

Organization Unit:		Year of report:	2019
Title of evaluation	EVALUACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA DE PAÍS DEL UNFPA: Venezuela		
Overall quality of	Good	Date of assessment:	10 April 2019
Overall comments:	This is a good evaluation of a country programme with solid methodologies working in a complex political environment. The evaluation details the context, including the effects of the political environment, and how this has impacted UNFPA's work. Through the use of a sound methodology, the evaluation report was able to capture how UNFPA has been able to compensate for many of the limitations and take a lead role among UN system organizations in the country. The report also captured UNFPA contribution to a pilot project on adolescent health taking place in a rural municipality .		

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 <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u> . (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 easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors?	Yes	The report is well-written.	
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	The text is 63 pages plus three pages for the executive summary.	
3. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Yes	The report is structured in a logical way and follows the expected structure.	
4. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys) as well as information on the stakeholder consultation process?	Yes	The eight appendices include the information.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
5. Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?	Yes	The summary is included as a standalone section and is well-drafted.	
6. Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?	Yes	The structure is followed.	
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	It is just over 3 pages long.	
2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level: Fair
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The main target audience is the UNFPA country office, although others are also mentioned.	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The development and institutional context is described; the context is particularly complex because of the political situation in the country.	
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	The text of the evaluation report discusses the intervention logic, and there is also an Appendix that describes it in detail.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
4. 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 framework is well-described in the text and the evaluation matrix shows how the eight evaluation questions were selected.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	Data collection tools are listed (including document analysis, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and a field visit for a case study). They are well-described and their choice justified.	
6. 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)?	No	There was no comprehensive stakeholder map and the consultation process is not described.	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methods of analysis are described in detail.	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	The limitations are described, mostly in terms of access to interviewees including, in the case study, problems with electrical failures that forced rescheduling interviews.	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	Yes, a purposive approach to sampling was used. The evaluators note that it is not representative, but that they used triangulation to improve validity.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Yes, data collection methods, particularly the interviews and desk research as described, enables collection and analysis of disaggregated data.	
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The evaluation's methodology was able to capture cross-cutting issues, including both gender equality and human rights, by using data disaggregated by gender, ensuring that interviews included persons with knowledge about the cross-cutting issues, and by including these issues as expected results to be measured.	

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	The data were consistently triangulated.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The quantitative data came from reports while the qualitative were from a large number of interviews and focus groups.	
3. Did the evaluation make explicit any possible limitations (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The evaluation noted that the sample of interviews was purposive and that some of the work in the field was affected by political conflicts and economic issues; the evaluation explained how it mitigated/worked around these limitations.	
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	While the report does not explicitly discuss how the evaluators ensured that data was collected ethically and non-discriminatory, there is no evidence of bias. Additionally, data was acquired and presented anonymously (and with regards to confidentiality), suggesting compliance with minimal ethical standards.	

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	Yes, the findings are substantiated by evidence, including data from reports and monitoring systems and interviews.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretation is always described.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis was presented first by criteria and then within it by evaluation question. Each evaluation question was answered in the analysis.	
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The sources of data are clearly expressed (either documents or interviews) in each finding and the evaluators noted their quality in each finding.	
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	The analysis focuses on what is termed "productos" rather than outcomes; the evaluation was not able to analyze the contribution of UNFPA to outcomes; in addition, for some of the findings (in "effectiveness"), what UNFPA itself did is not always clear. Several unintended consequences were mentioned as well as outcomes that were not included in the analysis because data were not available on those types of outcomes but could have been usefully included in the evaluation if the data had been available.	
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Partial	The analysis showed differentiated outcomes for adolescents, but for others it is less clear.	
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors, including particularly the political and economic situation of the country, are integrated into the analysis.	
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues, particularly gender equality, are built into the data collection and analysis of the evaluation. For example, there is a section on findings about gender and women's empowerment, based on document analysis: "Público, el Tribunal Supremo de Justicia (TSJ) y la Defensa Pública. De acuerdo con datos de la Defensoría del Pueblo, en el tercer Programa de País se formó a 361 funcionarios/as en aspectos específicos de la LODMVLV [Ley Orgánica por el Derecho de las Mujeres a una Vida Libre de Violencia]: denuncia, flagrancia, violencia institucional, victimización secundaria, culpabilización de la víctima."	

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	For each conclusion the findings to which they relate is noted; additionally, the conclusion text is aligned with how the questions were answered in the findings section.	
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated?	Yes	The conclusions express a wider view than the individual findings and further contextualize the findings, placing them within a broader context.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions.	

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	They are clearly linked to the conclusions and in each case indicate the relevant conclusion.	
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	Each recommendation specifies who is the implementer, the priority and, more importantly the recommendations include specific actions that the user could take to implement the recommendation. For example, to implement recommendation 2 on developing strategies to confront emerging threats, one of the actions would be to collaborate with universities and academic centers to generate evidence about the threats, by way of research programs or projects.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	There is no indication that the recommendations are partial/biased.	
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Yes	They are directed to the formulation of the next country programme.	
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	There are nine recommendations, of which seven are high priority and two are medium. They are drafted to allow for a management response.	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>			

1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	3	GEEW is integrated into the scope of analysis and reflected in the indicators of the evaluation matrix. For example, under evaluation question one the following indicator was used: "Productos que incorporan un enfoque de género, DDHH e interculturalidad consistente con la CIPD, el Consenso de Montevideo y los ODS." Additionally, under evaluation question 2, gender equality is included in a hypothesis the evaluation is testing: "UNFPA ha contribuido a la formulación y la implementación de leyes y políticas que favorecen el acceso de las y los adolescentes y jóvenes a servicios de SSR de calidad y con enfoque de derechos, género e interculturalidad."
2. Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved?	2	Three of the twenty-five evaluation questions shown in the Annex 3 Evaluation matrix (1, 11 and 19) address GEEW specifically, and gender is considered in other evaluation questions (through the specific indicators selected).
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2	The interview and focus group questionnaires and guides all include a gender component to ensure that the interview or discussion includes gender. For example, within Annex 8, for interviews with teachers or health personnel trained during the program, the following question was asked: "after the training, did you feel any change in your own way of thinking or working? In which aspects? Does that include your perception of sexual education, gender-based violence and access to sexual and reproductive health services?" A mixed methods methodology was used, and triangulation was used, as well - two additional elements of a gender responsive methodology.
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3	Several conclusions and four of the recommendations make specific reference to gender.

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool, see Annex 7. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totalling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).

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	40	47	13	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report		Good		
	Very good very confident to use	Good confident to use	Fair use with caution	Unsatisfactory not confident to use

(*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column).

(b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair').

(c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

If the overall assessment is 'Fair', please explain

• How it can be used?

The fair rating is based on unevenness in the evaluation design and in its applications in terms of findings. While the weaknesses of the methods and findings need to be considered, the fact that the conclusions are strong and clearly expressed, suggests that the evaluation can be used to help design the next country program.

• What aspects to be cautious about?

Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory

Consideration of significant constraints

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

Yes No

If yes, please explain: