

Title of evaluation report: Rapport d'Evaluation du 5ème Programme de Cooperation UNFPA-Union des Comores 2008-2014

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Poor

Summary: This evaluation has major problems in its structure and methodology. The evaluators appear to confuse conclusions and lessons learned, and the organization of the report including its structure and formatting is extremely illogical. They do not use the recommended OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, and although they mention efficiency as a criterion they do not analyze the program's efficiency in the analysis section. They do not develop evaluation questions. Sources are very rarely cited and there is no indication that the evaluators considered the credibility of data or used triangulation. To a large extent the evaluators use the interim evaluation in 2012 as their basis and merely seek to update it. The large deficiencies in the ToR are not mentioned or ameliorated in the report.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. 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>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>The Table of Contents is inaccurate and difficult to follow (ex. In the Executive Summary, subsections include "Composante genre: le taux d'exécution est de 81.67%", "Generales", and "Specifiques", which are not actually subsections. This problem recurs with "Les facteurs affectant l'Effet" on page 37, which is inconsistently listed as a subsection.) In some chapters subsections are given numbers, while in others they are not. Formatting within the chapters is also not clear, as plain text and bullet points are sometimes supposed to indicate sections and subsections. Lists are presented without bullet points or numbering (ex. the list of documents consulted on p. 14). All of these organizational issues make it very difficult to follow the logic of the report. Finally, some sections are</p>			

	<p>inaccurately titled: for example, the section entitled “Objectifs de l’Evaluation” actually describes the objectives of the program (p. 11).</p> <p>The findings and analysis sections, however, are relatively well presented. The presentation of results and analysis is broken into a first subsection on progress on intended activities and indicators and second subsection on UNFPA’s contribution towards the progress.</p> <p>Most of the required sections are included, but the required section on conclusions is poorly organized and inadequate. The methodology section, for example, is included as a subsection of the description of the 5th UNFPA country program. In fact, the section titled “Enseignements Tires” fills the position of the conclusions section, but is primarily findings organized according to program component. The final section “Conclusion Generale”, which is a shorter summary of the findings, is unnecessary.</p> <p>Most of the required annexes are included, but the methodological instruments used are missing.</p>
<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</p> <p>The Executive Summary does not discuss the intended audience and purpose of the evaluation. The objectives are listed (although these do not cover all of the standard objectives required by the UNFPA handbook) and the intervention described. There is no description of the methodology in the Executive Summary. Conclusions (though called Lessons Learned and written more like findings) and Recommendations are listed, although they are too long at four pages rather than the recommended</p>

	<p>two paragraphs and are not prioritized. As a result the executive summary is one page too long. Ultimately, this Executive Summary cannot serve as a standalone document given that the findings and recommendations are not justified by some discussion of how the methodology led to valid data and analysis.</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>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>The description of the methodology is missing from the first chapter and is rather included as a subsection of chapter 2, "Presentation du 5ieme Programme". This is confusing and illogical.</p> <p>There is no discussion of constraints. In particular, it appears that the evaluators relied heavily on document review, especially of the 2012 interim evaluation and very little on site visits and interviews with stakeholders (for instance, none of the interviewees listed on pp. 51-53 are beneficiaries, other than midwives, and the only interviews mentioned on p. 15 are with UNFPA staff and coordinators). Many of these interviews appear to have been conducted by phone or email. The rationale for these decisions and their potential limitations are not discussed.</p> <p>The evaluators do not appear to have formulated specific evaluation questions: although the ToR does not call for specific evaluation questions, they do not point out this shortcoming or propose evaluation questions.</p> <p>The evaluators appropriately apply the key evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. However, they also include impact and lessons learned in the same list as evaluation criteria. The</p>

	<p>evaluation is not resourced or mandated to measure impact (and the evaluation handbook specifically states that impact should not be assessed in CPEs on p. 217). Lessons learned are logical extensions of conclusions that can be applied to other cases, not perspectives from which to judge the quality of a program.</p> <p>Triangulation and validation of data are not mentioned in the methodology.</p>
<p>4. Reliability of Data <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>Poor</p> <p>The evaluators have identified many sources of data, particularly through review of program documents. These include qualitative and quantitative sources. They also interviewed some UNFPA, partner, and government staff members. However, the evaluators did not seem to use other common sources of data including site visits or interviews with beneficiaries.</p> <p>There is no discussion of credibility of sources or evidence of triangulation. Indeed, in most cases sources are not cited, making it impossible for the reader to assess whether the data are reliable. In the few cases that data are cited, they are done so informally and do not appear to have been checked with multiple sources, such as “La Direction de la Statistique Nationale assurée par un intérimaire ne dispose que de sept cadres” (p. 28). Indeed, there is no evidence that the evaluators questioned any of the data reported in documents or interviews.</p> <p>Data is disaggregated by gender in several cases (examples on pp. 31-32).</p>

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.

Poor

The analysis is clearly organized in subsections dedicated to analyzing UNFPA's contribution to the progress towards indicators and contextual factors. This analysis also includes a discussion of unintended consequences in some cases, such as the discussion of the drain of skilled personnel from government ministries to NGOs and UN agencies (p. 28).

Although the analysis subsections for each product are called "Les Contributions du Programme à l'Effet à travers les Produits," they largely discuss the state of progress in Comoros rather than UNFPA's programs and their effects. In the population and development and gender components the discussion is generally disconnected from the interventions and intended effects, although this is less in population and development than in the other areas. For example, in the section on gender, there is very little analysis of whether and how UNFPA contributed to the passage of laws on gender equality. This section primarily includes generic discussions of women's reproductive rights or gender-based violence that are disconnected from the cause and effect analysis (for example, pp. 34-36). In the reproductive health component, the analysis focuses on the role of UNFPA but claims of cause-and-effect relationships are not backed up by supporting evidence (p. 40). The subsection on UNFPA's contribution to the progress on indicators is less than half a page long.

Although mentioned as an evaluation criteria in the methodology section, there is no section on the efficiency of the program.

The analysis also includes discussions of how contextual

	factors (administrative and coordination difficulties, resource constraints) prevented UNFPA from achieving its intended effects in specific subsections.
<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>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>The evaluators seem to confuse Lessons Learned with Conclusions: the section titled "Enseignements Tirés" is inserted between the analysis and the recommendations. However, despite the title, this section is a mix of conclusions and findings. The final section "Conclusion Generale" reiterates some findings (ex. "Le programme a contribué malgré ce contexte peu favorable à la réduction de la mortalité maternelle et à la prévalence des méthodes contraceptives en assurant la sécurisation des produits") but still does not reach the standard of conclusions that are systemic or transversal factors of success or failure.</p> <p>The conclusions are not based on credible findings. There is no supporting evidence to support claims like "L'évaluation a montré que le programme : a contribué à former une masse critique de personnel dans le domaine de la population et du développement" (p. 44) in the conclusions section nor in the findings and analysis section.</p> <p>Conclusions are not organized in priority order. There is no evidence of 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; 	<p>Poor</p> <p>Recommendations are incorrectly numbered and do not seem to be presented in priority order. There are too many categories of recommendations: first, "general" recommendations and then component-specific</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p>recommendations, followed finally by recommendations “en direction des autorités” which mainly indicate areas in which UNFPA should focus its advocacy efforts towards the Comoros government (p. 48-49).</p> <p>There are too many recommendations to be strategic or operationally feasible.</p> <p>There is no way to link recommendations to conclusions, so it does not appear that the recommendations flow logically from the conclusions.</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>Poor</p> <p>The ToR is highly deficient. There is no discussion of the evaluation criteria or evaluation questions, a very brief discussion of the methodology that does not discuss important points such as the need for triangulation, and no timeline. The evaluators do not point out any of these deficiencies and also do not meet UNFPA’s general needs such as the definition of targeted evaluation questions.</p>

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)			2	2
2. Executive summary (2)				5
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			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