

## Title of evaluation report: Evaluation finale du 7ème Cycle de Programme pays Mauritanie/UNFPA 2012-2016

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good**

**Summary:** The evaluation of the 7<sup>th</sup> Programme was of top-line quality in terms of design, data collection, obtention of findings and their translation into practical conclusions and recommendations. The evaluators had a clear understanding of expected results and compared the results observed about them so that they were able to draw clear conclusions. The report was particularly well-drafted (in French) and can serve as a model in several sections.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor 2	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>Good</b>            The evaluation contains a complete structure as per the ToR and UNFPA guidance. It is of necessary length but not excessive. The annexes are complete and the report includes graphics.</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, at four and one-half pages, is an excellent stand-alone document and is drafted with an excellent style. However, it misses a summary of the main conclusions.</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 evaluation makes a very thorough description and analysis of the context in which the programme is taking place and the role of the evaluation. It uses carefully identified expected results and then baseline data. It also shows the limitations of both the programme and the evaluation.  The evaluation approach and framework, included an extensive use of interviews, field visits and consultations with stakeholders, including for the conclusions and recommendations. The methods chosen were carefully described, including limitations. To select field visits a carefully defined purposive sampling mechanism was used. The selection of persons to be interviewed followed carefully defined criteria. One effort, to collect questionnaires from some stakeholders, was considered inadequate because of a low response rate.  Data collection involved careful triangulation and the design, because of the structure of the programme, gave a heavy emphasis to gender and youth as key cross-cutting issues.</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>Very Good</b>  The data collection, in the particular context of a country that among other things, is in a conflict zone, was state of the art. In presenting data, the evaluators were careful to express limitations, either because data had not been collected during programme implementation, or because of limitations that emerged from the collection process. Ethical considerations were explicitly mentioned and data were disaggregated and carefully presented. Involvement of stakeholders was clear throughout</p>
<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b>  <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>  <u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>  The findings are structured according to the groups of evaluation questions (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, partnerships) and in each case they begin with</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>a summary of findings and then a detailed analysis. In each case, the sources of data used for the findings are clear. Input from stakeholders is clear. There are contextual factors described. Throughout, cross-cutting issues are addressed. At times, however, findings are not sufficiently substantiated. This section lacks reference to evidence to be found in the evaluation matrix. Moreover, causality links between activities conducted (such as trainings, etc.) and stated positive changes are often not analyzed.</p> <p>E.g., p31: the evaluators list the activities conducted (training of 42 people; provision of equipment; etc.) and state that they have led to significant results such as: management capacities of [a partner] strengthened; transportation and storing of SR products secured; availability of family planning methods improved; etc. without providing substantiating evidence.</p>
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b></p> <p><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>Very Good</b></p> <p>The conclusions are clear, are linked to findings and given priority. They are practical and well-supported</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>Good</b></p> <p>The recommendations are linked to both findings and conclusions and are given one of two priorities. They are presented so that both the source of the data and the intended user of the recommendation is clear in each case. The number is manageable within the groupings (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability). ). However, There would probably have been room for more strategic recommendations, and less programmatic ones. In fact, Recommendation 1, which is very broad, should probably have been broken down in several recommendations.</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><b>Good</b> The evaluation clearly responds to the ToR, However, the poor formulation of some evaluation questions (in particular the effectiveness one) would have deserved to be raised by the evaluation team with a view to proposing new questions, more in line with the standard UNFPA methodological approach for CPEs.</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>	17	83		

(\*) 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

