# EQA for UNFPA Uruguay Country Programme Evaluation (2011-2015)

**Title of evaluation report: EVALUACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA DE PAÍS DEL UNFPA EN URUGUAY 2011/2015**

**OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Good**

**Summary:** The evaluation report covers a programme that is a Delivering as One pilot, rather than a standard country programme evaluation. With a sound structure and good design, the findings are expressed clearly, and there is an effort to connect what UNFPA interventions with intended results. The report nevertheless has problems with presenting some findings since the data on which the findings are based is at times missing from the main report (but located in an annex). As a result, the conclusions are rather general, but the recommendations are specific and operational and address some of the problems with data availability that has affected the findings and analysis. Despite limitations, the report has been rated as good quality.

| Quality Assessment criteria | Assessment Levels | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | **Very good** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting** *To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.* Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure: <br> • 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) <br> • Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used. | **Good** Overall, the report is logically structured, comprehensive and well written, in a clear and concise manner. The evaluation report contains all of the recommended content. The annexes are thorough and show the sources of data in detail. | | | |
| **2. Executive Summary** *To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.* | **Good** The executive summary is a stand-along and contains all of the necessary information within the specified length. The only weakness | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):<br>• 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. | is that the recommendations are shown in more detail than necessary, but this does not detract from the quality of this section. |
| **3. Design and Methodology**<br>*To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools*<br>Minimum content and sequence:<br>• Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;<br>• Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;<br>• Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;<br>• Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided;<br>• Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation. | **Good**<br>The design is solid and is consistent with international norms. The questions are limited to seven, in line with recommended standards, and the evaluation matrix clearly details what should be measured. The evaluators, having found the original logic model unsatisfactory, elaborated a more effective one to be used in the evaluation. The data collection method is a combination of very solid document analysis, well-focused interviews and focus groups and a carefully-explained selection process (including a few limitations in terms of the final beneficiary population where in one case interviews were difficult to arrange).<br>Triangulation has been applied systematically and there were stakeholder consultations at the design stage and when initial findings were presented. Cross-cutting issues, in particular human rights and gender, have been consciously dealt with. |
| **4. Reliability of Data**<br>*To clarify data collection processes and data quality*<br>• Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;<br>• Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit;<br>• Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary. | **Good**<br>Data sources have been identified throughout the analysis in the report. The interview protocols were designed to ensure that necessary data were acquired. Limitations were explained clearly. |
| **5. Findings and Analysis**<br>*To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* | **Good** |

| | |
|---|---|
| Findings<br>• Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;<br>• Findings are substantiated by evidence;<br>• Findings are presented in a clear manner<br>Analysis<br>• Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;<br>• Contextual factors are identified.<br>• Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained. | The findings are structured according to the evaluation questions and within them by programme area. The findings are expressed clearly. There is an effort to connect what UNFPA interventions with intended results. Contextual factors are carefully described.<br>The sources of data for the findings, in many cases, are missing from the main text, but can be found in Annex VI (completed evaluation matrix). For example, the evaluation report stated (p. 46) that "Un tercer logro sustantivo de la Oficina de País fue su aporte a la legitimación y el desarrollo de un marco de sentido en educación sexual con enfoque de derechos humanos entre actores gubernamentales y sociales. El UNFPA promovió alianzas para la implementación de la educación sexual y vinculó a diferentes actores, logrando el involucramiento de contrapartes gubernamentales en las acciones e instancias de seguimiento (tales como la Comisión). Este logro tuvo como efecto derivado el fortalecimiento del diálogo multiactoral y de la agenda de políticas, al jerarquizar tópicos que ya estaban presentes pero que cobraron un perfil más destacado." The source of data for this conclusion is not presented in the text, although it is included in the Annex.<br>In a few cases, the causal connection with the result was doubtful. For example, the completion of the 2011 Census was shown as a result of UNFPA assistance, but the connection was not clear in the text (p. 50). However in the Annex it is noted that there was financing provided for the Census and that activities to publicize its results by briefing journalists were undertaken. In cases like this, the evaluation should have presented the data more clearly in order to support the findings. |
| **6. Conclusions**<br>*To assess the validity of conclusions*<br>• Conclusions are based on credible findings;<br>• Conclusions are organized in priority order; | **Good**<br>The conclusions are clearly linked to findings and reflect the evaluators' judgment based on their analysis.<br>The conclusions tend to be more general than recommended, given the findings. For example, the conclusion on effectiveness is "La |

| | |
|---|---|
| • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. | Oficina de País fue eficaz en su accionar y obtuvo logros en áreas que son clave para la CIPD. De todas maneras, llevó a cabo algunas intervenciones de menor eficacia relativa en lo referido a la sensibilización y capacitación de efectores que se desempeñan en el nivel operativo de los servicios de SSR y educativos". <br><br> However, the conclusions are not presented in priority order. |
| **7. Recommendations** <br> *To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations* <br> • Recommendations flow logically from conclusions; <br> • Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible; <br> • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; <br> • Recommendations should be presented in priority order | **Good** <br> The recommendations are logical and address issues raised in the analysis, and are based on the conclusions. They are strategic and targeted and have been given relative priority. The extent to which they take stakeholders' consultations into account is not clear, but there is evidence that this took place. |
| **8. Meeting Needs** <br> To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & 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. | **Good** <br> The report responds to the requirements in the ToR, and the evaluators made an effort to improve the presentation of expected results. |

| 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) | | 2 | | |
| 4. Reliability of data (5) | | 2 | | |
| 5. Findings and analysis (50) | | 50 | | |
| 6. Conclusions (12) | | 12 | | |
| 7. Recommendations (12) | | 12 | | |
| 8. Meeting needs (12) | | 12 | | |
| TOTAL | | 100 | | |

(*) 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: Good**