

Organizational unit: **Ecuador CO** Year of report: **2022**

Title of evaluation report: **Evaluación Final del VII Programa de País (2019 – 2022) del Fondo de Población de las Naciones Unidas en Ecuador**

Overall quality of report: **Good** Date of assessment: **14 August 2022**

**Overall comments:** The evaluation of Ecuador's 2019-2022 CPE uses a mixed-methods approach that includes document review, three online questionnaires (with 150 informants), key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (86 participants) with a total of 340 participants. While the data collection methodologies are numerous, allowing for triangulation, there are some gaps in describing the sample and other elements of the design. For example, participants are not disaggregated by sex or disability status. Methods of analysis are also not described nor is an ethical considerations subsection provided that details safeguarding measures employed with vulnerable population. Findings are triangulated adequately among data sources, but specific voices of beneficiaries are not mentioned, so it is not possible to identify the extent to which diverse vulnerable groups' perspectives are represented in the findings. Persons with disabilities (PWD) are mentioned in the findings and conclusions, and special emphasis is made on best practices on a program that directs its actions to guarantee the sexual and reproductive rights and the right to a life free of GBV for people with disabilities. The evaluation conclusions and recommendations are utilization-focused: the conclusions are concise and linked to each evaluation question, while recommendations are also specific and provide suggestions for their operationalization, making both useful for the evaluation's intended audience.

**Assessment Levels**

<b>Very Good</b> (blue box)	strong, above average, best practice	<b>Good</b> (green box)	satisfactory, respectable	<b>Fair</b> (yellow box)	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> (red box)	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)*

<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Very good</b>
--	----------------------	-------------------	------------------

*To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly*

<b>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)?</b>	Yes	The report is structured in a logical way with clear distinction between sections. It is easy to read with minimal grammatical/spelling errors.
<b>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)</b>	Yes	The report is of reasonable length at 63 pages excluding annexes.
<b>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)?</b>	Partial	The annexes include the ToR, Evaluation Matrix, list of people and institutions consulted and bibliography. Only one out of three data collection tools is included (the online questionnaire, however FGD/ interview protocols are not in the annexes).

*Executive summary*

<b>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?</b>	Yes	The Executive Summary is well written and serves as a standalone section. It includes all required information except for intended audience, though the audience is inferred given that this is a CPE.
<b>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</b>	Yes	The executive summary is reasonably concise and has a length of 5 pages.

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

*To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context*

<b>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	The developmental and institutional context for the implementation of the CPE in Ecuador is clearly explained, including the constraints faced.
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>	Yes	The results framework, built based on an internal exercise, is presented in Annex 6 in Excel.

*To ensure a rigorous design and methodology*

<b>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?</b>	Partial	The evaluation matrix is not mentioned in the main report. It is included in Annex 2, and it establishes evaluation questions and subquestions by criterion, assumptions, indicators and appropriate data sources, and methods for data collection. However, main findings are not included in the matrix. Moreover, data sources include "idem" instead of listing particular data sources, which would be expected to vary among criteria and subquestions.
---	---------	---

4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Partial	The tools for data collection are described. They include desk review, key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs) reaching 190 stakeholders. Only in the Annexes is it defined which interviews were individuals vs group interviews (but not in the main report). Seven focus groups were organized, in which 86 people participated in them, so it is thus assumed that the remaining 104 were KIIs. The report also describes the implementation of three online questionnaires that reached 150 informants. The rationale for their selection is briefly described, but it could have been explained in more detail.
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	The stakeholder map consists of a paragraph which lists the actors who were invited to either interviews or focus groups. This is suitable, though it is good practice to include a table, or graph, that summarizes the universe of possible stakeholders (not only those who were invited to participate). The consultation process is described for FGDs, semi-structured interviews and online questionnaires, though the consultation process for recommendations is not described. It is not clear from the descriptions whether vulnerable and marginalized groups participated in the evaluation. Annex 3 only describes FGDs participants as "youth collective, community vigilantes and women's group",
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	No	Qualitative and quantitative methods were used, though the methods of analysis are not described. The report only mentions "all of the information collected was ordered and systematized" in addition to the use of triangulation and validation techniques.
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Partial	The only perceived limitation noted in the report was the delay in meeting the schedule for data collection due to challenges with scheduling interviews with the Ministry of Public Health. However, there is no mention of a mitigation strategy. The report mentions that this challenge "did not affect the evaluability conditions, which were favourable for its exercise." Therefore, it is not clear if it was a limitation or not.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	No	There is no sampling strategy described. The report only mentions the map of actors interviewed or summoned in discussion groups, however its not clear how the selection of stakeholders, beneficiaries and other actors were selected.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	No	The methodology should allow for data disaggregation but there was no discussion about how this was done. Evaluation participants were not disaggregated by gender and/or disability status and the one data collection tool that was included in the annex did not have space to collect this information.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The evaluation methodology includes cross-cutting issues of gender and human rights. In particular, question 4 deals with prioritization of Leave No One Behind as a vulnerable group, and question 9 addresses gender-based inequities (primarily GBV).
<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Findings triangulate data across sources/methods. Multiple data sources are identified for each evaluation sub-question and the evaluation matrix shows a clear intention to collect triangulated data for each evaluation question.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Data sources are identified. In addition, the reliability of sources is briefly discussed in the methodology section. 86 FGDs, 104 KIIs and the online questionnaires were conducted.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	No	There is no ethical considerations subsection, the report only mentions the adherence to UNEG ethical guidelines. The evaluators appear to have consulted with beneficiaries in FGDs, some of whom appear to have been victims of GBV. In such cases, it would be been important for the evaluation to include special safeguards for consulting with this group.
<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	Findings are coherent and respond to each criteria and evaluation question with sufficient depth, presenting both strengths and weaknesses of Ecuador's CPE.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	Findings are thorough based on analysis of the evidence from different sources.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are structured along each criteria and evaluation questions.

4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	Causality is presented. Specifically, under effectiveness, cause-and-effect links are further explained. Although question 3 includes unintended outcomes, findings under that question do not clearly mention whether there were or were not any unintended outcomes.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Findings discuss the extent to which the CPE has reached vulnerable groups- especially women, adolescents and young people, as well as indigenous populations living on the northern border. Most of the sources, however, seem to derive from duty bearers.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Findings present an analysis of contextual factors affecting results achievement, specifically the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The analysis elaborates on cross-cutting issues, including UNFPA contributions to gender equity, GBV prevention, people with disabilities, indigenous and Afro-descendant population, among other groups. Such analysis derives from desk review, and consultation with duty bearers.
5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	Conclusions are drawn from findings, specifying respective evaluation criteria and the associated recommendations linked to 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 and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The nine conclusions reflect findings but also go beyond them. They are organized by two categories - strategic and programmatic level - and reflect cross-cutting issues. Conclusion 4 discusses women's empowerment amongst the GBV survivors. Conclusion 7 also discusses people with disabilities and the good practices implemented in the DECIDIMOS program.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The conclusions appear to have no biased judgement. They seem to be balanced and independent arguments.
6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>		
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Recommendations are linked to specific conclusions.
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	Each recommendation is targeted at different intended users and includes a brief description of the operational implications required to implement them.
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	The recommendations are balanced and impartial and include cross-cutting issues.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	The priority level of each recommendation is explicit (high or medium).
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>		

<p>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>	<p><b>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)</b> This was not evident in the evaluation objectives but the thematic scope directly addresses human rights, disability and gender. (2)</p> <p><b>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)</b> Gender and human rights were mainstreamed into other criteria through the evaluation questions, mainly under Efficiency and Coordination. (3)</p> <p><b>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3)</b> There are dedicated evaluation questions and related assumptions which address GEEW. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> Under effectiveness the evaluation notes the generation of high-quality, disaggregated data on LNOB populations (LGBTIQ+, women and girls, people with disabilities, indigenous and Afro-descendant populations, which are used in economic and social planning). (3)</p>
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>	<p><b>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)</b> The methodology notes how gender and inclusion were addressed. However, it is not clear if interviews were conducted with survivors and whether safeguarding measures had to be employed during FGDs (2)</p> <p><b>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analysing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3)</b> The evaluation takes a mixed-methods approach. However, the report does not include disaggregation by sex by any method of data collection. The process for selecting the sample was not described either. Similarly, it is unclear whether FGDs were conducted with women and men separately to gather their nuanced perspectives. (1)</p> <p><b>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3)</b> Triangulation methods were applied. However its not clear that all voices were given the same weight.(2)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation's participatory process included diverse stakeholders, however the sampling technique is not described. It is unclear the extent to which particularly vulnerable groups were consulted. (2)</p> <p><b>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3)</b> Ethical standards were referenced in general in terms of the adherence to UNEG standards, but not detailed. (1)</p>
<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p><b>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)</b> The context includes an adequate analysis of specific social groups, such as people with disabilities and the indigenous and afro descendent population. (3)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The findings provide disability and gender analysis. However, its unclear what weight was given to voices of different groups (especially beneficiaries). (2)</p> <p><b>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3)</b> There is no mention of unanticipated effects. (0)</p> <p><b>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)</b> The evaluation includes one recommendation (#9) that specifically address GEEW issues. (2)</p>

(\*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.  
(\*\*) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

**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	36	51	13	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	<b>Good</b>			
<b>The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.</b>				
<p style="text-align: center;">There is a sufficient analysis of gender issues, human rights and disability inclusion.</p>				
<b>Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)</b>				
<p>The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>				
<p>If yes, please explain:</p> <div style="background-color: #f0f0f0; height: 50px; width: 100%;"></div>				

