

Organizational unit: Cambodia CO **Year of report:** 2023

Title of evaluation report: UNFPA Cambodia 6th Country Programme Evaluation (2019-2023)

Overall quality of report: **Very Good** **Date of assessment:** 21 May 2023

Overall comments: This is a very strong evaluation report that provides valuable insights for decision-makers, with solid sections on data reliability, analysis, conclusions, recommendations, and gender integration. The evaluation design is rooted in the Theory of Change and results framework, detailing data collection activities and limitations. The mixed methods approach enables data triangulation and validation via stakeholder consultations. Findings respond thoroughly to all evaluation questions, primarily using qualitative data, and successfully link outputs to outcomes. The report commendably details program effectiveness, including results, challenges, factors affecting success, unintended consequences, and performance indicator comparison. It successfully integrates human rights, gender equality, women's empowerment, and disability throughout. One recommendation focuses on the need to improve the quality and availability of essential SRHR services to include women and men with disabilities. The recommendations are clear, actionable, and prioritized. Although the report provides a thorough assessment of UNFPA Cambodia's 6th CP, there are some issues regarding its presentation including that the executive summary is quite dense with recommendations presented as a lengthy paragraph, the annexes were provided as separate files instead of being consolidated, and the evaluation matrix does not include key findings.

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 *Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)*

I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes	Assessment Level:	Fair
	No		
	Partial		

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

<p>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)?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The report is well-structured and easily navigable with clearly labeled sections and effective use of visuals. However, it would have benefitted from closer final proofreading, particularly regarding the presentation of visual aids. For example, the resolution of the Programme Logic Model in Figure 5 and the map in Figure 6 could be improved for better readability.</p>	
<p>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)</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>At 73 pages, excluding the executive summary, the report exceeds the maximum 70-page limit requirement for CPEs.</p>	
<p>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)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The annexes contain the required elements - the TOR, evaluation matrix, reconstructed theory of change, data collection tools, stakeholder map, list of consulted stakeholders, data collection tools, and references for consulted documents - as well as additional materials.</p>	
<p><i>Executive summary</i></p>			
<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The executive summary includes considerable detail but covers all sections</p>	
<p>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>This section could be more concisely written. It is within the 5 page limit, but this is primarily due to recommendations being presented in one long paragraph which decreases their readability.</p>	
<p>2. Design and Methodology</p>	<p>Yes No Partial</p>	<p>Assessment Level:</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p><i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i></p>			
<p>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The report provides a solid overview of the development context, including a clear description of development challenges related to GEWE, the impact of Covid-19, and corresponding national strategies and development aid.</p>	

<p>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</p>	<p>Partial</p>	<p>The report briefly describes how the program's Theory of Change (TOC) was utilized in the evaluation within the methodology section and stated that no revisions to the TOC were necessary. However, there is no further discussion or explanation provided regarding the logical linkages and the objectives behind the interventions in the programme TOC or its strengths and weaknesses.</p>
<p><i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i></p>		
<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 matrix in Annex 5 clearly outlines the evaluation criteria and questions. It organizes information such as assumptions, indicators, methods for data collection, and sources of information. The matrix is referenced in the methodology section and in the main report. However, the UNFPA requirement for key findings to be included in the matrix is not met.</p>
<p>4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluators utilized various data collection tools, including a literature review, individual key informant interviews, and focus group discussions. These tools are briefly described in the methods section, with the justification for their selection being to gather comprehensive information from diverse stakeholders and to suit the evaluation context.</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>Yes</p>	<p>Annex C contains a stakeholders map that organizes stakeholders and rights holders based on program outcomes and outputs. Annex B provides a comprehensive list of persons consulted. [However, some information is contradictory as the evaluators noted that they did not meet with people with disabilities although they reported interviewing a few UNYAP members that included persons with disability including people with diverse sexual orientation.] Direct beneficiaries were selected based on availability due to the constraints of Covid-19, and focus group discussions were conducted with rights holders in the sampled districts. The evaluation reference group was involved at each stage of the evaluation, including providing input on the design and validation processes for reporting, which would have included recommendations.</p>
<p>6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evaluators provided a brief description of the data analysis methods on pages 7 and 8, which encompassed qualitative content analysis, descriptive analysis of quantitative secondary data, and retrospective and prospective analysis. This promoted triangulation of data. Furthermore, the evaluators emphasized that the data analyses were performed in a manner that enabled gender and age disaggregation.</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>Yes</p>	<p>Methodological limitation and mitigation measures are discussed in chapter one. The evaluation team utilized virtual online methods to address the Covid-19 limitations.</p>

8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The methodology section outlined the process of sample selection. The specific sampling criteria for the selection of evaluation participants and field sites are provided in chapter one. It is mentioned that the sampling approach was purposive, guided by the stakeholder map presented in Annex 3. Additionally, Annex B offers a breakdown of the final sample by stakeholder group and gender.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	An explanation is provided of how the evaluation team paid attention to collection and analyses of disaggregated data.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The design of the evaluation incorporated a participatory approach. The indicators for the evaluation questions encompassed cross-cutting issues, including gender and disability inclusion.
3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The evaluators used multiple sources and methods to identify consistent topics, themes, and patterns. The evaluation findings include qualitative quotes from Key Informant Interviews (KII) and focus groups, as well as references to secondary data in footnotes, which support the triangulation of data sources. Annex 4 lists the consulted documents.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluation report relies on appropriate and reliable sources, with an extensive list of documents. Primary sources heavily emphasize qualitative data, while quantitative data predominantly comes from secondary sources. The limitations section acknowledges some concerns regarding the reliability of the data sources.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	The data collection instruments integrate ethical considerations during the data collection phase. The methodology section acknowledges adherence to various ethical guidelines, including UNEG Ethical Guidelines, code of conduct, ethical guidelines, UNEG guidance on gender- and human rights-responsive evaluations, and international best practices in evaluation. The report consistently upholds ethical standards throughout the data collection protocols, encompassing aspects such as informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and adherence to COVID-19 protocols.

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 findings in the report are strongly supported by a variety of sources, including document sources, project monitoring data, references to interviews, and direct quotes from respondents.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The evaluation report uses various frameworks, such as the 6th Country Programme (CP), individual ToCs for three programme results, the UNFPA global results framework to interpret findings, and SDGs. It outlines key performance indicators' achievements and their comparison with baselines and targets, which strengthens the analysis and clarifies progress towards program outcomes.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The report's findings are organized systematically based on the evaluation questions, providing a clear structure that facilitates understanding of how each question has been addressed. For each evaluation question, a concise summary of the findings is provided, making it easier for readers to grasp the answers and conclusions pertaining to each specific question.	
4. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The findings of the evaluation are based on the results framework and ToC to assess the causal linkages between output and outcome level changes respectively. Additionally, the report discusses unintended results that have emerged from the intervention.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The report analyses intervention performance by the different outcomes and its effects on vulnerable groups such as PWDs, out-of-school youth, GBV survivors, and entertainment workers.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The report offers comprehensive context about the program's environment and presents the factors influencing program results, such as UNFPA's past contributions to SRH and commitment to the ICPD programme being facilitators. However, hindrances include midwife workforce turnover and the limited link between health centers in target provinces and local adolescents and youth.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report includes an in-depth analysis of cross-cutting issues like disability inclusion and Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment (GEWE). It effectively integrates disability and women's empowerment into the analysis and discusses male involvement in GBV prevention activities related to SRHR, as well as strategies to address SGBV and harmful practices.	

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 report logically connects 25 conclusions derived from the findings in Chapter 4 with the evaluation criteria, leading to well-supported conclusions linked to appropriate recommendations. Each conclusion in the report is directly tied to a corresponding recommendation.	
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?	Yes	The report's conclusions are backed by supporting details, providing a thorough understanding of the country's development context, including relevant cross-cutting issues. They address gender equality, equity, vulnerability, human rights, and disability inclusion, ensuring a nuanced analysis of the program's performance and impact, given the country's unique challenges and opportunities.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The report maintains objectivity throughout the evaluation, showing no signs of bias. It acknowledges both the strengths and weaknesses of the UNFPA intervention, presenting a balanced view. This approach ensures that the evaluation accurately reflects the program's achievements and areas for improvement.	
6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The report presents 10 recommendations linked to conclusions, with specific action points under each. Clear connections between recommendations, corresponding findings, and evaluation conclusions are established. Each recommendation is classified as either strategic or programmatic, promoting a systematic approach to improvements. This structure enhances clarity and eases implementation of the recommended actions.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The evaluation report targets recommendations primarily at UNFPA Cambodia CO, specifying other target groups when necessary. All recommendations are actionable and useful. They provide clear operational implications, outlining practical action plans for successful 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	The report's recommendations reflect impartiality, deriving from the strengths and weaknesses identified during the evaluation. They consider cross-cutting themes like gender equality, equity, vulnerability, and disability.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The report categorizes each recommendation's priority level from low to high, guiding which actions should receive immediate attention to address issues and improve program effectiveness.	
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very 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?	2	<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) The evaluation does not include an objective specific to assessing gender and human rights, nor is this reflected in the scope. = 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) HRGE issues are mainstreamed into the criteria = 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) EQ4 and subquestion EQ1 (i) are dedicated question to GEEW. = 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)</p> <p>The results framework and indicators enabled assessment of data collection adequacy regarding human rights and gender equality results. Where possible, data was disaggregated by gender. = 3</p>	

<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>	<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) The evaluators used UNEG's guidance on Human Rights and Gender Equality (HRGE) in evaluations, ensuring consideration of gender and socio-economic status in Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participant selection. They also made provisions for participant comfort, including separate discussions for males and females. = 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) The mixed methods and participatory approach is appropriate for assessing GEEW. = 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) Evaluators state that they used a participatory approach to ensure inclusion, accuracy, and credibility. Both triangulation and validation were evident based on the range of data sources. = 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 evaluation respondent list includes organizational affiliation and location but lacks a cumulative count or breakdown by stakeholder group, gender, or location. It does, however, indicate representation from organizations focused on women, human rights, and persons with disabilities. = 3</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) Ethical considerations are apparent and evaluators specifically stated getting consent from parents and guardians for participation of minors = 3</p>
---	---

<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>		<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) The context section provides an appropriate analysis, including on GBV. = 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) The findings provide a solid analysis of gender equality (GE), but there is room to make the voices of disability inclusion actors and women more prominent. =2</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) ³ The evaluation does include the unanticipated effects of the intervention on HRGE where applicable. =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) Both the strategic and programmatic recommendations 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 (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 =

(**) 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			
Total scoring points	80		20	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very Good			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory

(*) (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).

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 of 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: