

Organizational unit:		Year of report:	2018
Title of evaluation report:	Evaluación Final del VI Programa País Ecuador 2015-2018		
Overall quality of report:	Good	Date of assessment:	27 January 2018
Overall comments:	The evaluation assesses the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the Country Program well and takes gender into account very well. There are some issues in the report, however, including in sampling, establishing / delineating causal connections and the time frame for recommendations, but on the whole the evaluation is good.		

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)		
I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level: Fair
<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	Yes, the report is well-drafted.	
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	Yes, it is of reasonable length - it is 69 pages long, not including annexes.	
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 follows the standard structure, including all expected sections.	
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	Yes, the annexes meet the criterion listed in the sub-criteria.	
<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	It is written as a stand-alone document and includes the main 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	Yes, the executive summary follows this structure clearly.	
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	No	It is 8 pages long. Some aspects, like methodology, are copied directly from the main document rather than being summarized, leading to the longer than desired length.	

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 evaluation report does not describe specifically its target audience, although it implicitly targets UNFPA's country office. The target audience is specified in detail in the terms of reference in the Annex.	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The national context for the issues with which UNFPA deals is carefully explained, using, among other things both statistics and data from UNFPA-financed studies. It also describes the role of international cooperation. In so doing, it also indicates constraints that exist.	
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 intervention logic as used by the program is shown, especially in Table I on results, output and indicators, and in the first part of the results section. It is also shown in appendix 4. The evaluators noted that they then reconstructed the logic, stating that "Esta reconstrucción se realizó con la información obtenida de entrevistas a personal del UNFPA, socios, actores y destinatarios del Programa. Los hallazgos y conclusiones generales permitieron validar las hipótesis." The evaluators used this to design data collection.	
<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 questions are shown clearly along with data sources and methods.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	There are five tools: document analysis, an on-line survey, semi-structured interviews, focus groups and site visits. They noted two phases: in the first they included a survey which provided data that could be used in the second phase, which was more robust.	
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)?	Partial	There is no stakeholder map described in the text, although the evaluation notes that one was prepared by the UNFPA office and presumably used. There was also a reference group which functioned throughout the evaluation which reviewed the design and the draft recommendations.	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	The methods for analysis using each type of data are shown in the methodology section, and are also reflected in the findings section.	
8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Yes	Limitations are noted. There was no evidence of bias that needed to be addressed.	
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The number of persons or sites selected in each of the four data sources are presented. It is a purposive sample based on the stakeholder map developed by the country office. How individuals were chosen from each category however is not detailed.	
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Yes, the data collection methods used (the questionnaires shown in Appendix 5) show that disaggregation by type of stakeholder and location is possible (and was used in the findings).	

11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Human rights and gender equality are fully built into the design. For example the questions shown in Appendix 5 for semi-structured interviews for beneficiaries and government counterparts include "¿Piensa que el apoyo de UNFPA ha contribuido a generar cambios en el país en cuanto a los derechos sexuales y reproductivos, a la equidad de género y prevención-atención de la VBG? ¿Cuáles y explique cuál ha sido el rol de UNFPA en estos temas?
--	-----	--

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	Effort was made to consistently triangulate data that is described in detail.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The sources of data were well-described and reliable; the evaluation used the data properly.
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 limitations of data sources was clearly described, although there were few data gaps. There is a clear description of how the data were obtained and any limitations noted by the evaluators.
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	There was a reference to UNFPA ethical standards in the ToR but there were no references in the text. However, there was no evidence that data were not collected with the expected sensitivity.

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------

To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The evaluators made a thorough analysis of data from different sources leading to the findings in each case. For example, in a finding about the effectiveness of training, the evaluators state "Las personas participantes en grupos focales con las organizaciones juveniles que se realizaron en Sucumbíos y en Esmeraldas, coincidieron en identificar los efectos positivos de la capacitación, en su vida personal y en la adquisición de herramientas de incidencia en otros grupos."
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretation was clear in all cases. For example, in a finding on improving capacity for strengthening an integrated approach to sexual and reproductive health, the evaluators note "La investigación de Costos de Omisión en Salud Sexual y Reproductiva en Ecuador fue destacada a lo largo de las entrevistas como una herramienta eficaz para incidir a nivel político y para facilitar la articulación entre la sociedad civil y el estado. La investigación es reciente y, por ende, la posibilidad de potenciar sus efectos constituye una agenda a seguir para el UNFPA Ecuador."
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings were organized by criterion and, within each, by the evaluation questions.

4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The evaluation was uniquely clear about the sources of data. A large number of findings were supported by quantitative analysis of the on-line survey results, while others clearly noted the focus groups as a source of data.
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	The causal connection is not always shown between support provided (such as training courses, technical advice and reproductive health supplies and equipmenta) and subsequent outputs (of which there are five, mostly having to do with improved capacity), as well as whether the outputs have contributed to the expected outcomes. The lessons learned section notes this problem as well.
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The evaluators were careful to show which target groups were affected and therefore indicated differences in outcomes (such as for youth, or in other cases, mothers).
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The analysis was careful to show contextual factors in each finding.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Gender and human rights were a concern throughout. An example is a finding related to Producto 3: "La investigación de Costos de Omisión en Salud Sexual y Reproductiva en Ecuador fue destacada a lo largo de las entrevistas como una herramienta eficaz para incidir a nivel político y para facilitar la articulación entre la sociedad civil y el estado. La investigación es reciente y, por ende, la posibilidad de potenciar sus efectos constituye una agenda a seguir para el UNFPA Ecuador."

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	The conclusions flow from the findings and are divided into two groups: strategic and programmatic.	
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 combine and summarize the findings in a way that shows clearly what has happened and why.	
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
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations are clearly connected to and flow from the conclusions.	
2. Are the recommendations clearly written, targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	While the recommendations are clearly written and targeted, there is little information on the human, financial and, in most cases, technical implications of the particular recommendations.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations are balanced and impartial and have been reviewed by the reference group.	

4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Partial	In some cases, the recommendations have a time frame, but in others there is no timeframe 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 prioritized and directed specifically to either the country office or the regional office. A management response would be possible in each case.

7. Gender	0 1 2 3	Assessment Level:	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?	2	A major element of the CDP was violence against women, as well as maternal mortality and the design of the evaluation was able to capture gender related data. The evaluation also deals with gender equality in the broader sense.
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	Gender was a major focus of the evaluation. While most of the evaluation questions did not mention gender as such, at least one under the evaluation criteria effectiveness dealt with gender-based violence that was a major focus of the programme.
3. Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?	2	The data collection and analysis was gender-responsive in terms of the gender issues dealt with, especially gender-based violence. There was also an effort to ensure methods were gender responsive. The focus groups and interview guides included gender-related questions and there was an effort to obtain interviews that were gender-balanced.
4. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	2	While gender was generally reflected, the findings, conclusions and recommendations tended to be more general.

(*) 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	22	47	31	
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?

- 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: