

2013 Evaluation Quality Assessments (EQA): Overall Assessment Summary

Country Office	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Bosnia Herzegovina	Good	The report is logically structured . However, while it includes the required sections and annexes and additional sections which contribute to the report's quality, the clarity of reporting is slightly undermined by inconsistent writing quality, use of acronyms, and somewhat poorly-structured tables. The evaluation methodology is explained in detail, including methodological choice, but lacks simple stakeholder classification. Findings stem from rigorous data analysis. Some conclusions are non-specific and this section also includes recommendations. The recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are strategic and targeted. The report meets most of the requirements outlined in the ToR .
Cambodia	Good	The report is well written and easily understandable. However, the fact that sections are not numbered and the inconsistent use made of subheadings considerably impair its readability and clarity. The executive summary is concise and clear; it gives a good overview of the main results of the evaluation. The methodological approach is well explained and is adapted to the constraints of the exercise. The data used are reasonably reliable, despite their scarcity. The evaluation team has conducted a rigorous analytical work, resulting in credible findings . However, the information displayed in the conclusions section cannot be considered as actual conclusions. Recommendations lack a logical link with corresponding conclusions and most of them are insufficiently operational. Overall, the report addresses well the information needs as expressed in the ToR.
Costa Rica	Poor	The structure of the report is not user friendly and sections do not flow logically. The report is unbalanced in terms of the weight given to descriptive/factual information and the findings. The report mixes methodology with description of the evaluation process, making it difficult for the reader to understand the methodology utilized. The executive summary contains several descriptive paragraphs that are not necessary or contribute to the summary. The summary would benefit from a more detailed and clear explanation of the methodology. The description of the methodological choice is conceptually confusing and tools for data collection are not explained in detail. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data are identified in the report and the credibility of primary and secondary data is established. There is a balance between the use of quantitative and qualitative data. There is evidence of triangulation of data in the report. The findings are not related to the evaluation questions and are mostly presented in between numerous descriptive statements and under headings that do not follow a clear logic. Conclusions are not presented in any discernible logic or order. Several conclusions are presented as findings mostly of a descriptive nature, and not as a judgment of the evaluators. Recommendations are too numerous, do not flow logically from conclusions and are not presented in a priority order. The evaluation responds to requirements stated in the ToR related to the scope, evaluation questions, important issues and DAC criteria.
Cote d'Ivoire	Poor	The report is mostly well-structured and addresses the questions laid out in the Terms of Reference . However, the authors rely heavily on secondary sources and fail to appropriately discuss issues of data quality or limitations to their chosen methodology of document review and interviews. There are few signs that the evaluators triangulated information from multiple sources to increase its accuracy. These issues undercut the credibility of the evaluation. The

		conclusions and recommendations are mostly well supported by key pieces of evidence and are logically connected to each other.
Cuba	Poor	The report can be easily understood but its structure is inconsistent and not all aspects comply with standard reporting. In fact, the report is more of a mid-term review than a country programme evaluation. The methodological choice --- rapid assessment -- is justified in the report by the evaluators due to the time constraints (2 months) and the very low budget of the evaluation (6001 USD); however this approach is not appropriate for a country programme evaluation. This being said, it needs to be acknowledged that the evaluation team clearly operated in a challenging setting and had to adjust its approach to accommodate the above scarcities for which the team needs to be praised. Analysis of UNFPA contribution to results in the findings is not clearly presented and the cause and effect links between UNFPA support and results are not clearly presented to the reader, and often lack accompanying evidence. Conclusions are not presented in a structured way – they mix several levels of importance and are too focused on the implementation level (which is acceptable for a mid-term review but not for a CPE). Recommendations flow logically from conclusions but are very broad, not strategic or targeted.
Democratic Republic of Congo	Poor	The evaluation report is poorly structured. The executive summary is too long (23 pages), and lacks sufficient detail. The evaluators rely almost entirely on the consultation of secondary sources and a small number of interviews with UNFPA staff members as sources of data . They do not discuss the limitations of this methodology or the potential biases or limitations of sources used and the need for triangulation. They do not rigorously consider the cause-and-effect relationship underlying the UNFPA programme and the intended effects of the CPAP, or specify their assumptions about the effects of UNFPA-supported interventions. Conclusions generally flow logically from findings , but many conclusions are in fact findings about the outcomes of the UNFPA programme. The recommendations are overly broad and are focused on identified needs rather than the lessons learned from the implementation of the 3 rd UNFPA country programme.
Djibouti	Unsatisfactory	The report is not logically structured and its sequence does not follow standard reporting for a country programme evaluation. Evaluation questions/ issues covering the 4 evaluation OECD/DAC criteria are not presented in the report; hardly any analysis is conducted regarding the efficiency, relevance or sustainability evaluation criteria. The methodology is briefly described and consultations of beneficiaries are very limited. In the findings , the cause and effect links between the UNFPA support through the country programme and the results are not presented to the reader. The findings (chapters 3 and 4) show serious deficiencies with a complete absence of evidence to substantiate the analysis. The report lacks proper conclusions and recommendations chapters. In summary, this report cannot be considered as a country programme evaluation.
Equatorial Guinea	Poor	The structure of the report is cumbersome and its sequence does not follow standard reporting for a country programme evaluation. The report lacks an appropriate findings chapter where the reader can find clear answers to the information needs presented in the ToR. The executive summary functions as a stand-alone section but is not succinct. The methodological section does not provide a clear presentation of the tools and methods used by the evaluators (e.g. the evaluation matrix is not included). Sources of secondary data have been systematically identified throughout the report; however, the report lacks primary data. Moreover, the list of interviewees only partially reflects the composition of programme stakeholders as beneficiaries are not included. The 4 evaluation OECD/DAC criteria are not all systematically covered in the findings ; moreover, causality links between UNFPA interventions and the

		“results” observed are not thoroughly discussed. The report lacks proper conclusions and recommendations , with descriptive statements presented as “conclusions”. In addition, recommendations are not linked to conclusions, with no order of importance, target audience or clustering.
India	Poor	The chosen structure of the report is poor, with the conclusions and recommendations combined in a section with the findings, and there is no overall section on recommendations. The executive summary is extremely long and does not present the findings and conclusions clearly. The methodology fails to provide some tools or explain how the evaluators planned to mitigate limitations. There are gaps in the referencing of data, and information shortages have not been appropriately addressed. There is a lack of evidence to support the findings and the use of different evaluation criteria is not made clear. The <i>conclusions</i> lack sufficient detail. The use of ‘suggested actions’ alongside recommendations is very confusing, and recommendations lack information on their operationalization. The evaluators have attempted to address all aspects in the ToR despite the brevity of the ToR.
Jordan	Good	The report is neither user friendly or logically structured. The annexes do not include the bibliography, the list of interviewees or the methodological instruments used. The length of the executive summary is appropriate and it functions as a stand-alone document and presents the main results of the evaluation. The report presents the methodological choice for the evaluation as well as the constraints and limitations and how these were addressed by the evaluation team. Tools for data collection are discussed. Information on the participation and consultation of stakeholders is also provided. The sources of qualitative and quantitative data are not clearly identified. Regarding reliability of data , the sources of qualitative and quantitative data are not clearly identified and limitations and challenges are not appropriately addressed. Findings are based on rigorous data analysis and substantiated by evidence. Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results – including unintended results - are explained. Certain conclusions are not clearly based on findings , especially the criterion of sustainability which is not adequately addressed under findings but there is a conclusion related to that criterion. Conclusions are not organized in a priority order; they are organized by evaluation criteria, which do not logically follow from the analysis by area in the findings section. Recommendations flow from the conclusions section, are prioritized, clear and operationally feasible. One of the weaknesses of this section is that recommendations are not targeted – they are directed in general to ‘UNFPA’ and not the country office/ regional offices/ headquarters. The report adequately responds to the requirements stated in the ToR related to the scope, evaluation questions, and evaluation criteria. The report has taken into consideration some issues that are identified as important in the ToR such as the context of Jordan as a middle income country.
Lesotho	Poor	The structure of the report includes all key elements. The executive summary lacks a separate findings section and is not a standalone document. The methodology has gaps including missing evaluation questions and insufficient explanation of analysis methods. There is insufficient use of quantitative or qualitative (interview) data in the report. The findings mostly consist of the reporting of activities, and the causal link to results is not made clear. The conclusions section is poorly presented and some statements only repeat the completed activities. The recommendations are not specific enough to be operationalised, and some are not aimed at UNFPA. The evaluators have attempted to meet the needs stated in the ToR.
Liberia	Poor	The report has not been quality checked for submission as a final version, and there are a number of spelling and formatting errors. Some sections of the report also appear to be missing. The executive summary mixes findings and

		conclusions and does not function as a stand-alone section. The methodology section in the main report is too brief and key information is missing. There is insufficient balance between the use of interview data and quantitative data in the report. The level of evidence provided in the findings is inadequate. Several evaluation criteria are not assessed appropriately, particularly sustainability and impact. The lessons learned and conclusions sections fail to adequately address programme issues. The recommendations lack focus and will be difficult to operationalise. There is insufficient detail in the report on key areas specified in the ToR, particularly the recommendations.
Mali	Unsatisfactory	The report is incomplete and not comprehensive. Evaluation questions/ issues covering the 4 evaluation OECD/DAC criteria are not presented in the report; hardly any analysis is done regarding the efficiency or relevance evaluation criteria. The methodological choice -- rapid assessment -- is not appropriate for a country programme evaluation and there have been very limited stakeholder consultations. In the findings, the cause and effect links between the UNFPA support and the results are not presented to the reader. The findings section displays serious deficiencies regarding a complete absence of evidence and/or sources of information to substantiate the analysis. The report lacks a proper conclusions chapter. Recommendations are very general and superficial, neither strategic nor targeted; they mix several levels of importance and are too focused on the implementation level. Furthermore recommendations are targeted at the government/other partners whereas they should only target UNFPA.
Moldova	Poor	The report contains significant formatting issues which make it difficult to read and which should have been corrected before submission of the final report. The chosen structure of the report has some limitations. The executive summary contains all key elements. The methodology is presented clearly and limitations are discussed, including steps taken to mitigate the short duration stated in the ToR. Limited sources of data are used in the evaluation and references are inadequate. The findings lack evidence for the many positive statements that are made, and the causal link between interventions and results is not made clear. The conclusions section is very short and the conclusions lack clear link with the findings. There are a large number of recommendations which have not been prioritized. The evaluators have made a clear effort to meet the needs of the ToR despite the limitation of the short duration.
Namibia	Poor	The structure of the report includes all key sections. The executive summary is clear and comprehensive although all the recommendations from the main report have been included. The methodology is described clearly in the report and includes key details. The use of data is variable, and the referencing of sources is inadequate. The findings section lacks sufficient evidence to support the findings. The conclusions do not link to findings and new information is presented in the Lessons Learned section. The recommendations are mostly clear and operational and relate to the findings. The evaluators have attempted to meet the needs of the ToR although further modifications to avoid the inclusion of impact would have been appropriate.
Nepal	Poor	The report does not present information clearly with some information scattered across several different sub-sections. The executive summary presents the findings/conclusions in a confusing arrangement. The methodology section is detailed and explanation is provided on how the evaluators responded to various challenges. The use of secondary sources of data to address data shortages are undermined by poor referencing. Findings are not adequately backed up with evidence, and the cause and effect links between UNFPA interventions and results are not made clear. The conclusions do not reflect the main programme findings for the three programme areas of gender, reproductive health and population & development. Issues related to programming areas are not addressed in any detail in the recommendations . The evaluators have commented on the ToR and used some elements in the design of the

		evaluation.
Nicaragua	Unsatisfactory	Overall, while the report was well written and responded to the ToR, the report's structure was complicated and made repetitive by presenting the findings/analysis, conclusions, and recommendations for each of the three main components (Sexual & Reproductive Health; Population & Development; Gender) and the two cross-sectional areas (M&E; Communications & Advocacy) by evaluation criteria. As a result, the depth of analysis was compromised. The evaluation did not carefully examine the indicators for the results or present in a coherent form the findings about the extent to which the outcomes were achieved. There are serious problems of attribution but, more importantly, there was little connection in the rather confused analysis about the connection between output and outcomes. The data analysis was based on interviews, focus groups and field visits, the basis for selection of which was not clear and, as a result, the representativeness of the sample was not clear. The presentation of information was repetitive and difficult to follow. The conclusions did not flow well from the analysis. The recommendations , other than that the indicators should be clearer, were unnecessarily general. More results were needed to demonstrate the programme's contribution to Nicaraguan society in the programme areas.
Niger	Poor	The report is well structured and readable, but it is twice as long as the maximum recommended length. The use of coloured boxes to highlight evaluation questions and subsection summaries is useful; however, the report is undermined by poorly formatted subsection headings and redundant subsection titles. The executive summary is also longer than conventional and is missing key information. The evaluators amassed a large amount of data and successfully wove it into their analysis of the CPAP's progress. The findings and analysis are mostly supported by facts. However, some findings are overly positive and not fully substantiated with respect to UNFPA contribution to outcomes. The recommendations flow logically from the conclusions. The recommendations are also generally actionable and strategic although some are overly general, some are targeted at inappropriate organizations (i.e. other than UNFPA), and some stem from an assessment of the needs in the country rather than an evaluation of UNFPA country programme.
Occupied Palestinian Territory	Poor	The evaluation report is clear and comprehensive and successfully responds to most requirements outlined in the ToR . The report is well-written, easily understandable to the reader and is well-structured . The inclusion of additional sections and annexes contributes to the report's overall quality. The executive summary gives a good overview of the main results of the evaluation but is too long, which detracts from its clarity and presentation. The design and methodology clearly explain the objectives of the report, and limitations are appropriately addressed by triangulation of mixed-methods data collection where possible. The reliability of the data is checked for consistency and generally cited well; however, there are some minor citation problems relating only to outside sources that detract somewhat from the reliability of the overall data used in the report. The evaluation team addresses most of the assessment criteria in their presentation of findings and analyses , however, they do not address cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results/outcomes. This significantly detracts from the rigor of their findings and analysis, and therefore the overall quality of the report. The conclusions and recommendations are well-written and consistent with specifications in the ToR .
Pacific Islands	Poor	The structure of the report is clear and all sections are included. The summary includes all key elements. The methodology is clear and detailed. However, there are gaps in data and some references lack key information. The causal link between activities and results is not made clear in the findings and some of the provided examples of

		results are not appropriate. The conclusions are clear and capture those findings that were indicated as key. The recommendations flow from the conclusions and are mostly clear and specific. The evaluators have attempted to meet the needs of the ToR and provided justification for modifications that they have made.
Pakistan	Poor	The structure of the report contains all the important sections; however the report is not user friendly. The evaluation methodology is not sufficiently explained, in particular as regards the sampling technique and the application of triangulation throughout the evaluation. Limitations encountered while conducting the evaluation are identified but there is no mention of attempts made to mitigate them. Findings are not presented in a clear manner, and in many cases they are not sufficiently substantiated by evidence. For the most part, the conclusions section contains statements formulated as findings, mostly of a descriptive nature, and not as a judgment on the strategy and/or the performance of the programme. Recommendations are too numerous and not prioritized; they are also insufficiently operational.
Rwanda	Poor	The chosen structure of the report does not clearly present the evaluation findings and their supporting evidence, as they are located in multiple sections. The Executive Summary does not function as a stand-alone section. Elements of the methodology are missing, particularly the data collection tools. Sources of data lack adequate referencing. The findings consist mainly of descriptions of activities and the link to results is not clear. The conclusions are extremely general and do not reflect the findings. Some recommendations are too general to be operational, and half are directed at government and implementing partners which is not appropriate. The evaluators have not met the needs of the ToR in terms of required sections or fulfilling the requirements of the evaluation objectives.
South Africa	Good	The structure of the report is comprehensive and contains all required sections including the minimum content in the annexes. The executive summary presents an adequate overview of the evaluation and is written as a stand-alone document. The length is appropriate and the structure contains all the main elements. The methodology section adequately presents the methodological choice including constraints and limitations. The evaluation criteria used are defined and the limitations that might be encountered when assessing one of the criteria (impact) are mentioned. The sources of qualitative data are identified and the limitations made explicit. Findings are presented in a clear manner and, for the most part, are substantiated by evidence. Conclusions are based on findings (from different triangulated data sources) and the judgment of the evaluators. The conclusions are organized by focus area (P&D, SRH and HIV, gender, and management and coordination). Recommendations are not presented in a reader-friendly way but mixed with descriptive paragraphs which contain in some cases findings or evidence from interviews as a basis for the recommendation. The logical link between conclusions and recommendations is not clear since certain recommendations address issues that do not appear in the conclusions. In some cases recommendations are not operationally feasible as they are directed to the government of the country. The report responds appropriately to the ToR and particularly addresses the requirement stated in the ToR to assess impact as one of the criterion.
Sri Lanka	Poor	The evaluation report has an unusual structure that prevents the reader from getting a clear picture of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary is dominated by the recommendations in terms of length and a clear findings section is missing. The design of the evaluation does not explain how the evaluators addressed limitations. The use of data is poor as few alternative sources have been identified and insufficient detail is provided about the sources of qualitative data. The use of evidence in analysis is limited in the findings . Conclusions are not sufficiently detailed and fail to reflect key findings. The total number of recommendations is high and they lack detail

		on how they can be operationalised. The evaluators have attempted to address the needs stated in the ToR and have made it clear where limitations prevented them from doing so.
Sudan	Poor	The structure of the report is adequate and includes all key sections. The executive summary lacks key information from the main report, and is not well organised. The methodology section is clear and includes key details. There is a lack of data in the report and very few references are provided. Findings lack the causal link between activities and results, and supporting evidence is often absent. Conclusions repeat description of activities and the role of the lessons learned section in the report is not explained. There are a high number of recommendations which lack sufficient detail and there is confusion with the section on Future Direction. The evaluators have met the needs stated in the ToR , but could have commented on the inclusion of non-standard evaluation criteria in the ToR.
Timor Leste	Poor	The evaluation does not meet UNFPA quality standards. It does provide a useful look at the programme but there are notable divergences from the respective standards specified in the Quality Assessment criteria in each of the respective categories. The report structure includes the required chapters, but does not have Context as a separate chapter or Transferable Lessons Learned. The executive summary provides an overview of the evaluation. The report explains methodological choices for data collection and selection of sites for visits. Nevertheless, methods for data collection and sources of data are not specified in detail. The findings stem from unclear data analysis and are supported by weak evidence. The links between findings and conclusions are not accurately explained; conclusions lack supportive arguments and do not make clear why the changes happened in the way they were observed. Recommendations are strategic and represent a general course of future actions.
Togo	Good	The report is well-structured and consistent with the assessment criteria; the Executive Summary is also concise and comprehensive in nature. All methodology and design criteria are met, with each methodological tool explained in detail. The evaluation team also employs triangulation to check consistency across data collection methods. The actual data is primarily taken from secondary sources, and the evaluation team comment on the subsequent limitations. The findings presented are supported by data analysis. The conclusion and recommendation sections were tightly linked and addressed most of the required criteria; however, many of the recommendations lack specificity. Finally, the report was deemed to have met the needs of the ToR, with the evaluation team also offering a critique of the weaknesses with the ToR .