Title of evaluation report: COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION UNFPA SUDAN FINAL EVALUATION REPORT 6th Cycle Programme 2013-2016

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: The Sudan CPE evaluation is a well written. Although expected to be a final evaluation, it is in fact a mid-term evaluation since most of the documentary data covers only 2013-2014 supplemented by interviews and site visits up to August 2015. It does an excellent job of showing the connection between activities undertaken or funded by UNFPA and the outputs expected to be produced by the government. The connections between these outputs and broader outcomes is less clear, as the evaluators note. The evaluation draws clear conclusions and makes operational recommendations that can be incorporated into the next country programme.

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 evaluation report is user-friendly, comprehensive, and logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.* All the basic elements of the main report and the annexes are present. The organization of the Finding and Analysis section is very clear and well presented. The separation of the conclusions and recommendations follows EO recommended structure, thereby making them less of an integrated whole. The report includes all required sections with the exception of Lessons Learned. The report outline specified in the ToRs does not include a separate section for this even though compiling lessons learned is a stated purpose of the evaluation. So, the omission is due to the ToRs. Given the challenge of access in many parts of Sudan, the limitations section may understate the obstacles faced in conducting such an extensive evaluation process.			

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 a well written and concise overview of the evaluation that serves as a stand-alone section presenting the essence of the main evaluation results within the prescribed page length. All the basic elements are included except for identifying the target audience as part of the purpose; but it also includes a short paragraph on limitations following the methodology which is a very relevant additive as was the inclusion of Major Findings that set the context for the Major Conclusions and Major Recommendations. The section addresses each of the evaluation criteria and treats both the Conclusions and Recommendations at strategic and programmatic levels to good effect.
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 evaluation design is aligned with the UNFPA logical framework for the 6 outputs of the CP covered. However, as the framework is not presented in its entirety, the inclusion of a theory of change would have helped to show how the outputs are expected to contribute to results. There is a clear explanation of all methods used and the sampling strategy. Purposive and convenience sampling were used (and are probably the most feasible given the country context) but the report would be stronger if the reasons for, and limitations of, using a non-random strategy were explained. Primary data was collected from a wide range of stakeholders, including program participants, with field visits to 5 states.
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;	**Good** Data sources are listed and are extensive. There is heavy reliance on program documents. One caveat in the Methodology section was the comment that except for the limitation of time and expert resources the "evaluation team

• Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.	did not encounter noteworthy field challenges when conducting field data collection" but the report states "some of the preliminary evaluation findings would have required additional assessment through quantitative surveys to confirm programme reported results…" Data dis-aggregated by gender was used extensively.
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; • Contextual factors are identified. • Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.	**Good** The findings for each section are clearly presented, detailed, organized by criteria and adequately address the indicators that, according to the ToRs, the evaluators were requested to develop. The mode of presentation of for each Evaluation criteria is well established and effective in identifying the relevant evaluation question, providing a summary followed by treatment of each programme area in terms of what are termed their outputs. One problem here is that, by using the terminology of the Country Programme in which what is produced by UNFPA is called an activity and this influences what is produced by the Government and is called the output. There is a clear causal connection in the analysis between the activities and the output, but the connection between the government's output and the expected outcomes is less clear. In fact, one of the conclusions of the evaluators is that the "evaluation has recommended that future assessment are conducted to evaluate specific 'outcome' issues to confirm some of the program reported results …" The findings take into account the context in which the programme is being carried out. One point made is that the findings largely cover only the first two years of the country programme, since documentary evidence only includes 2013 and 2014, while information on the first six month of 2015 were acquired through the interviews and field visits. As such, the findings constitute a mid-term rather than final evaluation.

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.	**Very Good** Although the conclusions are not organized in priority order, they are logically organized by evaluation questions under each of the respective Evaluation Criteria, following the body of the report and are based on a brief summary of findings, immediately followed by a cross reference to an associated Recommendation. They are based on the findings, and focus primarily on what are termed outputs (which would be outcomes in terms of what UNFPA produces by itself).
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	**Good** The first two elements are met, the fourth is not in a strict sense (i.e., are not in priority order but are assigned a priority level in keeping with the associated conclusion). As suggested by the ToR, they are structured by section, with recommendations relating to strategy first, then recommendations related to programmatic aspects. In all cases, they are connected with the conclusions. While the text does not show changes due to consultations, it is clear from the description of the evaluation process that extensive consultations took place.
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 generally responds to the ToR. The main issue being that the evaluators should have noted that the requested report format did not include a lessons learned section.

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	12	88		

(*) 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