

## Title of evaluation report: **Évaluation du 5ème programme de l’UNFPA en assistance au gouvernement de la République d’Haïti (2013-2016)**

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING: *Good***

**Summary:** The evaluation covers what was a difficult period for assistance to Haiti, where funding was highly variable and there were political issues. The evaluation itself generally follows UNFPA standards and collected considerable data to substantiate findings. Much of the data was placed in a very large annex, but in the report itself there is an inadequate description of the data sources for findings, which would have made the findings more readable. The conclusions are clear, and substantiated by the findings. The very long annex (121 pages) on the evaluation matrix contained much of the data that should have been reflected more clearly in the findings section. The actionability of recommendations is uneven.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>  <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"> <li>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)</li> <li>Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <p>The structure meets UNFPA standards and the required appendices are included.</p> <p>The Evaluation Matrix (pp84-204) is not presented as a Table but rather as an outline. It reads like a rough draft of the final report, includes typos and unfinished sections, and does not present information in a way that is easy to follow.</p> <p>The labeling of the sections and references to appendices is confusing and sometimes incorrect. For example, on p3 the evaluation matrix is described as being part of annex 2, on p64 it is described as annex V, and when it is presented on p84 it is labeled as “7.4 Annexe 4: Matrice d’évaluation.”</p>			

<p><b>2. Executive Summary</b>  <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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>  The Executive Summary meets the standard criteria. It is a stand-alone summary, although done in a somewhat outline style, and is within the expected maximum length. The recommendations consisted of a list, but the key details of several were not well-explained.</p>
<p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b>  <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i>  Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;</li> <li>Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;</li> <li>Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;</li> <li>Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided;</li> <li>Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>  The methodology is well-described and the data collection tools are presented briefly. The main tool is interviews with personnel who deliver the UNFPA-supported outputs. The interviews were selected by type of person and it was indicated that for some stakeholder groups (e.g. UNFPA office) all were interviewed, but for beneficiaries (e.g. Responsables et professionnels de santé dans les structures soutenues par le UNFPA) a random selection was used, but how the sample was drawn is not completely clear in the text.  There is no discussion of the constraints of the selected methodology, the credibility of data, or the use of triangulation in the methodology section.</p>
<p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b>  <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;</li> <li>Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit;</li> <li>Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b>  Much of the data is drawn from documents that were reviewed and are as reliable as the documents (including government reports). The evaluators appear to have relied much more heavily on document review than on the collection of primary data. The list of people consulted (p82) does not include any program beneficiaries. There is evidence in Annexe 4 that a purposive sample of beneficiaries was interviewed. In addition, in the Matrice d'Evaluation presented in Annexe 4, the evaluators quote documents at length in a section entitled "Extraits détaillés de la documentation" but only mention the interviews that</p>

they conducted with project heads as “autres elements d’information” (ex. on p.85). There was a list of focus groups with beneficiaries in three locations in an annex.

How the interview data were used is not always clear. For example, on p. 28, it is stated “L’UNFPA exerce un leadership positif sur l’évolution des politiques de santé maternelle en Haïti depuis l’introduction de l’approche des SONU pour réduire la mortalité maternelle. La mise en oeuvre des interventions pilotes dans le Sud-Est et dans les Nippes a démontré l’efficacité de l’approche.”. This was obviously derived from interviews, but which were not clear in the text. There were more notes in the massive evaluation matrix, but this was not carried over to the main text.

With the exception of figures and tables, information is inappropriately cited in the body of the report. The evaluators mention in the methodology section that “the body of the report presents a synthesis of findings, the justification should be researched in the evaluation matrix in the annex” (p3). Particularly considering that this annex is 120 pages long, this does not provide the reader with sufficient information to judge the credibility of the data used to make findings in the report.

The evaluators do include a list of quotations in this “evaluation matrix” with citations. This is helpful as it allows the reader to assess the credibility of the source of various claims. However, in the main body of the evaluation most information is presented without citations to indicate whether it comes from an interview, was triangulated based on multiple sources, etc.

Gender disaggregated data were used particularly in the section 4.3 on Efficacité et durabilité du volet égalité des sexes et droits de la procréation.

<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b>  <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;</li> <li>• Findings are substantiated by evidence;</li> <li>• Findings are presented in a clear manner</li> </ul> <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;</li> <li>• Contextual factors are identified.</li> <li>• Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <p>The findings are based on data analysis from the various sources and these are mostly found in the evaluation matrix that contains considerable detailed finding information. The findings are organized clearly and are presented succinctly. The details of the findings data found in the annex are usually not shown in text in the findings section Findings that derive from analysis of documents, which is the main quantitative part, are largely supported, but others that would be based on interviews are not as well supported in the sense of knowing from which interviews they are derived. The extent to which causal connections of UNFPA output with government or CSO output and outcomes is uneven. While the analysis does discuss both the outputs of UNFPA programs such as the number of traditional birth attendants who are trained, and changes in indicators such as the use of long-term contraceptives, there is little discussion of the causal links in between. In particular, there is not enough discussion of contextual factors that may be driving the outcomes rather than UNFPA.</p>
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b>  <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are based on credible findings;</li> <li>• Conclusions are organized in priority order;</li> <li>• Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <p>Conclusions flow well from the findings. The conclusions are presented in a way that links them back to the evaluation questions. Conclusions do not show any signs of bias. Many conclusions are focused on the evaluators' assessment of the effectiveness of a particular program component..</p>

<p><b>7. Recommendations</b></p> <p><i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;</li> <li>• Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible;</li> <li>• Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial;</li> <li>• Recommendations should be presented in priority order</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <p>Although the recommendations are targeted on specific stakeholders, they are often not actionable. For instance, the first recommendation is that "100% of adolescents living in the city are autonomous and responsible for their sexual and reproductive health." What was really suggested is that youth be included more strongly in the next programme. Recommendations are prioritized but are not presented in priority order. It is not clear to what extent they reflect stakeholder consultations.</p>
<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b></p> <p>To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope &amp; 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><b>Good</b></p> <p>The report responds to the requirements of the ToR.</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		
<b>TOTAL</b>		81	19	

(\*) 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