

Organizational unit: UNFPA Maldives Country Office **Year of report:** 2019

Title of evaluation report: Government of Maldives/UNFPA 6th Country Programme Evaluation (2016-2020)

Overall quality of report: Good

Overall comments: This is a well-written evaluation that appears to provide useful recommendations for informing the next country programme. The findings are thorough with clearly stated data sources, and include a careful analysis of the programme logic. The conclusions provide a good overview of the accomplishments and challenges of the programme and lead to a clear set of recommendations. The methodology would be more rigorous if additional beneficiaries participated in the evaluation process beyond the seven focus group respondents, or if the reasons for not including more were explained. The report could also be improved with a more comprehensive methodology section, including an explanation about how it was gender responsive and how data was collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations.

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:	Fair
--	----------------------	-------------------	------

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 writing is very clear with minimal errors.
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	The main report is just over 50 pages.
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 is logical. There is not a lessons learned section and this was not required in the ToR.
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	All required annexes are included.

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?	Partial	The summary is well-written and provides a good overview of the evaluation process and main results. The only issue for it serving as a stand-alone document is that it includes a number of undefined acronyms (SRH, CSE, CPD, GEWE) that may not be understood by all of the target audience.
6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?	Yes	The structure is followed with all required elements being covered.
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	It is concisely presented and is just under 4 pages in length.

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------

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 is clearly specified in the Introduction. In addition to internal stakeholders, it includes government and CSO partners.
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	Both are addressed in chapters 2 and 3.
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 adequacy of the results framework is taken up under Relevance.

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	The general framework, in terms of the criteria and questions, and reference to the evaluation matrix are included in the main report. The annexed matrix covers each of the required elements.
--	-----	---

5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	Data collection tools (document review, KIs, focus groups, and review of a mobile app for the SRH component) are explained and justified.
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)?	Partial	Although the need for mapping is included in the ToR, the report does not include one. Relationships and roles, particularly of implementors, could be clarified. However, the process for stakeholder input and consultation is clearly described; it included periodic validation, a debriefing with CO staff, a validation meeting with key stakeholders including senior government officials, and sharing of the draft report. Although the description does not specify consultation on recommendations, it can reasonably be assumed that draft recommendations were part of the validation meeting and draft report. A gap in the methodology section is that the total number of evaluation participants (or disaggregation by stakeholder group and gender) and is not stated.
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	It is noted that most data was qualitative, and that content analysis and contribution analysis were used to identify patterns, meaning and linkages of activities to outputs and outcomes. There are only 2 sentences on analysis; within that, processes are identified but not fully 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 given are in regards to limited availability of CO staff, in-country time for the international consultants, and availability of outcome data. Mitigation measures for each are briefly stated.
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	There is a sub-section on sampling. It is noted that "because of the limited number of UNFPA stakeholders, the evaluation team consulted all of them". However, this probably should have been stated as all stakeholder groups were consulted. The implementing partners interviewed are listed. The strategy for selecting FGD participants is not clear. It is mentioned that it included beneficiaries who participated in the Youth Cafes were selected using purposeful sampling. Why that particular activity was chosen to draw beneficiaries from and what the criteria was for the purposeful sample should be stated and limitations of the sample indicated.
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Data on the gender of evaluation participants was collected. The evaluators note making an attempt to collect disaggregated data but that a limitation of the evaluation was the limited amount of disaggregated data available to show progress in outcomes achievement for adolescents, youth and women. However, in several cases, such data was presented - i.e., that 70% of university graduates are women.
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Evaluation questions looked at the extent that HRGE was integrated into the CP. The methodology was suitable for this purpose (although as noted below, the analysis could have been more indepth).

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
-------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes

1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Triangulation is noted as being applied during the analysis process. This can be seen in multiple places in the Findings where two or more data sources are shown as evidence for a particular finding.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Data sources are identified, and it is explained that most data was qualitative. The types of documents reviewed are described in the main text and are listed in the annex. Reliability is addressed in terms of stakeholders consulted being those most familiar with UNFPA activities.
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?	Partial	As noted above, limitations of data sources and mitigations strategies were briefly covered, although not in depth. There is a comment about the limited amount of quantitative and disaggregated data for both primary and secondary sources. However why this happened for all data sources - for example why there were so few FGD participants - is not mentioned. It would be helpful to readers to know the total number of evaluation participants and have this broken down by stakeholder group and gender - none of this information is provided in the main text, although in the annex it can be seen that just under 50 people were included as respondents.

4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	Although ethical considerations are not fore fronted, it is noted that UNFPA representatives were not present during interviews with partners and beneficiaries. As well, the annexed KI/FGD protocol states that the introduction to the meeting should include "Confidentiality of discussion in line with UNEG norms and standards". It would be useful to have more details on the ethical considerations applied during the evaluation process within a specific subsection or paragraph in the methodology section.
--	---------	---

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	This is well done throughout most all of the Findings, although to a lesser extent in Sustainability.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	This is also well done. For example, in explaining inadequacies of the results chain, the evaluators discuss in appropriate detail a range of contributing factors including political and social issues, institutional capacity, etc.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The evaluation questions are highlighted at the beginning of each criteria section.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	Document sources are cited throughout (through footnoted document references and types of data sources being indicated in brackets for many findings) and there is frequent reference to perspectives obtained during the evaluation from stakeholders. The evaluators also make clear, in several cases, the conclusions they have drawn from the data and why; for example, that programme performance was reasonable even though it wasn't apparent when measured against the indicators and targets; and that the issue was more with problems of the results chain itself.
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Causal linkages are made clear throughout, and particularly in the Summary of achievements against targets in table 7. The reasons for achievement and non-achievement of targets is explained. There are useful descriptions of different activities undertaken and analysis of the extent to which they were able to contribute to expected results. Subsection 4.3.6 is dedicated to Unforeseen Consequences; and the report notes that none were seen.

6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Partial	There is minimal presentation of differentiated results, including on the different ways that males and females participated in, or perceived/benefitted from, the youth programmes.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors discussed include the increasingly conservative cultural environment, issues with the logical frameworks, and a review of the RH strategy being put on hold due to other government strategy discussions.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The analysis included assessment of the extent to which interventions reached the most vulnerable populations, and the extent to which the CP integrated issues of HRGE.
5. Conclusions		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The evaluators clearly specify the relevant questions and criteria for each conclusion.
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	The conclusions are clear and successfully synthesize the main findings, providing a good overview of the accomplishments and challenges of the programme.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias.
6. Recommendations		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The relevant conclusions are shown. As with the conclusions, both strategic and programme level recommendations are provided.
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	These are very clearly presented and include targeted users and operational suggestions for implementation.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	There is no indication of bias and recommendations appear balanced in respect to building on past performance and where new emphasis needs to be placed.
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	The introduction to this section notes that they are to be considered for the next CP.
5. Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	A priority rating is given and all are rated as high priority. They are presented in a way to support a management response.
7. Gender		
	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level: Good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?		<p>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) The objectives are not explicit in this regard but the scope notes that x-cutting issues to be considered include the extent that the adoption of a HRBA and gender mainstreaming were considered throughout the programme. = 3</p> <p>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) This was integrated into relevance and effectiveness. = 3</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) There is a dedicated question = 3</p> <p>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 evaluators do highlight that insufficient information is available. = 3</p>

<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>	<p>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) This is missing from the methodology section. = 0</p> <p>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) Mixed methods were used and appeared appropriate for assessing GE = 2</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) 2 Data sources were reasonably diverse and enabled triangulation = 3</p> <p>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) The list of stakeholders consulted shows that a diverse range were included. There was not enough information presented about evaluation participants to determine if sample size was sufficient, particularly for beneficiaries and CSOs. = 2</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) It was noted that UNEG norms and standards were to be followed for KIIs and FGDs but there was not an explicit description of how ethical considerations were applied. = 1</p>
---	---

<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p>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) The background section includes some data points about women and girls but provides minimal analysis. Score = 1</p> <p>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) The extent of gender analysis in the findings was quite limited. The key section (4.3.5 Integration of Gender and HRBA) was just three sentences in length. It included a statement that, "in discussions with youth leaders and safe space beneficiaries, respondents did not perceive any gender inequality in UNFPA-supported interventions". Otherwise, the voices of different stakeholder groups were rarely apparent in the findings. = 1</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) As noted above, the evaluators stated that no 'unforeseen consequences' were found in the evaluation. However, as the analysis of gender issues appeared to be quite light, a more thorough examination may have found some unanticipated positive or negative effects. Score = 2</p> <p>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 is a conclusion and supporting recommendation on the need for UNFPA to steward conversations on SRH and GE in light of the increasingly sensitive and challenging religious contexts (=3)</p>
--	--

(*) 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	22	47	31	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report		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

Consideration of significant constraints

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: