| **Organizational unit:** | | **Year of report:** | **2018** |

Title of evaluation report: EVALUACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA DE PAÍS DE UNFPA EN CUBA 2014-2018

Overall quality of report:

Very Good

Date of assessment: 10 November 2018

Overall comments: The evaluation report is assessed as "very good" because of a very strong methodology: the report carefully describes theory of change and uses a range of quality data, particularly of documents and extensive interviews, to show how well the program performed in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and monitoring and evaluation. The main weakness in the evaluation was in the recommendations, which though very sound but did not elaborate on the human, financial and technical requirements of their implementation.

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 _assessment level_ followed by main _comments_ . (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)		
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	**Good**
To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly			
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 in Spanish with no evident grammatical or other errors.	
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)	Partial	The main report (i.e. not including the tables of content, population data tables, references and similar) is 80 pages long, This is longer than is considered desirable for CPEs.	
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	Yes, the report is structured in a logical manner and follows UNFPA norms for structuring the report.	
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	Yes	The annexes on methodology are fully complete and follow guidelines carefully.	
Executive summary			
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 executive summary is clearly written and presents the main results, expressed as 11 conclusions and 8 recommendations.	
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 summary follows the recommended structure.	
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The executive summary is 4.5 pages long.	

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Very good

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context		
1. Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?	Yes	The target audience is the country office, the regional office and the government counterparts.
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	There is a clear indication of the broader context, as well as the specific role of UNFPA so that the role of the evaluation is clear. It is shown in Figure 1.
3. Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change, and assess the adequacy of these?	Yes	There is a clear reconstruction of the intervention logic, shown in Table 6 of the report.

To ensure a rigorous design and methodology		
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	Yes	The framework is fully described both in the text and in a very extensive evaluation matrix shown in Annex 1.
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	Yes, the data collection tools are described (documents, interviews, focus groups, survey and field observation). In each case, the reasons for using the tools were explained.
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)?	Yes	The stakeholder map is described in the text and stakeholders selected for interview/consultation were listed. In addition the initial results were discussed at a workshop for the Grupo de Referencia of the
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The evaluators described their method of analysis for each of the data sources (in section 1.3) and noted that there was a particular emphasis on triangulation for validity.
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	The main limitation is that the sample of sites to visit was limited, but in the discussion the use of document analysis to supplement was shown.
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	Yes, the report notes that, in Cuba, the entire universe of partners is essentially comprised of implementing partners, and, given the relatively low number, all were interviewed.

10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The disaggregated data is included in the document analysis, and is also available in the interviews.
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	An effort was made to ensure that the evaluation questions and the methodology would cover the cross-cutting issues including particularly gender.

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes				
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Triangulation was used extensively.		
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The evaluators were careful in selecting their data sources to ensure that the data would be reliable.		
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	There were two main limitations: response rates from the survey and the limited access for field missions, in part caused by time. The evaluators explained how they attempted to mitigate these (e.g. mostly through in-depth interviews).		
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	In describing the way in which data were collected, the evaluators discussed issues of ethics/discrimination.		

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To ensure sound analysis and credible findings				
I. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	In each case, by question, the evidence behind the finding is clear, including by footnotes showing the basis for the finding.		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The evaluators carefully describe the basis for interpretations.		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is organized by questions and within them by the specific sub-questions.		
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	In each case, the source of data, often in documents, other times from interviews are shown.		
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The evaluators are careful to show the causal links. There is less attention to unintended outcomes, although that is largely because		
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The evaluators distinguish by target groups. This is particularly the case with outcomes for youth, as well as more broadly, for women.		
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors are always presented in the analysis.		
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The evaluation is careful to address cross-cutting issues in each question.		

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Very good**
To assess the validity of conclusions				
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The connection with the findings is shown in the presentation and the linkages are clear.		
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 evaluators show the larger picture in which the findings are embedded.		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgment?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions.		

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	**Fair**
To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations				
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The links with the conclusions are shown in each recommendation.		
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The recommendation targets are clearly indicated (mostly the country office but also LACRO), are given priority and include actions that should be taken. The information on implications is not, however,		
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations are balanced.		
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Partial	Some of the recommendations are for the next planning period, but for most the timeframe is not given.		
5. Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	Yes	The recommendations are given priority and are clearly presented.		

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?	3	GEEW is a major part of the evaluation scope.
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?	3	The questions are set up to address GEEW.
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2	The analysis includes gender-response tools where relevant.
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3	Gender is built into the conclusions and the recommendations that flow from them.

(*) 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	82	7	11	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very 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: