EQA for UNFPA Armenia Country Programme

Evaluation (2010-2015)

Title of evaluation report: Independent UNFPA Country Programme Evaluation, Armenia. Second Country Programme 2010-2015

Overall Quality Rating: Good

Overall Assessment: The evaluation report includes all relevant sections. The Executive Summary has relevant structure and length, contains all required parts, and functions as a brief and consistent report resume. The methodology section clearly describes the evaluation methodology that was developed fully in line with UNFPA guidance. Constraints and limitations of evaluation are clearly explained and mitigation measures are described. The evaluators created a solid logical framework that allowed them to establish clear causal connections between UNFPA activities and their results in terms of CPAP products and outcomes, and the findings are thorough. There is a clear linkage from findings, to conclusion and recommendations, and recommendations are detailed and strategic.

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 required content. Conclusions and recommendations are combined into a single section and there is no Transferable Lessons Learned section, although that is not called for in the ToR. All necessary Annexes are present, with the exception of methodological instruments used. Findings section is clearly structured, and includes both overall summary and detailed discussion.			
2. Executive Summary *To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.*	**Good** The summary is a stand-alone document that contains all of the required information and is an appropriate length. The overall			

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 Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page.	objective of the evaluation (purpose) is stated clearly, although intended audience is not described. The conclusions are particularly well-expressed in this summary.
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 evaluators have made clear how the time and resource constraints for the evaluation were taken into account in the design of the evaluation. The number of evaluation questions was kept within recommended numbers (seven) and are clearly linked to evaluation criteria. Constraints and limitations of the evaluation are clearly explained, with mitigation measures described. A large number of interviews took place, as well as several focus groups, with respondents selected according to a purposive sample that was well-explained. Selection of sites for fieldtrips as well as selection of stakeholders for interviews and focus groups are explained and clear. Triangulation was applied and the several stakeholder consultations also described. The cross-cutting issues were described, and how they were addressed in the design is also clear.
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 sources were clearly identified. Disaggregated data were used in those areas where it was important, and is mostly presented within the annexes. The data were comprehensive and of good quality.
5. Findings and Analysis *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* <u>Findings</u>	**Good** The evaluation report indicates that the evaluators made a concerted effort to show the links between UNFPA support and the

• 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.	achievement of expected CPAP output and outcomes, which are used as the organizing basis for the findings within each criterion. Findings are presented by evaluation question and within these by major programme area, and include detailed discussions which are clear and demonstrate the sources of information leading to the finding. The assumptions were always clear and contextual factors shown and taken into account. Findings showed clear cause and effect links between UNFPA activities and CPAP outputs and outcomes. For example, in the CPAP output on gender violence (CGBV- SC Output 1), UNFPA financed several surveys. The evaluators noted that "the research results were widely shared and formed the basis for decision making by many stakeholders in their approaches to promoting gender equality, including UNFPA planning for the 2nd CP. Key informants praised UNFPA support for the surveys and studies which have made substantial progress possible through creation of relevant strategies." Similar findings can be found throughout the evaluation.
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 are presented with the recommendations in the same section. This is useful as this clearly shows how the recommendations flow from the conclusions. The conclusions are clearly summarized from the findings, and as such are well supported by the data. They are organized in terms of general conclusions and then specific programme areas rather than in priority per se, but each is given a priority in terms of the recommendation.
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'	**Good** The recommendations are connected directly with the conclusions and each is given a priority ranking. Each recommendation contains a detailed analysis of its operational feasibility. Recommendations are strategic and targeted.

consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order	
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.	**Good** The report responds to the ToR requirements and is very thorough in dealing with the evaluation questions.

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		100		

(*) 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