

Organizational unit:	Bolivia	Year of report:	2021
Title of evaluation report:	EVALUATION OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAM OF THE UNFPA IN BOLIVIA (SIXTH CYCLE OF COOPERATION 2018-2022)		
Overall quality of report:	Very good	Date of assessment:	2102/2022
Overall comments:	<p>This is a strong evaluation of the Country Program of the UNFPA In Bolivia (Sixth Cycle of Cooperation 2018-2021). Evaluators adopted a mixed-methods approach to collect qualitative as well as quantitative data. Cross-cutting issues including gender equality, human rights, and disability were appropriately addressed in the methodology. The evaluators used a theory-based approach and created a ToC based on findings in the light of political crisis and COVID. Evaluators obtained input from 223 representatives of all stakeholders with whom UNFPA worked throughout the review period, as well as officials from UNFPA LACRO and UNFPA Bolivia. Findings are backed by adequate qualitative and quantitative evidence. Sources are cited in footnotes where applicable and Annex 10 shows the extent to which results are achieved based on indicators during the 2018 to 2020 administrations. The conclusions and recommendations show the findings/conclusions on which they are based and provide useful direction for the next Country Programme. The main shortcomings of the report are that it does not include a clear description of ethical considerations or of specific methods of analysis. The evaluation is notable for its coverage of disability inclusion. This is expressed in the context section and thematic scope, is explored in the analysis under three criteria, and reflected in Conclusions. The stakeholders consulted also included a representative of an NGO working with people with disabilities.</p>		
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 <i>assessment level</i> followed by main <i>comments</i> . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)	
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
1. Is the report structured in a logical way? 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? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Yes	The report is clearly structured and easy to follow. The language is appropriate and there is use of rights-based terminology.	
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	At 70.5 pages, the report is reasonable in length for a country programme evaluation.	
3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?	Yes	Annexes are complete and include all required elements, as well as one on measures adopted in response to COVID, one on the qualitative and quantitative survey responses and others with further information to substantiate the findings.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	Partial	The Executive Summary includes all required elements, however, it would have been beneficial to explicitly mention intended audience. The presentation is clear and there is a useful graphical depiction of the data collection methods and sources.	
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	At 5 pages, the executive summary is reasonable in length.	
2. Design and Methodology			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	A clear explanation of Bolivia's country context is provided, including demographic dynamics, economic and social situation, Government's Patriotic Agenda 2025 and the Plan of Economic and Social Development, Sector Strategies, and Current situation in UNFPA program areas including maternal mortality, sexual and reproductive health in adolescents, gender and sexual violence, and population and development, as well as the role of international cooperation.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Yes	The evaluators used a theory-based approach and created and adjusted ToC based on existing findings, experience and evidence. This was used to assess "what really happened" and the logics underlying the response, specifically, in the context of political crisis and COVID-19 pandemic.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			

3. 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 evaluation matrix provided in Annex 5 is comprehensive - it includes criteria, questions, assumptions, detailed indicators, sources of information, and data collection methods and tools. It is not consolidated as it does not provide findings or other details on collected data.
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The main methods of data collection used by the evaluators are clearly described. They included desk review, technical sessions/workshops with the UNFPA country office team, semi-structured individual and group interviews with key institutions and actors of the Country Office and counterparts, including the United Nations System and rights holders, 4 FGDs with rightsholders, and a questionnaire survey with implementation partners. Due to the pandemic, data collection was done online.
5. 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	It is noted that the evaluation team conducted a stakeholder mapping exercise, and the 11 different stakeholder groups are shown. However, it would have been useful to include further information on the makeup and roles of those groups in the CP. To ensure accuracy, clarifications, and complementations, the evaluators validated the preliminary findings with the Country Office and ERG.
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	Evaluators note that data analysis was based on the participatory and dynamic methodology using social research techniques for both quantitative and qualitative data. However, it would have been beneficial to further explain the techniques and methods employed (i.e., contribution analysis, qualitative comparative analysis, etc.).
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	Limitations and their mitigation strategies are clearly described on page 14. They are divided into two areas, organization and management and are related to limited access to participants, the COVID-19 pandemic, and gaps in data.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	Evaluators note that representatives of all stakeholders with whom UNFPA worked throughout the review period, as well as officials from UNFPA LACRO and UNFPA Bolivia, were consulted. Graph 3 usefully shows the breakdown of evaluation participants but stakeholder group and gender. However, it is less clear how the sample was determined (criteria used) beyond it being based on the results of stakeholder mapping.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The approach and tools enabled disaggregated data to be collected by the evaluation team. However, it is also noted that there was lack of disaggregated monitoring data from which to draw upon (as seen in conclusion 3 "In this framework, the lack of disaggregated data regarding the indicators does not allow evidence that the achievements and results are reaching the priority populations in a timely manner and contributing to closing the gaps, except in the case of adolescents and young people, as they constitute a specific job.").
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Evaluators have employed an appropriate methodology to cover the cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender equality, and disability by incorporating them in evaluation questions under relevance, sustainability and coverage criteria.
3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	To ensure triangulation, evaluators have used different data collection methods and engaged a total of 223 people using interviews, FGDs, and probe surveys.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected from multiple sources including desk reviews, 10 technical sessions/workshops with the UNFPA country office team, individual and group interviews, FGDs, survey, and case studies. Data reliability is noted as being assured by the extent of data collected and triangulation.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	There is brief mention of human rights being the subject of evaluation and guiding the ethical aspects of the evaluation and data collection tools cover confidentiality in their preamble. However, it would have been useful to more fully explain ethical considerations including their application.
4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		

1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	Findings are backed by adequate qualitative and quantitative evidence. Sources are cited in footnotes where applicable. Additionally, Annex 10 shows the extent to which results are achieved based on indicators during the 2018 to 2020 administrations.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for the interpretation is shown where possible. For example, under efficiency criteria, it is noted that "From the beginning, different programming times between UNFPA and the local government, which did not coincide with the formulation of the budget and POA, a situation that delayed the registration of resources, the implementation of the programmed actions and, in turn, conditioned the reduction in the allocation of UNFPA resources due to low municipal execution".
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are organized according to the evaluation questions. A brief summary is provided under each finding, which adds to the clarity of the section.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Causal linkages between outputs and results are shown particularly in the effectiveness section of findings. Finding 5 specifically focuses on assessing the extent to which assumptions outlined in the designed ToR hold true. Table 7 presents Validation analysis of the assumptions of the ToC using the criteria (Green, fulfilled; yellow, partially fulfilled; orange, requires revision).
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Finding 14 under the coverage criterium assesses the extent to which the intervention reached the most vulnerable populations, including women, indigenous people, Afro-Bolivians, and people with disabilities. It is also noted that disaggregated and comparable data was not available for detailed analysis.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors are identified where appropriate. For example, under Efficiency it is noted that "Among the external factors that negatively affect the potential for sustainability, some are mentioned on which UNFPA has no influence, such as the high mobility of officials at the state level, the budgetary restrictions of state counterparts, largely associated with a weak will policy in favor of the agenda priorities with UNFPA".
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues such as gender, vulnerability, and disability are adequately covered in the findings. This is particularly evident in the relevance and coverage section. For example, under the relevance criteria, evaluators note that "Some innovations in the more comprehensive approach to the needs of vulnerable populations have potential for replication, such as the installation of services free of discrimination for LGBTI people in Cochabamba and the promotion of inclusive Information Analysis Committees (CAI) in Chuquisaca".
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 conclusions are based on findings and organized by strategic and programmatic conclusions. The number of findings they are based on and associated recommendations are also stated. This is a good practice.
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Conclusions are sufficiently forward-looking and address both the intervention's strengths and weaknesses. Cross-cutting issues including gender and human rights are discussed in the section. Conclusion # 3 specifically focuses on "leaving no one behind".
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no indication 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	Recommendations are organized as strategic and programmatic recommendations. They are clearly formulated and state the conclusions on which they are based.
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	Recommendations are directed towards the intended users. Each recommendation statement is followed by strategies/sub-recommendations for their operationalization.
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Recommendations appear to be balanced. Recommendation # 8 focuses on the most vulnerable populations and taking into account the "leave no one behind" strategy and cross-cutting approaches.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	All of the 8 recommendations are prioritized as 'high priority'. The time period for their implementation is also provided and this ranges from 6 months to 2 years.

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)			
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) Gender, human rights, and disability are integrated into the scope. =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) Gender is mainstreamed into evaluations questions as a cross-cutting issue under the criteria of relevance, sustainability, and coverage. = 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 specific question covering gender aspects. = 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 background and findings section presents gender and age-disaggregated data. Additionally, Finding 14 describes lack of disaggregated data for vulnerable groups "making it difficult to show the scope and the effect generated in the reduction of gaps and exclusions". = 3</p>	
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?		<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) Evaluators used appropriate methodology to assess gender; for example, data collection tools have questions covering, human rights, gender, and disability. Similarly, evaluators make reference to UNEG guidelines and UNFPA Evaluation Policy and the Evaluation Manual, and describe key elements of gender equality and human rights approaches in Box 2. = 3</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) An appropriate mixed-methods approach was used = 3</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) To ensure triangulation, evaluators used diverse range of data sources and consulted a total of 223 people = 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 stakeholders consulted by the evaluators included leaders of rights defense organizations: women, indigenous, adolescents, LGBTI+, and Afro-descendants. = 3</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) The confidentiality and anonymity of data and participants is described in the preamble of data collection tools. However, a more detailed description of the ethical considerations would have been beneficial. =1</p>	
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		<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) Gender issues including maternal mortality, sexual and reproductive health in adolescents, and gender and sexual violence are covered in the background section. Additionally, the country data table has statistics covering gender such as maternal mortality ratio and gender parity index.= 3</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 findings section provides a thorough gender analysis and covers issues such as sexual violence and sexual and reproductive health = 3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) The intervention's unintended effects in terms of human rights and gender equality are not described. = 0</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) This is done. For example, recommendation 1 focuses on cultural changes and gender and generational social norms = 3</p>	
<p>(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.</p> <p>(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).</p>			

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	100			
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very good			

