Title of evaluation report: Tchad - EVALUATION INDEPENDANTE DU 6e PROGRAMME DE PAYS

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: The evaluation made a solid assessment of the results of the 6th Country Programme, using a very effective design and methodology that was able to provide credible findings about what worked and what was problematic in the execution of the country programme. It noted that in several areas there were notable results, especially in terms of effectiveness. It also noted a number of areas in which there were problems, including follow-up, transfers of funds, monitoring and evaluation and sustainability. It made a limited number of recommendations, directed at the UNFPA office, the usefulness of which is limited by the insufficient level of details provided, particularly with regard to their operationalisation.

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 structure matches the standards set by UNFPA and includes all of the relevant sections. The annexes are complete and cover all of the information necessary to understand how data were collected and the findings.			
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 Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page.	*Good* The executive summary is the required length (3.5 pages) and includes the desired structure. The methodology was well-described including its limitations. The conclusions followed the intended structure.			

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 design of the evaluation was based on the Terms of Reference but included a thorough results matrix that indicated the main outcomes to be measured and was included in the appendix. It should be noted that in the design, based on how the country programme was drafted, what is called an output (produit) is more often, in terms of what UNFPA itself produces, an outcome. The methodological design was good, including document reviews of a very large number of documents, of UNFPA and of others, all of which are listed in the appendix. The basis for choosing persons to be interviewed was clear, focusing on three regions, the most important of which was the capital. The constraints on the methodology were presented. There was sufficient information on the stakeholders' consultations in the description of the process. Considerable information is provided on cross-cutting issues including gender and human rights, obtained from both document review and interviews.
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* All of the data sources were clearly identified in the methodology and subsequently in the findings. The limitations were clear, but the credibility of the primary data was good. Data disaggregated by gender was used.
5. Findings and Analysis *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* <u>Findings</u> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <u>Analysis</u> • Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;	*Good* The findings are clearly structured by the evaluation questions asked. There is a summary of the findings at the beginning of each section and then a detailed analysis of the basis for the findings. All are clearly supported either by evidence from documents or from interviews. For example, in responding to the question in the findings on relevance

- Contextual factors are identified. - Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.	about the Prise en compte des besoins des populations et des groupes vulnérables lors de la planification, one finding notes that "Les entretiens réalisés avec les adolescents et les jeunes sur les questions de SR et de Genre mettent en évidence la nécessité de promouvoir des espaces spécifiques adaptés à leurs attentes et besoins (services conviviaux)." Similarly, reporting on women's political participation, the report notes "L'accès des femmes à des postes de responsabilités autres que ceux traditionnellement occupés marque une nouvelle étape de la participation publique de celles-ci. Des entrevues réalisées, il ressort que l'engagement des acteurs communautaires, des partenaires au développement et de la société civile a amélioré la sensibilité au genre et à l'égalité des sexes." The interpretations are clear and contextual factors are given. The findings relating to effectiveness and efficiency are particularly well-documented and there are clear cause and effect links. It should be noted that the findings focus on what are termed "produits" that are actually outcomes, but this is required because that is how the country programme was drafted.
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 clearly flow from the findings and the links with the findings, organized by evaluation question, are shown. However, they are not in a priority order, since they are based on the evaluation questions. They are clearly unbiased.
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	*Poor* While the recommendations flow from the conclusions, there are only six, all of highest priority and all of them directed to the country office of UNFPA. They are also expressed in vague terms and are not accompanied with options for their operationalization. There were two stakeholder

	consultations in the work plan and presumably the final version took into account the consultations. Since several of the conclusions and recommendations were very critical, the impartiality of the evaluators was maintained.
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 evaluation was completely consistent 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		88	12	

(*) 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