

Title of evaluation report: INDEPENDENT COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION - BANGLADESH

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: This evaluation of the 8th country programme in Bangladesh is a very thorough assessment of the extent to which the results expected of UNFPA's interventions have been obtained. In several senses it is a model for other evaluations, particularly in the care in which the expectations are described, measured and reported. A conscious effort was made to show causal connections between the interventions funded or provided by UNFPA for a programme designed around government output. The data collection methodology was thorough, and its limitations described. The evaluators based their findings on extensive document review (and noted where documentation was inadequate), a large number of key informant interviews, and extensive field visits to see results, in which focus groups were held). The conclusions derived from the extensive findings were clear and connected with recommendations that can be applied to the 9th country programme that is under development. There is one main problem with the report: the length (158 pages plus a 176 page annex). The findings section is particularly long and this may undermine utility.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting <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"> • 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. 	<p>Good</p> <p>The report has clear structure, and is well written, but is very long to read within limited time. The report itself has 158 pages. The annexes are 176 pages. This may undermine utility for all but the most dedicated reader.</p> <p>Acronyms exist and are explained in 4 and a half pages. The report includes Executive Summary; Introduction; Methodology, including Approach and Limitations; Context; Findings/Analysis; Conclusions; and Recommendations.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the evaluation is "(4) To draw key lessons from past and current cooperation...". TOR does not specify how to describe the lessons learned but there is no chapter or separate paragraph in the report called "Transferable Lessons Learned." Key success stories (which could be applied by other projects outside the area) are not written in the way to easily find them. Nevertheless, the recommendations mention the lessons such as "Use good practices and lessons learned from reproductive health and gender equality efforts."</p>			

	<p>Minimum requirements for Annexes are satisfied: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; and Methodological instruments used. A few documents in the Bibliography do not have a full name/reference, it is impossible to find them in the internet, for instance, Government of Bangladesh official policy and strategy: 5th Five Year Plan, 6th Five Year Plan, and others.</p>
<p>2. Executive Summary <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"> • 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. 	<p>Good</p> <p>The summary provides a stand-alone overview of what is a complex evaluation. It describes the objectives, scope of the evaluation, and the context, but it does not describe the intended audience and objectives of the intervention. There are sections on Methodology, Main Findings, Main Conclusions (more than 1 page); and Main Recommendations. The overall length at 5 pages is longer than the normal maximum length. It can be made more concrete with specific information, for example, on results achieved, and yet be reduced by about 2 pages. The Executive Summary is not included in the Table of Contents.</p>
<p>3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Good</p> <p>The report seeks to answer nine evaluation questions that are outlined clearly and concisely. In a results matrix, in the annex, the evaluators described in detail what was expected to happen as a result of UNFPA interventions. This helped address the problem that the program is of the government and what were termed outputs were really, for UNFPA, outcomes of the UNFPA interventions.</p> <p>The data collection methodology is outlined clearly and relies mostly on 124 key informant interviews, 12 focus group discussions in 18 different sites as well as Dhaka (in addition to document review). The selection of sites and persons to interview was based on a purpose sample. While this was described in Table 2 and in a detailed annex, how the specific persons, particularly for the focus groups, were selected is not described.</p> <p>The limitations in data collection (including a lack of data on “soft interventions” and the lack of time to interview more beneficiaries) are described. Vulnerable groups, youth, gender equality were among the main foci of the program and were therefore built into the design. The participatory stakeholder’s consultation process was clearly described and implemented.</p>

<p>4. Reliability of Data <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary. 	<p>Very Good</p> <p>The sources of qualitative and quantitative data were clearly identified. The report notes that “No primary quantitative data were collected during the evaluation and data from secondary sources has largely been gender specific or gender disaggregated” (pp. 4-5). The data that is collected was done so in an adequately reliable manner and limitations are made explicit.</p> <p>Similarly, credibility of primary and secondary data is established and limitations are made explicit (pp.5-8).</p> <p>Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary. There are tables with include disaggregated data by gender, for instance, tables 4, 14, and 15, and the Annex 4 “People interviewed and consulted.” Also, there are examples in the text such as “...a mapping and baseline survey was conducted among 330 potential women entrepreneurs...About 80 per cent of workers in garment factories are women (p. 30). On the whole, the evaluators made a clear effort to ensure that the data collected and used were very reliable.</p>
<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i> <u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Good</p> <p>The findings are structured according to the evaluation questions and, within them, by the programs that UNFPA intends to influence. The findings are carefully presented, with an effort to show what has happened because of the UNFPA interventions (and the source of data for this are either included in the text or in footnotes). The thoroughness of the analysis is helped, in each findings section, by suggesting what UNFPA provides by way of its own outputs and the extent to which causal connections with the government’s output and evidence that this has led to expected outcomes. The findings section, because of this approach, is very long (94 pages) and is back up by a very detailed results matrix in annex 7 (113 pages). This clearly required considerable effort to complete but shows the factual basis for the findings. Although there is considerable length, in part due to the complexity of the country program which required a significant level of detail and within the limitation of this, the findings are clearly presented.</p> <p>Findings are substantiated by evidence. There are references in the text on the sources of information. There also tables which explain Baseline information (2012), 2014 Achievement Progress, Mid-2015, and include the Remarks. Findings are presented in a clear</p>

	<p>manner: findings are designed according to the evaluation questions and program areas. Short paragraphs are easy to read. Tables are clear and specific.</p> <p>Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions (Annex 7. Evaluation Matrix). Contextual factors are identified (pp. 9-17).</p> <p>The evaluation worked hard to determine the cause and effect linkages, which is often a problem in program evaluations. Mostly this has been done successfully by connecting UNFPA funded actions with changes in the beneficiary population. A case in point is the effect of training midwives (and obtaining a government policy on midwives). The connection with UNICEF funds and advocacy is shown. This is one of the few evaluations that has dealt with this issue successfully.</p>
<p>6. Conclusions <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. 	<p>Very Good</p> <p>The conclusions are derived logically from the findings, and seem to follow findings in order or priority. They seem to be free of bias. They are linked with the findings through references to the evaluation questions, although they do not make specific detailed references to the findings. As an innovation, they are presented, and then the recommendations flowing from the conclusions are shown, by priority order. The evaluation process included a number of points where there were consultations with stakeholders to ensure that there was an acceptance of the conclusions.</p>
<p>7. Recommendations <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Very Good</p> <p>Recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are presented together: conclusion and corresponding recommendation. This is a useful approach to ensuring the linkage.</p> <p>Recommendations are strategic and targeted. All are directed to the country office and the recommendation includes detailed operational implications for implementing the recommendation. This is also innovative.</p> <p>While it is not said in the Recommendations section if they were developed taking into account stakeholders' consultations, in the methodology section the consultants stated that "the discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations are important to allow stakeholders to take into account evaluation findings in future programming."</p> <p>Both conclusions and recommendations are presented in priority order, starting with high priority and ending with medium priority.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Good Evaluation Report responds to requirements stated in the ToR, which is included in the annex. The ToR was worked out in conjunction with the UNFPA Office as part of an initial scoping mission and therefore is particularly relevant.</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		
TOTAL	29	71		

(*) 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