

<b>Organizational unit:</b>	Haiti CO	<b>Year of report:</b>	2021
<b>Title of evaluation report:</b>	Évaluation du 6ème programme de l'UNFPA en assistance au gouvernement de la République d'Haïti (2017-2021)		
<b>Overall quality of report:</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Date of assessment:</b>	04.25.2022
<b>Overall comments:</b>	<p>Overall, this is a good evaluation report that can be used by decision-makers with reasonable confidence. The findings systematically respond to all evaluation questions in a balanced way and with sufficient depth. In addition, findings are effective at demonstrating the linkages between outputs and outcomes. Similarly, factors facilitating and hindering the achievement of results are systematically identified. The findings also include a good gender analysis and discusses the extent to which vulnerable groups were reached. Persons with disabilities (PWD) are mentioned in the findings, conclusions and recommendations; however, they are included as part of vulnerable groups in general and a specific analysis addressing PWD is not presented. In addition, it is not clear if PWD were consulted during data collection. While some findings adequately triangulate data sources and identify the voices of stakeholder groups, others do not. In addition, key elements are lacking from the methodology, including the identification of the number of consulted stakeholders, a detailed sampling approach, clear limitations and mitigation strategies, as well as a section describing the evaluation's ethical approach. The latter is particularly important considering that adolescents and victims of GBV appear to have participated in the evaluation process. While the evaluation acknowledges that the methodology is further detailed in the inception report, additional details could have been included in this report or its annexes. Even so, the evaluation proposes analytical conclusions and useful recommendations to improve UNFPA's country programme in Haiti.</p>		
<b>Assessment Levels</b>	<b>Very Good</b> strong, above average, best practice	<b>Good</b> satisfactory, respectable	<b>Fair</b> with some weaknesses, still acceptable
			<b>Unsatisfactory</b> weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria	Insert <i>assessment level</i> followed by <i>main comments</i> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)		
<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
<b>1. Is the report structured in a logical way? 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? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?</b>	Partial	Overall, the report is logically structured, well written and does not include major grammatical or spelling errors. There is also a clear distinction between the findings, conclusions and recommendations. However, one of the evaluation objectives is to analyse lessons learned. Yet, the report does not include a separate section on lessons learned, nor can these be easily identified in the findings section. Furthermore, the findings are text-heavy and could have benefitted for the use of visual aids. In addition, there are slight formatting issues (i.e., Figure 1 presenting the intervention's logic is only partially visible).	
<b>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)</b>	Yes	At 70 pages excluding the executive summary and annexes, the length of the report is within requirements for CPEs.	
<b>3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?</b>	No	The report contains three annexes, as follows: 1) evaluation matrix; 2) list of consulted stakeholders; 3) bibliography. However, it is missing key annexes, namely the ToR and data collection tools.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
<b>4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?</b>	Partial	The executive summary mostly reads as a standalone document and includes all of the required sub-sections. However, it includes very little information on the methodology, such as the type and number of consulted stakeholders.	
<b>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</b>	Yes	The executive summary is reasonably concise (i.e. 5 1/3 in length).	
<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
<b>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	The context section clearly describes the political and socio-economic situation in Haiti. In addition, it provides a good overview of the national institutional and legislative framework related to sexual and reproductive health.	
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>	Yes	The report clearly outlines the objectives of the UNFPA Programme in Haiti (2017-2021). In addition, Figure 1 shows the interventions logic, depicting the results chain between outputs and outcomes. The evaluators also provide an assessment of the logic, noting, for example, the absence of assumptions and risks.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			

<p>3. 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?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are clearly outlined. In addition, the evaluation matrix presented in Annex 1 is of good quality overall. For each evaluation question, it establishes clear judgement criteria, indicators, data sources and data collection methods. However, the evaluation matrix does not include a summary of findings, nor does it make explicit reference to assumptions. The methodology section would also be more complete if the overall evaluation design/approach was discussed.</p>
<p>4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The methodology very briefly identifies the data collection methods (i.e., desk review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and site visits) and identifies the type of sources associated to each method. However, it does not explain the rationale for their selection and how these helped answer the evaluation questions.</p>
<p>5. 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)?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Table 1 identifies key stakeholder per programme outcome area; however, the mapping does not explain the roles of stakeholders in implementation. This said, the figure identifies the type (but not the number) of consulted stakeholders. This figure identifies beneficiaries (e.g., community groups, adolescent, etc.) but it is unclear whether particularly vulnerable groups, such as persons with disabilities or living with HIV, have been included in the sample. In addition, the report does not specify the level of stakeholder involvement in the process of developing recommendations.</p>
<p>6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Even though section 2.2.1 is titled 'Data collection and analysis methods and tools', the methods for data analysis are not described.</p>
<p>7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Some limitations are mentioned in a broader section that describes the evaluation process (section 2.2.2), and it is therefore difficult for the reader to fully grasp them. A more structured section on limitations and mitigation strategies would be useful.</p>
<p>8. Is the sampling strategy described?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The sampling strategy is only partially described. Section 2.1 explains that a purposive strategy was used to select implementing partners combined with a random sampling to select community beneficiaries. In the stakeholder mapping table, the number of stakeholders consulted is specified for outcome 1 but not for the 3 other outcomes. Therefore, it is unclear how many stakeholders have been consulted in total. In addition, the criteria for selecting stakeholders (including geographic criteria) are not sufficiently specified and it is unclear the extent to which the selected sample is representative. The evaluation report mentions that further details on the sample strategy are included in the inception report. However, the evaluation should read as a standalone document and such details should have been included in the main evaluation report or its annexes.</p>
<p>9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The methodology does not specify its approach to the collection and analysis of disaggregated data. With respect to qualitative data collection, it is unclear the extent to which evaluation participants were gender balanced or whether women and men were consulted separately to obtain their differentiated perspectives. Even so, the evaluation includes a few quantitative and qualitative indicators aimed at collecting disaggregated data (by age and disability status). In addition, gender and age disaggregated data are presented in the context section.</p>
<p>10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>As noted in criteria 9, the evaluation matrix includes evaluation questions and indicators aimed at collecting disaggregated data, mostly by age and disability status. However, the methodology does not adequately specify the approach for integrating cross-cutting issues in the evaluation nor does it explain whether and how particularly vulnerable groups were included in the evaluation sample.</p>
<p><b>3. Reliability of Data</b></p>	<p>Yes No Partial</p>	<p>Assessment Level: <b>Unsatisfactory</b></p>
<p><i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i></p>		
<p>1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>Even though the methodology does not fully describe the data triangulation process, data collection methods and multiple data sources are identified for each evaluation sub-questions in the evaluation matrix. This gives the reader a good sense of the triangulation process, in theory. In practice, however, the use of triangulation varies, with some findings systematically identifying data sources while others do not. For example, the findings on the programme's effectiveness clearly present the perspective of different stakeholder groups. However, the findings in the relevance section do not present the views of stakeholders.</p>
<p>2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The findings appear to make good use of both qualitative and quantitative data in respect to those interviewed and documents reviewed. However, there is not a discussion on reliability, not even in the limitations section. It is also not clear how site visits contributed to the evaluation as the description of these only includes a list of the geographic locations and not what interventions were at each site or what data was collected. There is a sentence at the beginning of findings that translates as, "IMPORTANT: Documentary information and information extracted from other information collection methods (interviews, site visits) as well as the analysis of these findings at indicator level are presented in Appendix 2 of this report." However, Appendix 2 is actually the list of stakeholders consulted and the information does not appear elsewhere in the appendices.</p>

3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	No	It is noted that the evaluators observed covid protocols when carrying out in-person data collection, however this report does not include a section describing ethical considerations (or otherwise address these) and the UNEG ethical guidelines are not specified. The evaluation consulted with beneficiaries, some of whom appear to have been victims of GBV. In such cases, it would be important for the evaluation to not only include standard ethical considerations but also special safeguards for consulting with this group.
<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
<b>1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?</b>	Yes	The findings present a coherent and complete narrative that respond to each evaluation question with sufficient depth. Findings also provide a balanced picture of the programme's strengths and weaknesses. In addition, data gaps are frequently identified.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	A strength of this evaluation is the thorough explanation of the findings.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are structured along the evaluation questions, making it easy for the reader to understand how these have been answered.
<b>4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?</b>	Partial	The findings on effectiveness present a good analysis of how outputs have contributed to expected outcomes. However, unintended results are not discussed.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The findings clearly discuss the extent to which the programme has reached vulnerable groups, including women, youth, and persons living with HIV. For example, the evaluation explains how UNFPA's support to youth organizations have led to greater participation of adolescent girls in activities and their increased leadership in advocacy efforts.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Factors hindering and enabling the achievement of results are clearly discussed. For example, the challenges in finding qualified midwives are discussed in terms of the poor salaries, working and housing conditions, and the more attractive opportunities with international NGOs, the private sector, and in French-speaking Canada.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	The findings present a good analysis of cross-cutting issues, including gender equality and human rights (in particular sexual and reproductive rights). However, persons with disabilities (PWD) are briefly mentioned as part of vulnerable groups in general without presenting a specific analysis of the extent to which the programme has reached PWD.
<b>5. Conclusions</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The strategic conclusions are explicitly linked to their corresponding finding with the evaluation question(s) shown for each.
<b>2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?</b>	Yes	The conclusions are analytical, go beyond the findings and demonstrate a strong understanding of the key issues underlying the country programme in Haiti. In addition, they adequately integrate cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, equity and vulnerability.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The conclusions convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement by presenting balanced and independent arguments.
<b>6. Recommendations</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Each recommendation is linked explicitly to its corresponding finding.
<b>2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?</b>	Yes	Each recommendation clearly identifies the users responsible for implementation. The recommendations also propose clear actions and also discuss implications for their implementation.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Recommendations are balanced and clearly address key issues raised by the evaluation. Recommendations also address cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, equity and vulnerability.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The level of priority is identified for each recommendation.

<b>7. Gender</b>	0	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
	1		
	2		
	3 (**)		

To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (\*)

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><b>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)</b> The objectives do not indicate that the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the CP was HRGE responsive. (0)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation does not include a separate criterion on GEHR. However, GEWE is adequately mainstreamed in the evaluation matrix. (3)</p> <p><b>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation questions and sub-questions adequately integrate GEWE considerations. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The methodology does not provide a good assessment of the availability of disaggregated data to measure progress on gender equality and human rights. (0)</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	<p><b>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)</b> The evaluation matrix includes indicators that are designed to collect disaggregated data. However, the methodology itself could have explained more clearly how the evaluation is gender-responsive. (2)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The methodology uses a mixed-methods approach. However, evaluation participants are not disaggregated by sex. Similarly, it is unclear whether FGDs were conducted with women and men separately to gather their nuanced perspectives. (2)</p> <p><b>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation consulted a range of data sources. However, some findings do not adequately and transparently triangulate data. (2)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The sampling frame includes a wide range of stakeholders. However, it is unclear the extent to which particularly vulnerable groups were consulted. (2)</p> <p><b>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation does not discuss ethical approaches. (0)</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	<p><b>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)</b> The background section includes a good gender and intersectional analysis. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The findings provide a good gender analysis and presents disaggregated data where possible. However, the voices of different groups could have been conveyed more clearly. (2)</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3).</b> The evaluation does not discuss unanticipated effects. (0)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation proposes recommendations that specifically address GEWE issues. (3)</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(\*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.

(\*\*) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

**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		
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Good</b>			
<p>The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.</p> <p>There is a sufficient analysis of gender issues, however more attention could have been given to human rights and disability inclusion.</p> <p><b>Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)</b></p> <p>The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please explain:</p>				