified. Conclusions are linked to findings and are organized by evaluation questions. Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are prioritized.

Annex IV: Quality assessment (2015)

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
West and Central Africa	<b>Chad (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and the annexes are complete. The executive summary is the required length and follows the desired structure. The report included a thorough results matrix and the methodological design is well presented, including constraints. Credibility of primary data is established by identifying all data sources clearly. Findings clearly follow the evaluation questions and are well supported either by evidence from documents or interviews. Conclusions are unbiased and evidently derive the findings. However, they are not organized by priority order. While the recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, there are only six recommendations all of which are presented as highest priority. All of them are directed to the UNFPA Country Office and are expressed in vague terms, which undermines their operationalisation.
	<b>Mauritania (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and includes the recommended annexes. The executive summary is an excellently drafted stand-alone document that contains all of the required information except a summary of the main conclusions. The methodology is carefully chosen and follows UNFPA standards. The country specific context is well described and limitations to the evaluation are outlined. Data collection in a challenging security context was state of the art. Credibility of data is established and ethical considerations were explicitly mentioned. Findings are structured according to group of evaluation questions and various sources are clear. However, findings are not sufficiently substantiated. Conclusions are based on findings and are prioritized. Recommendations flow logically from findings and conclusions and are prioritized. It would have been desirable to have more strategic recommendations and less programmatic ones.
	<b>Senegal (2012-2016)</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards, includes the recommended annexes and is clearly drafted. The executive summary is a stand-alone document that contains all of the required information within the maximum length. The methodology is clear and follows UNFPA standards. A systematic effort of triangulation is made. The purposive sampling ensures that data is reliable and credible. Gender disaggregation is used, whenever possible. Findings are clear and structured around the evaluation questions, programmatic areas and geographical zones. Contextual factors are clearly identified and applied. Conclusions are based on credible findings and are organized in an innovative matrix, showing strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and risks for the programme. However, they are not organized by priority order. Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are prioritized in two priority levels.