

## Title of evaluation report: Angola

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING:** *Good*

**Summary:** The evaluation was a thorough examination of the UNFPA programme from 2009-2014. This is the sixth programme in Angola and the evaluation showed clearly how much progress was obtained, particularly in sexual and reproductive health and gender equality. It also showed that there had been issues in the implementation of the population and development part of the programme. The data collection was carefully designed and was mostly qualitative. The evaluators suggested in a number of places where there was an absence of credible quantitative data. The findings were thorough and structured according to the questions asked in the ToR. The recommendations, mostly directed to the UNFPA country office, were practical and organized by priority.

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><i>Good</i>            The evaluation includes all of the requested content in the order specified, including ample annexes. It follows the UNFPA Handbook clearly. The report is logically structured and contains the minimum content required to meet international quality standards. The methodology section is comprehensive and includes a discussion of the methodological approach taken as well as the associated limitations. The section on the country context is clear and concise and includes an important discussion of the challenges of moving the country (and country programme) from an emergency to development situation. The report's tables and figures are clear, and the annexes include all requirements.</p> <p>There are several formatting issues that detract from the report's usability. First, there is excessive blank space</p>

	<p>between section and subsection headings. Second, the titles in the annexed Evaluation Matrix do not always correspond with the content; for example, the heading may indicate that the content will relate to the 'relevance' criteria when the table content refers to 'efficiency' criteria (p. 117).</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><i>Good</i></p> <p>The executive summary provides a clear and concise description of the intervention as well as the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, the methodology used, and the main conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary does not identify the intended audience of the evaluation, however this information is included in the subsequent introduction section. Moreover, the length of the executive summary slightly exceeds the four page maximum; this is due to excessive blank space between sections as opposed to excessive content. Overall, the executive summary serves as a stand-alone document that successfully communicates the main evaluation results.</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><i>Good</i></p> <p>The methodological choices made were clear. They noted that in some areas data was missing that would be needed to verify achievement of objectives, but the evaluators were careful to indicate how they collected the data, including the tools and the selection of persons to interview. Stakeholder mapping was conducted in order to identify staff, direct and indirect partners, and beneficiaries for interviews, ensuring that those interviewed had varied roles and levels of involvement in the country programme. Women and youth organizations were included in this sample. Field visits were conducted to projects in progress in both the capital of Luanda in northern Angola (urban setting) as well as Cunene in southern Angola (rural setting).</p>

	<p>Triangulation was systematically applied throughout the evaluation to overcome or reduce methodological constraints and limitations, which were also discussed. Some major constraints noted included the absence of a consistent monitoring and evaluation strategy in the local office and the absence of census data, which was addressed through the collection of primary data. The evaluation team integrated regular stakeholder and Reference Group consultations within the evaluation process.</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><i>Good</i></p> <p>The data collected, much of which was qualitative, were sound and, given their variety and the care with which interviewees were selected, credible. The evaluators were aware of the limitations of much of the quantitative data. The sources of primary and secondary data used in the report were identified clearly in the annex of the report (p173, p174, p178) and referenced throughout the body of the report, with limitations made explicit. For example, the report notes that the last general population census with national coverage occurred in 1970 and, therefore, many of the national statistics are projections based on sample surveys conducted by the National Statistics Institute, or <i>Instituto Nacional de Estatísticas</i> in Portuguese (p31). Data has been disaggregated by gender, where possible. Disaggregation by gender was accomplished where those data were available.</p>
<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>	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The findings were structured around the questions posed in the ToR, but divided by the three areas of the UNFPA program (sexual and reproductive health including HIV/AIDS, population and development and gender equality). The findings were clear based on the evidence collected. For the most part, the report explicitly links</p>

- 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.

findings to data analysis, and supports analysis and inference with evidence (document review and interview data). For example, specific content is dedicated to topics of sustainability with reference to the implementation of the population and housing census in Angola.

The report identifies and explains context and assumptions affecting interpretations from the analysis. This includes a description of the programme context and environment, specifying local realities regarding staffing and capacity that influenced programme fidelity considerations. This also includes the report's attempt to identify limitations constraining analysis: for example, the report makes clear that when reliable data was not available, the analysis of expected results was not feasible (p76). Another example of this would be the report's explanation of procurement processes and training systems/processes with regards to contraceptive purchase outcomes. In this latter case, the report provides an explanation of the institutional context that underwrites this rationale, discussing the absence of subsidies.

While many of the terms like product referred to what were called outputs in the CPAP and would be outcomes, the evaluators were careful to link UNFPA activities to the observed results in order to show the causal link. Cause and effect links between the intervention and its outcomes are explained clearly. For example, the report makes clear that whilst the UNFPA intervention did not increase the proportion of government contribution to contraceptive purchases (in terms of spending), the intervention was associated with the institutionalization and adoption of contraceptive methods and family planning standards. Similarly, the report provides detail on the treatment of

	<p>more than 300 women across target provinces for fistula obstetric, arguing that this treatment would not have been available without the intervention. However, it should be noted that in other areas, the report connects programme activities with outputs (for example, training activities are connected with the creation of and support to homes and youth clubs) without extending this narrative to outcomes. The report could also present more detail on how training sessions, for example on gender violence, or the creation of indicators and monitoring systems resulted in specific intended outcomes (p85).</p> <p>The data were clearly presented and the evaluators showed both positive and negative results. Contextual factors, such as the effect of elections on the definition of expected results, were clearly stated. The analysis showed the role of UNFPA in coordination at the country-team level.</p> <p>Unexpected/unintended results, both positive and negative, were also identified and explained. For example, the report presents the unexpected performance of integrated health services with respect to HIV-AIDS, discussing the role of condom/contraceptive delivery systems in this observation</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><i>Poor</i></p> <p>The conclusions were included in a section called "lessons learned". The conclusions are organized around the themes of strategic positioning, programming, and transversal aspects. The conclusions are based on credible findings and flow logically from the results; however, they are not organized in priority order. There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions.</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b>  <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p>	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The recommendations were all based on the findings and</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>were addressed primarily to the UNFPA office. They were all practical and feasible. They were given in a priority order, although most were first priority. The recommendations take into account stakeholder consultations; for example, recommendation 3 includes a suggestion made by the Reference Group (p87). Only two levels of priority have been shown, with most recommendations listed as first priority. While there is no direct (and corresponding) alignment between the conclusions and recommendations (1 for 1; 2 for 2; etc), the recommendations do flow logically from the conclusions and make explicit and clear reference to specific conclusions made. For example, recommendation 1 refers (and relates) clearly to conclusion 1 under strategic positioning, however programme level recommendations are more numerous than the related conclusions and thus do not directly correspond.</p>
<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b> 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><i>Good</i> The evaluation was completely consistent with the ToR and it was clear that the evaluators were careful to ensure that the evaluation included all elements in 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>		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