Organizational unit:	**UNFPA UGANDA CO**	Year of report:	**2020**

Title of evaluation report:	**UNFPA 8TH COUNTRY PROGRAMME 2016 – 2020**		

Overall quality of report:	**Very Good**	Date of assessment:	**2020 AUGUST**

Overall comments: This is a revised EQA of a thorough evaluation of a complex country programme of Uganda. The revisions made by the evaluation team significantly improved the overall presentation and quality of the report. As a result, the Uganda CPE is a strong report that assesses the programme's performance and makes clear recommendations for improving and continuing programme implementation. The data presented in the report were carefully acquired and analyzed, where the findings are presented in terms of the theory of change, and also by comparing conditions of time, and therefore show causality clearly. The report also analyzes the different outcomes for various target groups, and this is partiicularly the case in the analysis of adolescents and youth. Overall, it was concluded that the CP was generally effective but could also have some improvement in the next cycle.

Assessment Levels	**Very Good** strong, above average, best practice	**Good** satisfactory, respectable	**Fair** with some weaknesses, still acceptable	**Unsatisfactory** weak, does not meet minimal quality standards

Quality Assessment Criteria		*Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)*	

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	**Good**

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

1. Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?	Yes	The report is easy to read and understand. The only weakness is the extensive use of acronyms throughout.
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	Yes	At 78 pages, it is a bit longer than usual for a CPE, but given the complexity of the evaluation, this is justified.
3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Yes	The structure follows standard guidelines.
4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process?	Yes	The hundred pages of annexes are extremely thorough, especially the evaluation matrix and the methodological tools.

Executive summary

5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?	Yes	The summary is stand-alone and covers the complex findings and recommendations well.
6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose; ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?	Yes	The summary includes all of the expected components. If findings and conclusions had been combined, the summary could have had the expected five page limit.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Partial	The summary, although complete, is 6.2 pages.

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context			
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The target audience of this CPE were the UNFPA Country Office (CO), Regional Office, UNFPA HQ and the Executive Board; relevant government agencies, national partners, development partners including the donors and UN agencies in the country. To an extent this is rather broad.	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	Chapter 2 shows the context in considerable detail. In Chapter 1 there is a detailed section on constraints and how these were mitigated.	
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	The evaluation looks at the UNFPA strategy over a series of country programmes including the current CP8 and shows it thoroughly especially in Figure 6.	
To ensure a rigorous design and methodology			
4. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	Yes	There is a thorough evaluation matrix in the appendices, which is summarized in the methodology section and also describes the main evaluation questions.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools, primarily interviews,, focus groups and observations are carefully described, including detailed interview schedules presented in the appendices. The rationale for each, including limitations, is described.	
6. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	Yes	A comprehensive stakeholder map is shown in the appendices and how consultations were organized during field level work is also described. There was a consultation process on the recommendations, described in the recommendations chapter as "recommendations were developed in a consultative process, as a result of a participatory discussion with key informants, a workshop held with the CPE management and CO and follow-up rounds of validation with the evaluation reference group."	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The analysis methods, a combination of qualitative (from interviews and focus groups) and quantitative (from documents and reports) are carefully described.	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	The limitations are described in Table 3.	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling at the district, community and individual level is purposive, but there was considerable stratification to ensure that the data was representative of the areas where UNFPA worked. The sampling was clearly described.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Data were carefully disaggregated by gender and age.	
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Gender and human rights were built into the evaluation questions and were reviewed in the analysis.	

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good

1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Throughout the analysis, different sources of data were triangulated.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The data sources were clearly identified in the appendices, but also in the analysis. When quantitative, the sources was indicated in a footnote. To the extent relevant, the reliability of the data is discussed.
3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	As noted, Table 3 was a careful description of how limitations were addressed.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	In their presentation of results and findings, the evaluators note where there might be issues of discrimination. They were also clear on how they applied ethical considerations to data acquisition.

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good

1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	In each case, organized by evaluation questions, the specific intended results (outcomes and outputs) are assessed and the results presented. These are either in terms of quantitative data if they exist or supported by examples from Key Interviews or Focus Groups.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	In each case, the basis is shown and described.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The organization of the findings is based on the evaluation questions that are organized themselves by criteria.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	In each case, the analysis indicates where the data are sound and where there are issues.
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The findings are presented in terms of the theory of change, and also by comparing conditions of time, and therefore show causality clearly. The report stated (in section 4.2.6) that "It should be noted that the study did not observe or establish any unintended results during the implementation of this evaluation. "
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Differences are clearly shown. This is particularly the case in the analysis of adolescents and youth.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors, like funding levels and new issues like refugees, are always shown in the analysis.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	One of the areas examined was Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, and another was hard to reach groups. The analysis covers these issues carefully.

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To assess the validity of conclusions				
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	In each case, the conclusions reference the findings on which they are based.		
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated?	Yes	In each case of the 7 strategic conclusions and the 13 programmatic conclusions, there is a clear summary of what the findings mean in practical terms.		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions.		
6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations				
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations, which are organized by short-term, medium-term and long-term, are each linked to the conclusion from which they flow.		
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The expected users, shown as targets, are indicated as well as the technical and financial implications.		
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	There is no indication of bias and the recommendations are all presented factually.		
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	The timeframe (short-term, medium-term or long-term) is given for each recommendation.		
5. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The recommendations are either high or medium priority. However, only four of the 22 recommendations are medium priority.		
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)				

1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	3	**a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3)** There were specific objectives on this. Score=3 **b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3)** There was a stand-alone criterion. Score=3. **c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)** Evaluation questions 3 was "To what extent has the programme integrated gender and human rights-based approaches?" Score = 3 **d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results ?(Score: 0-3)** The evaluation carefully assesses the information available. Score=3
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	3	**a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3)** The evaluation appeared to be gender-responsive. Gender in collection is shown and, where relevant, data are disaggregated. Score=3 **b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3)** Gender-based quantitative and qualitative data were both collected. Score=3 **c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)** Data sources include earlier surveys and analyses, as well as Key Interviews and Focus Groups that ensure inclusion, accuracy and credibility. Score=3 **d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3)** There was a special effort to deal with issues of "hard to reach" population groups and this was included as one factor in sampling. Score=2 **e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)** Ethical considerations were considered and used. Score=3
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3	**a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3)** There is a section on Gender Equality, Sexual and Gender Based Violence and Social Inclusion. Score=3. **b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3)** There is data triangulation in the analysis. Score=3 **c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)** There is an analysis of how religious and cultural factors affected some gender and youth issues. Score=2 **d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3)** There are several recommendations under programmatic recommendations. Score=3

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).
0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.
1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.
2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.
3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)		7		
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			
3. Reliability of data (11)	11			
4. Analysis and findings (40)	40			
5. Conclusions (11)	11			
6. Recommendations (11)	11			
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	93	7		
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very Good			
	Very good very confident to use	Good confident to use	Fair use with caution	Unsatisfactory not confident to use

(*) **(a)** Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column.
(b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair').
(c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain

• How it can be used?

• What aspects to be cautious about?

Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory

The evaluation, as revised, meets almost all of the criteria for a very good rating.

Consideration of significant constraints

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:　　　　☐　Yes　　　☑　No

If yes, please explain: