

## Title of evaluation report: Perú - Evaluación del Programa de País 2012-2016

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING:** Good

**Summary:** This is a generally good evaluation of the 2012-2016 Country Programme, using thorough data collection methods to show clearly the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the programme. It addressed weaknesses in the results framework and suggested a better way to describe and measure results. Its conclusions indicate that the programme has been successful, while pointing at several areas where improvements could be made. It makes a major effort of applying a results-based management approach. The recommendations are well connected to conclusions, and their implementation should be made easier by their prioritization and the systematic identification of their respective addressees.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>  <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i>            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>	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The structure is complete in terms of the standards and includes all of the recommended annexes. The drafting is clear and concise. In particular there is a very thorough and detailed evaluation matrix which indicates what questions needed to be answered, how this would be done and shows the data used for each.</p> <p>There are some general formatting issues that, if adjusted, would make the report cleaner. For example, the page numbers in the Table of Contents are not aligned and some of the content on page 178 is cut off due to the selected page orientation.</p>			
<p><b>2. Executive Summary</b>  <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i>            Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p>	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The executive summary contains all of the required information and is drafted as a stand-alone document that shows the results of the evaluation precisely and the</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>recommendations that follow. At 3 pages, it is within the standard.</p>
<p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b>  <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i>  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><i>Very Good</i></p> <p>The evaluation was carefully designed and met all of the standards. Evaluation questions were succinct and appear to respond to the requirements in the ToR for UNFPA Country Program Evaluations, though the ToR is not included as an annex. However, the report does note that the evaluation questions were changed slightly from those in the ToR. Techniques for data collection included: documents review, interviews with 130 stakeholders, focus groups and a questionnaire. However, the sampling methodology was not explained.</p> <p>The authors noted weaknesses with the results framework, which were addressed through the reformulation of the framework in collaboration with Key Informants, including the UNFPA Evaluation Manager. For example, the authors found that there were no indicators for gender and human rights in the framework, though this is a key focus, and crosscutting issues, of UNFPA. The authors thus developed indicators to operationalize this focus and assess UNFPA's progress towards achieving related goals. The authors also noted that the results matrix 'over-promised' on results that could be attributed to UNFPA's work.</p>
<p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b>  <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><i>Good</i></p> <p>The data sources are shown (and included in annexes) and are consistent with the methods employed. They are credible. Gender disaggregation was used as required.</p>

<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b>  <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;</li> <li>• Findings are substantiated by evidence;</li> <li>• Findings are presented in a clear manner</li> </ul> <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;</li> <li>• Contextual factors are identified.</li> <li>• Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The findings are thoroughly based on the evidence, including documents, interviews and field visits. They are structured around the evaluation questions and are clear. The authors report on both qualitative and quantitative data to validate many of the evaluation findings; for example, highlighting that UNFPA achieved 99% efficiency in fund disbursement but that several NGO partners reported delays in fund disbursement (though rare). The authors provided evidence-based rationale/contextual factors on the reasons for timely disbursements as well as programmatic examples of specific efficient interventions, such as the resupply of modern contraceptives to partners. The expansion of modern contraceptive offerings and the associated increase in government funding or contraceptive inputs is also cited as a response to the effectiveness of UNFPA activities.</p> <p>A weakness is that the source of the information on which the finding is based is not always clear (sometimes there is a footnote, others a reference to interviews). There is a consistent effort to show causal connections but not all cause and effect links are adequately explained and sources not all clearly identified. The context for the finding is always clear.</p>
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b>  <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><i>Good</i></p> <p>The conclusions are carefully linked to the findings (the specific ones on which the conclusion is based is shown in the summary). The conclusions are organized by evaluation question, but are connected to the recommendations which have a priority order. The conclusions are clearly based on the evaluators' judgment.</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b>  <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p>	<p><i>Good</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>The recommendations are connected clearly to the conclusions. They have been given a priority rating and the entity to which they are addressed is shown. The process involved consultations with stakeholders, although these consultations could probably have been made more explicit.</p>
<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b> 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><i>Good</i> The report meets all the requirements stated in the ToR. The authors identified deficiencies in the ToR and addressed them in their evaluation design.</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>	5	95		

**(\*)** 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