

# Evaluation of DRUG RESISTANT TUBERCULOSIS (DRTB) INTERVENTION IN BAGHDAD, IRAQ

## Approaches for Assessing, Judging and Concluding on the Evaluation Criteria

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the **relevance, appropriateness, connectedness, effectiveness, and efficiency** (i.e., evaluation criteria) of MSF DRTB intervention; and to identify the key lessons learnt. This document outlines:

1. Approach for analyzing and synthesizing data and findings on the evaluation criteria.
2. Approach for concluding on the evaluation criteria.
3. Approach for assessing the catalytic effect of the project.

### FIRST: APPROACH FOR ANALYZING AND SYNTHESIZING DATA AND FINDINGS ON THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

## 1. RELEVANCE

### 1.1. Definition

Relevance is defined as “the quality of DRTB intervention including its design and delivery were aligned to the respective stakeholder needs, policies, and priorities; and measure and report on the sensitivity of the response to the demographics across implementation sites in Sadr City.”

### 1.2. Elements for analysis

#### A. Responding to needs, policies and priorities

- Assessment of the extent to which the intervention addressed beneficiaries’ needs and priorities.
- Assessment of how the intervention addressed the priorities of involved institutions or partners.
- Assessment of alignment between MSF and partner institutions strategies and policies.

#### B. Being sensitive and responsive to the context

- Assessment of the relationship, and interaction, between the intervention and the needs of beneficiaries and other key stakeholders within the context (i.e., assessing contextual relevance).
- Assessment of changes and adaptations of the intervention in response to changes in the needs.
- Assessment of the project assumptions within the historical background of the intervention.

### 1.3. Concluding on criteria

- The quality of DRTB intervention, including its design and delivery, were aligned to the respective stakeholder needs, policies, and priorities, and measure and report on the sensitivity of the

response to the demographics across implementation sites in Sadr City.

## 2. APPROPRIATENESS

### 2.1. Definition

Appropriateness is defined as “evidence that the DRTB intervention measure and report on the sensitivity of the intervention to the demographics across implementation geography.”

### 2.2. Elements for analysis

#### A. Quality of design

- “Assessment of extent to which stakeholders’ priorities and needs are articulated in the intervention’s objectives, its underlying theory of change (ToC), theory of action and/or change model.
- Assessment of gaps in design and/or unaddressed needs.
- Assessment of the intervention’s strategy and its appropriateness (relevant to similar projects by MSF and to address the needs and dynamic changes in context).

#### B. Adapting over time

- Assessment of the project evolution overtime (focusing on core DRTB-related services supported by the project).
- Assessment of degree the project succeeded to apply adaptive management effectively.
- Assessment of how external factors, risks and opportunities were addressed effectively to ensure minimal negative impact on achieving objectives (or maximizing chances).

### 2.3. Concluding on criteria

- There is evidence that the DRTB intervention measure and report on the sensitivity of the intervention to the demographics across implementation geography.

## 3. CONNECTEDNESS

### 3.1. Definition

Connectedness is defined as “evidence that the implementation of DRTB intervention measure and report on the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions across the implementation geographies and the degree to which the designs and implementation attained internal coherence”.

### 3.2. Elements for analysis

#### A. Coherence:

- Assessment of internal coherence of the intervention building on (in comparison with) similar previous or current MSF projects targeting DRTB area. Focusing on interconnections, complementarity, and coherence of how the project was designed and implemented.
- Assessment of external coherence of the intervention focusing on alignment with external policy commitments; and coherence with relevant DRTB interventions (or TB in general) implemented by other actors in the context.

#### B. Partnership and integration

- Assessment of interaction of the project with its partner organizations and success in creating effective partnership environment.
- Assessment of degree to which the project was embedded and well-integrated within the local health system, overall national strategy and building on existing capacity.

### 3.3. Concluding on criteria

- There is evidence that the implementation of DRTB intervention measure and report on the

compatibility of the intervention with other interventions across the implementation geographies and the degree to which the designs and implementation attained internal coherence.

## 4. EFFECTIVENESS

### 4.1. Definition

Effectiveness is defined as “DRTB intervention is well implemented and adapted as needed. There is evidence on the extent to which the intervention is achieving, or is expected to achieve its objectives, results; including any differential results across groups.”

### 4.2. Elements for analysis

#### A. Achievement of the objectives

- Assessment of whether the intervention has achieved its intended results at different levels of the results chain (usually outputs and outcomes), using the validated ToC.
- Assessment of ToC logic, validity, and plausibility to assess the potential contribution of the project in the wider context and achieving broader DRTB-related objectives.
- Assessment of any unintended effects (both positive and negative) as well as indirect effects or changes.

#### B. Weighing the relative importance of what was achieved

- Assessment of relative importance of achievements (at outcomes level) relevant to the needs, priorities and gaps targeted by the project and/or identified by the stakeholders.

#### C. Assessing the influencing factors

- Assessment of factors that influenced the results achieved by the project (at objectives and outcomes levels).
- Assessment of implementation quality of services delivered by the project (in comparison to the relevant implementation protocols and guidelines).
- Assessment of positive and negative effects arising from the intervention’s context, which in turn contribute to achievement or non-achievement of results.
- Assessment of the intervention’s adaptive capacity in response to contextual changes.

### 4.3. Concluding on criteria

- DRTB intervention is well implemented and adapted as needed. There is evidence on the extent to which the intervention is achieving, or is expected to achieve its objectives, results, including any differential results across groups.

## 5. EFFICIENCY

### 5.1. Definition

Efficiency is defined as “measure of how resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results within the scope of this evaluation. Given the nature of the project, the evaluation judgment applied to the input-output link in the causal chain of the project. The evaluation team will assess project outputs measures – qualitative and quantitative – and indicates favorable outcomes and progress compared to suitable benchmarks and standards.”

### 5.2. Elements for analysis

#### 5. Economic efficiency

- Assessment of project’s management ability to avoid waste and the conversion of inputs into

results in the most cost-efficient way possible in comparison to suitable benchmark or reference standard.

- Assessment of appropriateness of choices made and trade-offs addressed in the design stage and during implementation (including the way that resources were allocated to target groups).

#### 6. Operational efficiency

- Assessment of operational efficiency focusing on planning and utilization of human and financial resources.
- Assessment of how resources redirected as needs changed.
- Assessment of how the project team managed the implementation risks.

#### 7. Timeliness

- Assessment of the extent the results were achieved within the intended timeframe.
- Assessment of the extent to which the timeframe was realistic or appropriate for the project (depending on the allocated budgetary framework).
- Assessment of efforts made by the project to overcome obstacles and mitigate delays in how the intervention was managed (given the change context of the project).

### 5.3. Concluding on criteria

- There is adequate level of evidence indicating that the intervention has delivered results in an economic and timely way.

## SECOND: APPROACH FOR RATING THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation team proposes the following criteria rating scale to be adopted for evaluation DRTB project. The description rating (in description column below) looks into two comments (1) results achieved relevant to criteria (outputs or outcomes), and (2) assessment of the process (using the ToC and well as feedback from stakeholders). See table below.

Out of the five evaluation criteria the evaluation team considers relevance and effectiveness are critical.

- **First constraint:** The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall project rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (1 and 2). If the relevance rating is in the unsatisfactory range, then the overall outcome will be in the unsatisfactory range as well. However, where the relevance rating is in the satisfactory range (6 and 5), the overall outcome rating could, depending on its effectiveness and efficiency rating, be either in the satisfactory range or in the unsatisfactory range.
- **Second constraint:** The overall outcome achievement rating cannot be higher than the effectiveness rating.
- **Third constraint:** The overall outcome rating cannot be higher than the average score of effectiveness and efficiency criteria.

### Criteria Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory	Level of results achieved (or clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings.
5 = Satisfactory	Level of results achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings.
4 = Moderately Satisfactory	Level of results achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Level of results achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings.
2 = Unsatisfactory	Level of results achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory	Only a negligible level of results achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings.
Unable to Assess	The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.

## THIRD: APPROACH FOR ASSESSING THE CATALYTIC EFFECT OF THE PROJECT

During the ToC workshop, the stakeholders emphasized the catalytic nature of the project. The evaluation team will investigate level of evidence gather during the data collection process and assess the extent the project has achieved any catalytic effect and the magnitude of this effect. The team proposes the follow approach and criteria to judge on this effect.

Scaling up	Approaches developed through the project are (or could be) taken up on a regional / national scale becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required.
Replication	Activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are (or could be) repeated within or outside the project nationally or internationally.
Demonstration	Steps have been taken to catalyze the public good generated by the project, for instance through the development of demonstration sites, successful information dissemination and training.
Production of public good	The lowest level of catalytic result, including (e.g.,) development of new technologies and approaches. No significant actions were taken to build on the achievements made by the project, so the catalytic effect is left to external factors (i.e., no-residual effects of the project).