

Organizational unit:		Year of report:	2019
Title of evaluation report:	EVALUACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA PAÍS PARAGUAY VII CICLO DE COOPERACIÓN 2015-2019		
Overall quality of report:	Good	Date of assessment:	29 April 2019
Overall comments:	The evaluation report is well-written and easy to understand, with minimal spelling/grammatical errors and a clear and organized structure. The methodology, discussion of findings and conclusions are, on the whole, comprehensive, demonstrating the application of triangulation and consideration of the national context (including the effects of conservative forces on reproductive health and services) and cross-cutting issues such as gender, vulnerability, and human rights throughout the evaluation process. However, the evaluation did not make explicit any limitations to the methodology or with the data, which affected the overall rating of the report.		
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	Yes, the report is clear and easy to read.	
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 report slightly exceeds the maximum for Country Programme Evaluations at 78 pages, however, the report is organized well, including summaries of findings and graphics, and therefore does not extend beyond what is reasonable.	
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, including distinct sections for findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.	
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 annexes are very thorough, containing all required documentation.	
<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 executive summary is concise and clear, presenting the main results of the evaluation, with recommendations presented in a box (helping the reader focus on/distinguish them).	
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 executive summary includes all the sections listed in the sub-criteria.	
7. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The summary is 3 pages and is well-written and concise.	
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	While the report did not formally indicate the target audience, implicitly it was the Country Office of UNFPA since the objective was "el diseño del próximo ciclo de programación 2020-2024". The ToR annexed to the evaluation report also describes the audience for the evaluation.	
2. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The development and institutional context in which the evaluation was conducted, and of the country programme, are clearly explained in independent sections and referenced throughout the report.	
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 evaluation team described the theory of change / intervention logic, which was seen as sound and not requiring reconstruction. It was derived from the results matrix in the terms of reference as well as the country programme documents. Table 3 showed the connection between UNFPA actions and results, although these were shown as "productos" rather than outcomes and tended to emphasize capacity development rather than concrete actions by those assisted.	
<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 described in the text and is presented in detail in Annex 2. The evaluation matrix is clear and provides all required information.	
5. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The evaluation uses a mixed-method approach, and the data collection methods are described.	
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 a stakeholder map, but there is no discussion on how key stakeholders were consulted as part of the evaluation process overall (though consultation with the UNFPA Country Office was noted in specific moments - vis a vis the terms of reference, sample selection, and preparation of data collection tools (p11-12).	
7. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	There is a clear description of the analysis methods provided on page 10 of the evaluation report and in Figure 1.	

8. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? (Does the report discuss how any bias has been overcome?)	Partial	The methodological limitations described are limited, primarily focusing on the effects of the conservative political context on UNFPA country programme as well as the evaluation, but not making any reference to how evaluators overcame risks and potential bias.
9. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The determination of who to interview by stakeholder category was from the terms of reference (with the country office providing a list) described on p. 11. A list of those interviewed is included in Annex 4 (Mapeo de socios/contrapartes entrevistados/as). However, the overall approach to sampling (why an individual/group was selected etc.) is not described. Similarly, the approach used to select site visits is not described.
10. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The methodology allows for the collection of disaggregated data, and this is reflected in the data collection tools and stakeholder map.
11. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The sections on methodology and how this was applied to findings show that gender, sexual and reproductive rights, and multiculturalism were considered within the data collection methodology and the analysis done.
3. Reliability of Data		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Fair
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The evaluators were careful to triangulate data.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	For each finding, the evaluators used data that were reliable, whether qualitative or quantitative.
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?	Partial	There is no discussion of potential bias from primary and secondary sources, however, there is discussion on gaps in data about particular groups (for example, indigenous groups). A more developed section on bias and limitations within the methodology would have strengthened this evaluation report (Criterion 2.8)
4. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	The evaluators noted that their interviews were confidential and collection aligned with ethical standards (e.g. "Las transcripciones de las entrevistas están en una matriz Excel disponible solamente para la gerencia de la evaluación, por razones de privacidad y ética con las personas entrevistadas (Anexo 6: Transcripción de Entrevistas)."
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	The evaluators were very thorough in showing the basis for their findings. Findings are substantiated by multiple sources, demonstrating the application of triangulation throughout the evaluation process based on the data to be obtained as indicated in the evaluation matrix. The 'sustainability' section is particularly well-written, demonstrating a clear analysis of risks, contexts, and assumptions. For each assumption/indicator or evaluation question in the evaluation matrix, the evaluators indicated the multiple sources and multiple methods used, and then this was also reflected in the report in the discussion of findings.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis (that is, the type of data and source) of the analysis was clearly described. For example, the evaluation claimed that UNFPA had contributed to the reduction of maternal and neonatal mortality rates in Paraguay through strengthening human resources, increasing efficiency in services and access to adolescent friendly services, and improving the service registry, and the report substantiated this claim with stakeholder agreement found within interviews.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The evidence is presented against the evaluation questions.
4. Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?	Yes	The analysis is clear about the sources and particularly about quality.
5. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	The evaluation largely did well to highlight cause and effect links between UNFPA's interventions and intended results through data collected, triangulating data gathered from documents, with direct quotes from interviewed stakeholders substantiating the claims made in secondary sources. For example, evaluators are careful to show the actions taken by UNFPA and the change that resulted. They were careful to note when the result was less than expected and why this was the case. There was no note on unexpected outcomes, only on expected. However, there were some instances in the report where links and interpretations were not carefully described. For example, the evaluation presented data on indicators, such as "100% compliance observed" amongst trained health personnel to implement the updated family planning standards, which exceeded targets. However, the observations of family health units and adolescent-friendly services revealed that services and facilities did not meet quality standards, specifically noting a gap in human resources (i.e. the 5 units visited all did not demonstrate even 80% compliance according to the evaluation observation checklist, p32). While the pathway towards compliance and quality services was clear, the strength of the evidence/interpretation of evidence was problematic in this case. Further clarification should be provided on the difference between observed compliance in the field and reported compliance in the results framework, and how compliance bolsters, or hinders, progress towards decreased maternal mortality rates.
6. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The evaluation methodology and report incorporates and compares the perspectives of diverse stakeholders, including government ministry officials, the civil service, as well as students, teachers, and mothers associated with schools delivering comprehensive sex education as a result of UNFPA's work.
7. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The contextual factors were always shown. An example is the effect that a more conservative government had on some of the actions taken and the results achieved.
8. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The analysis was careful to address all of the cross-cutting issues. For example, observations of adolescent-friendly health services revealed that facilities/services were not accessible for persons with motor or sensory disabilities.

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	In describing the conclusions there is clear reference to the findings.		
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 are divided between programmatic and strategic and, take into account the underlying issues of the system, particularly the relationship of the UNFPA country office with the government and with other UN system organizations. The conclusions incorporate a discussion and understanding of contextual factors impacting upon progress, such as conservative political agendas and/or the efficient distribution and integration of knowledge/data gained from research to partners/stakeholders.		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	Because they are clearly based on findings, they reflect an unbiased judgment.		
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 flow logically from the conclusions, though they are not directly linked through numeric codes (as is frequently applied in other evaluations).		
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, they are quite general, using words such as 'strengthening' but not delineating how nor providing information on the human, financial and technical implications. The only apparent intended user is the UNFPA Country Office, although in one case headquarters could be a target. The implications are not always clear nor the time horizon.		
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial?	Yes	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial, flowing from the findings and conclusions.		
4. Is a timeframe for implementation proposed?	Partial	The timeframe is not always clear. Some are directed toward the next country programme while others seem to be for immediate use going forward.		
5. Are the recommendations prioritized and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?	No	There is no prioritization of the recommendations. The recommendations are not presented in a way to facilitate a management response in either the executive summary or report body.		
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?	2	The data collection tools and matrices are mostly designed in a way to ensure GEEW-related data are collected. Evaluation criteria and questions specifically address GEEW, with indicators designed in a way to capture the extent to which the country programme was gender responsive. For example, one indicator requires the evaluators to collect information on "actions and instruments that show that people from disadvantaged groups are recognized as rights holders." However the indicators do not explicitly require sex disaggregation on data collected from "recipients" of services or other stakeholders, which would have strengthened the gender analysis.		
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	3	The evaluation methodology was gender-responsive, including using a mixed methods approach to data collection (which featured focus groups and observations). The observation checklists clearly reflected a consideration of gender and intent to conduct a gender analysis. According to the evaluation report, focus groups consisted of persons with similar profiles to ensure equal participation and mitigate against power imbalances. As a result of the methodology chosen, the report was able to suggest that perceptions and behaviors defining 'masculinity' should be further integrated into country programme approaches, and that 'GEEW' should be further mainstreamed into M&E activities and programme approaches.		
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	2	The youth interviewed are primarily female, which has potential to affect the ability to conduct a comprehensive gender analysis that captures the differences in perspectives on gender issues and access to services, though homogeneity in focus group respondents did not emerge as a limitation. The evaluation highlights the lack of data on specific, vulnerable groups (such as girls under 15 years and indigenous people) and how this affects UNFPA's, as well as the evaluation's, ability to develop strategies based on a robust gender analysis. Recommendations are in place within the evaluation report to expand collection and use of gender disaggregated data so as to be able to respond to the diverse needs of vulnerable groups.		
<p>(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. 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).</p> <p>(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).</p> <p>0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.</p> <p>1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.</p> <p>2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.</p> <p>3 = Fully integrated. Applies when all of the elements under a criterion are met, used and fully integrated in the evaluation and no remedial action is required.</p>				
Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment				
	Assessment Levels (*)			
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	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	18	47	35	
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: