

EQA for UNFPA Democratic People’s Republic of Korea Country Programme Evaluation (2011-2015/16)



Title of Evaluation Report: UNFPA Country Programme Evaluation: Democratic People’s Republic of Korea Fifth Programme Cycle, 2011 – 2015/6

Overall Quality Rating: Good

Overall Assessment: The evaluation report is a thorough examination of the UNFPA programme, taking carefully into account the contextual factors in the country. The report is clearly structured and contains the minimum information required. Whilst the Executive Summary includes much of the required content and is clearly presented, it exceeds the maximum length requirements and includes unnecessary content. The methodological approach is broadly described, however detail regarding the instruments used is lacking. Sources and credibility of data used are largely identified and discussed, disaggregated where possible and limitations presented. Findings stem from data analysis, and are clearly presented and discussed, with limitations and contextual factors integrated into the discussion. The report presents complete findings that are based on a clear causal connection with UNFPA activities. While the conclusions are less specific than might be desirable, the recommendations are clear and practical, although not given priority.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i> Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Good The report contains the elements required, including Acronyms and Abbreviations; Executive Summary; Country Context; Evaluation Findings; Conclusions; Recommendations. The Annexes include the Terms of Reference for the evaluation; References (Bibliography); List of persons met (List of Interviewees); Methodology and Work Plan; and the Evaluation Matrix. The Evaluation Matrix includes details on methods and tools used for data collection for each outcome area; the Methodology and Work Plan content includes discussion/explanation of the methodological instruments used. However, the actual methodological instruments themselves are not included in the Annex (interview protocol/observation protocol).</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>2. Executive Summary <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i> Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para); iii) Methodology (1 para); iv) Main Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page. 	<p>Poor The Executive Summary includes an overview of the purpose (including audience), objectives, intervention description, methodological approach, conclusions, and recommendations content. The content is presented as a stand-alone section, and presents the main results of the report. The Executive Summary exceeds the recommended maximum length, totaling 6 pages. In particular, the Conclusion and Recommendations content has not been abridged sufficiently, totaling 4 pages (rather than the 2 paragraphs required). The Executive Summary also includes content on the Country Context and UNFPA Country Programme (1 page) that are not recommended in the UNFPA methodology.</p>			
<p>3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Poor The description of the design included the methodological choices, which are provided in Annexes 3 and 4. While these techniques/tools are briefly discussed/identified in the Annex (Methodology and Work Plan), more detail should have been provided in the main body of the report (p73). Even the Annex content does not provide sufficient detail; this undermines the clarity of reporting in describing the methodology. The selection of persons to interview was clear as was the reasons for selecting site visits at the local level. The choice was to select two provinces in which UNFPA was working, based on clear criteria, and then to randomly select one county and one municipality in each. The evaluators were clear about the limitations. Methods for data triangulation are discussed and the evaluation used extensive participatory stakeholder consultations. While cross cutting issues are identified in the country context section (gender, economic growth, data availability, disaster risk reduction) (p13), little detail on these issues is included under the methodology (specifically, no mention of how gender was accounted for in the</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
	methodological approach). This is especially a concern given the evaluation question under Effectiveness which reads: “In what ways and to what degree has UNFPA support contributed to increased utilization of essential, high quality reproductive health information and services and neonatal care by both women and men” (p3). The methodological overview does not include detail on how the evaluation team incorporated gender into the design and conduct of the evaluation.			
<p>4. Reliability of Data</p> <p><i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Good</p> <p>The evaluators have been very careful to describe the data from which their findings are derived, including limitations. They note that in many cases, data is simply not available and they take this into account. They are clear on the credibility of sources. Limitations of primary data collected are presented (of which there are many); e.g. the evaluation team clarifies that monitoring of UNFPA programmes at the subnational level is limited to eleven counties, with remote/rural areas difficult to access (p4). There is also discussion of limitations regarding secondary data availability, notably disaggregated data by geography, gender (little gender-disaggregated data has been used), socio-economic status (p5). Broader discussion of the credibility of data sources used and effects on evaluation scope is included, albeit not consistently.</p>			
<p>5. Findings and Analysis</p> <p><i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <p><u>Analysis</u></p>	<p>Good</p> <p>Within the limits of the data, the findings are clearly supported, including through triangulation. The findings are presented in terms of the evaluations questions and are clear. In particular, the findings about effectiveness are carefully presented and supported, and they show the causal connection with UNFPA activities e.g. results are connected to achievements through an observable means of verification by output (p39).</p>			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Limitations and contextual factors are integrated into the discussion. For example, for the second output of the reproductive health component, the report identifies that both indicators have been achieved (LMIS functioning; country hospitals/clinics have no reported stock-outs) (p34). However, the report also clarifies that the limited use of the software to national and provincial levels blocks the comprehensive promotion of a 'pull strategy' until the software is available/used at the country and 'ri'[administrative] levels' (p35).</p>			
<p>6. Conclusions <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. 	<p>Poor While the conclusions are based on credible findings, they are not in priority order and lack detail, and do not adequately reflect the findings. Conclusions do not appear to contain evaluator bias.</p>			
<p>7. Recommendations <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Poor There are 22 recommendations arranged in 4 groups, and there is no prioritisation. Their direct connection with the conclusions is not always clear and are much more connected with the findings, which makes them somewhat more detailed. Recommendations appear targeted, and identify the actor responsible and stakeholders to be involved. Some recommendations are also strategic and appear operationally-feasible but some lack precision.</p>			
<p>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 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.</p>	<p>Good The evaluation report responds to the requirements in the ToR, making reference and identification of the evaluation's scope and evaluation questions, as well as structuring the discussion along DAC criteria/issues. The evaluators note where they have modified or interpreted the questions in the ToR and as a result they are more useful.</p>			

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		69	31	

(*) 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

OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Good