

# Title of evaluation report: EVALUACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA DE PAÍS DEL UNFPA 2012 – 2016: HONDURAS

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good**

**Summary:** The evaluation of the country programme provides a thorough analysis of the factors underlying UNFPA’s work in a complex political environment and draws conclusions particularly about how better, in future, to assess results. It has an innovative lessons learned section that expands on these issues, and draws conclusions and recommendations on how to improve effectiveness in the next period. The evaluation has a carefully defined results matrix that has guided the collection and analysis of data.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b></p> <p><i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i></p> <p>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>		<b>Good</b>		
		<p>The report reads well and includes all of the elements necessary for a good evaluation. The description of the national context is clear and the annexes include elements, like the Matriz de Indicadores y Resultados that provide a useful detailed supplement to the main report. A list of people consulted during the evaluation is however missing in the annexes. Links built into the document make its electronic version particularly useful. Methodology is not afforded a standalone section, however this does not limit the clarity given the level of detail provided. More details on the methodological tools used would have been useful. Although not requested in the ToR, the evaluation includes a detailed section on lessons learned.</p>		

<p><b>2. Executive Summary</b></p> <p><i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i></p> <p>Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p> <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 Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <p>The executive summary is a stand-alone document of three pages, covering all of the required text. It clearly describes the conclusions and recommendations. However, the content included on the methodological choices is relatively light, with only a brief indication of techniques and little detail.</p>
<p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b></p> <p><i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i></p> <p>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></p> <p>The evaluation was well-designed based on the use of a logical framework that clearly set out the information to be gathered. Methodological choices are described and explained in detail, including document review, key informant interviews, structured/open interviews, and focus groups. Constraints and limitations of the methodology are described where appropriate. The report presents a map of stakeholder per results area (table 9). However, criteria for the selection of informants and beneficiary sites were not clearly discussed. The basis for selecting persons to be interviewed was largely based on partners. The consultation process was designed to ensure participation. Annex 3 (8.3 instruments) presents a brief, abstract description of the purpose of different possible tools for data collection. However it does not present the tools developed for this particular evaluation, e.g. interview guides, group discussion guides are not available. Triangulation was applied as a means to bypass some problems with data access limitation. Details are presented on how gender was addressed as a cross-cutting issue for the evaluation.</p>

	<p>The agenda of the mission is presented in Annex 8.5 However, a list of people interviewed/consulted, including position organized per type of stakeholder is not available.</p>
<p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b></p> <p><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>Poor</b></p> <p>Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have not been systematically identified (included in footnotes) across the findings section of the report. This said, the evaluation matrix, provides an indication that different data sources have been used. However, the evaluation matrix does not provide the factual basis to back up the analysis contained in the findings chapter.</p> <p>In addition, some key limitation of data are noted, as well as how they were addressed. Of particular interest is the note that “La disponibilidad de información de procesos, de efectos directos y de productos para realizar el debido análisis, así como de la información básica para los indicadores: líneas de base y metas (en caso de considerarse pertinente). Por ello, en la metodología para el análisis de eficacia en la implementación del CP se introdujeron técnicas metodológicas cualitativas que permitan conocer posibles debilidades instituciones u otras circunstancias que limiten la capacidad para generar información clave sobre los indicadores de referencia. Se buscó en algunos casos información secundaria que permitió construir <i>ad hoc</i> los datos básicos para el cálculo del indicador.”</p> <p>Since one of the program areas analyzed is gender equality, gender disaggregated data is used throughout.</p>

## 5. Findings and Analysis

*To ensure sound analysis and credible findings*

### Findings

- Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;
- Findings are substantiated by evidence;
- Findings are presented in a clear manner

### Analysis

- 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.

## Good

The findings are structured around the 16 evaluation questions set out in the ToR. The findings for each are derived from the analysis of data collected using the methodology set out. For most, a research model is used, connecting independent variable with dependent variables through activities and then noting observations. This is innovative but has the defect of making causal connections less easy, something that the evaluators noted in their methodology. The evaluators had to contend with a country programme in which what are called outputs are what the government produces and the outcomes are what is supposed to happen when the government produces the output. The causal connection with UNFPA output (which are called activities in the results design) is with the government outputs. This is not an unreasonable approach and, in the results matrix in the annex, these connections are shown. The evaluation is careful to note when UNFPA support (either in terms of material, funding or technical advice) can be said to have an effect and when not (and why not).

Within this, the analysis is carefully done and the findings can be sustained and causal connections are realistic. Findings are contextualized by the context/status, programmatic response, and theoretical model (when appropriate); e.g. through emergency, programmatic response, and logic of intervention defined (p48).

<p><b>6. Conclusions</b></p> <p><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></p> <p>The conclusions are organized by focus (strategic, operational and transversal) and are directly supported by the findings. In one case, the conclusion on effectiveness is general, noting that one problem is that expected results and their indicators, were not well-defined. This was addressed separately in conclusions about monitoring and evaluation, the system for which was classified as "moderado" rather than "bueno". While the conclusions are structured differently than the findings, their structure draws on the findings (strategic level draws heavily on findings on relevance, for example). Programmatic level conclusions draw heavily on findings on effectiveness as well as relevance. What are called cross-cutting issues derive from findings about monitoring and evaluation, among other things. The connections are clear enough that it would not be necessary to footnote the findings. Conclusions appear to represent evaluator's unbiased judgment of the intervention, with discussion including limitations (e.g. Conclusion 14 on Program Officer time/resource constraints).</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b></p> <p><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' consultations whilst remaining impartial;</li> <li>• Recommendations should be presented in priority order</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b></p> <p>Like the conclusions from which they flow, the recommendations are organized by strategic and operational levels and transversal aspects. They are given either priority 1 or 2 and most are directed to the country office. All of the programmatic recommendations are given highest priority. There are several recommendations for improving the M&amp;E system with a combination of priorities (in order). The recommendations were consulted with counterparts and their observations included.</p>

<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>The evaluation report responds to the ToR, but improves on it, having made suggestions about issues of outcome and output definition, indicators and by adding a lessons learned section.</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>		95	5	

(\*) 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