

# EQA for Independent Evaluation of UNFPA Lebanon Country Programme (2010-2014)



**Title of Evaluation Report:** Independent Country Programme Evaluation Lebanon 2010-2014

**Overall Assessment:** The evaluation does a thorough job of showing how the UNFPA programme has delivered its outputs and affected results in a complex climate and makes strategic, yet practical, recommendations for the next phase of UNFPA activities. Building on a very solid results matrix into which data acquired could be placed that shows the causal connections with UNFPA activities, the evaluation’s findings focus on the factors affecting the achievement of expected results, especially those factors impeding achievement. The evaluation, which took approximately a year, included extensive consultations with stakeholders and this was important in framing the conclusions.

| Quality Assessment criteria   | Assessment Levels   |      |      |                |
|---|---|------|------|----------------|
|   | Very good   | Good | Poor | Unsatisfactory |
| <p><b>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b><br/> <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i><br/>                     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><br/>                     The structure of the report follows norms, including very detailed annexes. It is written in clear language and covers all of the necessary content.</p> <p>One weakness is that, while optional, there was no explanation of why Transferable Lessons Learned were not clearly visible of where they could be found in the report structure. The evaluation Foreword states that the evaluation “provides relevant and useful lessons for other UNFPA country offices” and then proceeds to take note of them.</p> |      |      |                |
| <p><b>2. Executive Summary</b><br/> <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i><br/>                     Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p>   | <p><b>Good</b><br/>                     The executive summary is complete, concise, well within the page limitations, and covers clearly all of the elements required. It is a stand-alone presentation of the evaluation, including both expected results and</p>  |      |      |                |

| Quality Assessment criteria   | Assessment Levels  |      |      |                |
|---|--|------|------|----------------|
|   | Very good  | Good | Poor | Unsatisfactory |
| <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 Findings v) Main Conclusions (1 para); vi) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page.</li> </ul>  | <p>unanticipated. The purpose and intended audience were not mentioned, however.</p>   |      |      |                |
| <p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b><br/> <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i><br/> 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><br/> The methodology used as standard and consistent with UNFPA guidelines. It included a very thorough analysis of documents, a wide variety of interviews with stakeholders that clearly yielded good qualitative data, and a series of focus groups in different parts of the country. The methodology was helped by a very thorough results matrix into which findings were placed in considerable detail. The results matrix clearly showed the causal relationship, to the extent it could be measured, between the UNFPA outputs (called activities) and the outcomes obtained (called outputs and outcomes in the CPAP.) The matrix showed, for each area, what were called "judgment criteria" which, in effect, were the outcomes expected based on the work of UNFPA. There was evidence of consultation with stakeholders, including through review of drafts. The main cross-cutting issues were dealt with in detail. This includes especially gender equality in which the UNFPA office was a leader, as well as concerns with human rights in the context of humanitarian relief. While the fieldwork for the evaluation took three weeks, the entire evaluation took a year. This meant that more consultation would be possible and more time available to sharpen findings, conclusions and recommendations. There were a few weaknesses in the design, particularly in that the selection of the places to visit was not explained. It should be noted that the design took into account the constraints imposed by the security situation at the time. Basic elements that were included but not required and were well done included: an overview of the evaluation process and</p> |      |      |                |

| Quality Assessment criteria   | Assessment Levels  |      |      |                |
|---|--|------|------|----------------|
|   | Very good  | Good | Poor | Unsatisfactory |
|   | relating the evaluation questions to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. Both provided good and critical points essential to understanding the design and methodology.   |      |      |                |
| <p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b><br/> <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>Good</b></p> <p>The quantitative data available, clearly sourced, was used properly within the constraints of the national situation, where data collection on population issues, especially reproductive health, was one of the issues dealt with in the evaluation. The qualitative data on programme implementation was sound and triangulated. The limitations encountered (such as the unavailability of the Ministry of Health for interviews during the field phase) were clear. Data disaggregated by gender were utilized as needed, although the gender of youth who had received training as part of youth programmes was not given.</p> <p>This section clarifies the data collection processes although clarifying data quality is not straightforward; it is, however, covered by a combination of the Intervention Logic in Section 3 along with the Evaluation Matrix in Annex 4. Each of the basic elements have been met. The Annexes with the data collection protocols are also important in that clarification.</p> |      |      |                |
| <p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b><br/> <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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;</li> <li>Contextual factors are identified.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Very Good</b></p> <p>The evaluation design carefully posed a limited number of questions, as called for in the UNFPA Handbook and organized the responses around the main program areas covered. The findings were presented systematically, starting with a general finding and then the specific findings within each area. The findings were clearly supported by evidence, which could also be found in the results matrix presented in an annex, and covered both the summative element (what results were obtained) and the formative (what were the main reasons for the results or their absence). Many of the reasons were clearly contextual, affected by the political factors in Lebanon during the period (a change of government and the</p>   |      |      |                |

| Quality Assessment criteria  | Assessment Levels   |      |      |                |
|--|---|------|------|----------------|
|  | Very good   | Good | Poor | Unsatisfactory |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.</li> </ul>   | <p>influx of refugees from Syria) that affected priorities and funding. The findings were careful to show cause and effect links that could be attributed to UNFPA work to establish the contribution of UNFPA. This was particularly important in determining how the activities were affected by programme design, on the one hand, and the external context, on the other.) Several exceptional features included in the report that contributed to the findings being presented in a clear manner include: The intervention logic in Section 3: Context which was specific and explicit; including at the beginning of each subsection findings the evaluation question as point of reference for reading the subsection and a summary of the major findings, both of which were in a box format to highlight the points and both of which were very helpful to the reader. Also a highlighted summary of the findings and analysis at the start of the specific details for each of the evaluation questions was most helpful.</p> |      |      |                |
| <p><b>6. Conclusions</b><br/> <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>Good</b><br/> The conclusions were presented with a direct connection to the findings on which they were based, including through cross-referencing. While their link with recommendations (which had been assigned priority) was clear, they were not organized in priority order. Instead, they were structured from general conclusions about the whole programme and then on specific programmes and then on the monitoring and evaluation system. The conclusions were presented fairly, were based on the findings and showed no evidence of bias on the part of the evaluators.</p>  |      |      |                |
| <p><b>7. Recommendations</b><br/> <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'</li> </ul> | <p><b>Good</b><br/> The recommendations flow directly from the conclusions and are clearly linked in the text. They address key issues of strategy and programmatic response that can realistically be implemented by the UNFPA country office. They clearly take into account the consultations with stakeholders, although that is not made explicit in all cases, and the recommendations</p>  |      |      |                |

| Quality Assessment criteria   | Assessment Levels  |      |      |                |
|---|--|------|------|----------------|
|   | Very good  | Good | Poor | Unsatisfactory |
| <p>consultations whilst remaining impartial;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendations should be presented in priority order</li> </ul>  | <p>are given a priority of either high, or medium or low priority. They follow the structure of the conclusions in that they go from global to specific, but are not presented in a priority order. In fact, had they been structured by priority, their logic would have been lost.</p> |      |      |                |
| <p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b><br/> 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><br/> The ToR was the guiding factor in the design and conformed with international and UNFPA standards. The fact that the evaluation was directed by the independent Evaluation Office of UNFPA ensured that this would be the case.</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>   | 50                    | 50   |      |                |

(\*) 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

**OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Very Good**