Title of evaluation report: Evaluation Indépendante du Programme de Pays Burkina Faso 2011-2015

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: The evaluation covers the entire country programme for the period 2011-2015. The questions to answer were clearly spelled out in the terms of reference and were followed by the evaluators, who additionally set up a clear evaluation matrix. The data collection measures were largely based on reviews of a large number of documents, but there were also a large number of interviews. The evaluation was affected by political developments in the country that delayed and constrained field work. However, the data led to thorough and well-substantiated findings and derivative conclusions. The recommendations were practical and addressed to the country office.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting *To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.* Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure: • i) Acronyms; ii) Exec Summary; iii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned (where applicable) • Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.	Good The report contains all of the material required for a sound structure. It includes a separate document with annexes. The report is well-drafted and thorough. The numerous levels of subdivisions in the findings section affect, however, the clarity and readability of the report.			
2. Executive Summary *To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.* Structure (paragraph equates to half page max): • i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para); iii) Methodology (1 para); iv) Main	Very good The executive summary is a stand-alone document that explains clearly the findings of the evaluation and the conclusions and recommendations. It is within the length maximum and is well drafted.			

Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page.	
3. Design and Methodology *To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools* Minimum content and sequence: • Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations; • Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner; • Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation; • Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided; • Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.	Good The evaluation used a matrix of questions for all three areas of the program, and, in its review of data, had a results-based management structure that showed the intended connection between activities, outputs and outcomes, and their indicators. It sought to collect data based on these. The evaluation had to take into account that its schedule was affected by political events of October 2014, which reduced the time available. The evaluators made an effort to compensate, but this affected the ability to visit all of the 13 areas in which UNFPA was active, and the selection process is not described clearly, other than for the interviews in the capital.
4. Reliability of Data *To clarify data collection processes and data quality* • Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; • Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit; • Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.	Good The data were collected from a variety of sources, especially documents and interviews. They were identified in the evaluation. There was gender disaggregation where the data were available.
5. Findings and Analysis *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* Findings • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner Analysis • Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; • Contextual factors are identified. • Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.	Good The findings were clearly structured, as called for in the terms of reference, following the standard order of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, partnership and divided between general strategies, and then the three main programme areas. In each case, the findings drew on the data that were available primarily from documents and also from interviews and observations. The evaluators made a concrete effort to look separately at outputs (largely defined as improved capacity through training) and further results, but they are clear that the causal connections between output and outcomes are not always clear. They made a visible effort to show where it is

	likely that the UNFPA output is likely to have a connection with the observed results. Some assumptions, however, lack sufficient substantiation; in the analysis of effectiveness in the SRH section, for example, the report describes several training activities, assuming that they actually contributed to the development of capacities, without mention of follow up to trainings and/or evidence that personnel trained remained in post and actually applied the skills acquired.
6. Conclusions *To assess the validity of conclusions* • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.	Good The conclusions derive directly from the findings and are structured according to the same categories, based on the type of findings and the programme area. For this reason they do not have a priority order. They include conclusions about problems with the way the programme was planned, noting, for example, that "outputs are often defined generally, making it difficult to attribute them only to UNFPA". At times, however, conclusions are already formulated as recommendations (e.g., NS4, p69: "Le passage à l'échelle demeure un défi que l'UNFPA ne peut relever qu'en menant une réflexion soutenue, en adoptant une planification stratégique et une gestion avisée et plus efficiente, ainsi qu'en assurant une allocation de ressources appropriée.")
7. Recommendations *To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations* • Recommendations flow logically from conclusions; • Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible; • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order	Good The recommendations are carefully connected to the conclusions and indicate who would be responsible for implementing them. They are all given highest priority, however, which means no priority. They took into account the consultations and suggestion from the Comité de Pilotage of the evaluation.
8. Meeting Needs To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the	Good The evaluation followed the ToR closely (and it is annexed). The evaluators did not find issues with the ToR.

report).In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.	

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)		2		
2. Executive summary (2)	2			
3. Design and methodology (5)		5		
4. Reliability of data (5)		5		
5. Findings and analysis (50)		50		
6. Conclusions (12)		12		
7. Recommendations (12)		12		
8. Meeting needs (12)		12		
TOTAL	2	98		

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. - if "Finding and Analysis" has been assessed as "good", please enter the number 50 into the "Good" column. The Assessment level scoring the higher number of points will determine the overall quality of the Report