EQA for Evaluación del programa de país Paraguay 2007-2012

Title of evaluation report: Evaluación del programa de país Paraguay 2007-2012

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: The evaluation is thorough and responds to the key questions asked. It is particularly effective in showing the linkage between the UNFPA programme, government priorities and the UNDAF. Its main weakness is that the methodology for obtaining data is not well described, so that for many outcomes, the data source is not completely clear. Despite this, however, its findings, conclusions and recommendations are reasonable and are backed by enough data to accept them.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	**Good**	**Poor**	**Unsatisfactory**
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting *To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.* Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure: • 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) • Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.	*Good* The report contains all of the minimum content required by the quality assurance criteria: acronyms, executive summary; introduction; methodology (contained in the introduction); context; findings/analysis; conclusions; recommendations. However, the methodology is not a standalone section, as required by the criteria, though this does not detract from the user-friendly nature of the report. The annex also includes all minimum requirements: ToR, bibliography, list of interviewees (under stakeholder mapping section), and methodological instruments used.			
2. Executive Summary *To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and*	*Poor* The summary is a stand-alone section that contains most of			

presenting main results of the evaluation. Structure (paragraph equates to half page max): • 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.	the required information, however, it is about a half page too long. Additionally, the report's summary is not consistent with the quality assurance criteria; specifically, the methodology is not adequately described nor is there description of the intended audience(s). The conclusions and recommendations are also simply listed, rather than being summarized.
3. Design and Methodology *To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools* Minimum content and sequence: • Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations; • Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner; • Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation; • Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided; • Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.	*Poor* While the design process is shown as well as a selection of documents to review, details on how participants were selected for interviews and focus groups are not shown. Furthermore, details on the consultation process (other than with the oversight committee) were not shown. The report states that triangulation was systematically applied though no details are provided on how triangulation was undertaken by the evaluation team. The annexes show some indications on how outcomes were defined, but not how the data were collected. While the cross-cutting issues are described, how data was collected about them, other than documents, was not described. The report acknowledges several contraints and limitations, such as the lack of information on processes, outcomes, outputs, and baseline and target indicators, however there is no mention on measures taken to mitigate them.
4. Reliability of Data *To clarify data collection processes and data quality* • Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; • Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit; • Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.	*Poor* The sources of quantitative data, primarily from documents, are shown and are reliable, but the sources of qualitative data are not clearly shown. While a list of persons interviewed was provided in the annex, including their status (e.g. implementing partner, beneficiary, UN representative) and their relationship to specific areas of analysis (e.g. sexual and reproductive health, gender,

	population and development), issues of credibility are not clearly discussed. In all likelihood, the interview data were sound and used properly, but that cannot be assessed from the report. Data were disaggregated by gender in the discussion of the Paraguay country context as well as the discussion of findings related to 'relevance'.
5. Findings and Analysis *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* <u>Findings</u> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <u>Analysis</u> • Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; • Contextual factors are identified. • Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.	*Good* Findings are presented in a clear manner, based on the questions posed in the ToR, in part helped by the systems approach defined in the methodology and, on the whole, are sufficient to justify a good rating. The evaluation was limited by the absence of baseline and target indicators, however the evaluation team does well in explicitly linking findings to data analysis, and supporting analysis and inference with evidence (document review and interview data), for the most part. It responds to the many questions set up in the ToR and the answers are generally credible, mostly derived from document review and interviews. In addition, the evaluation identifies ten "landmarks" (hitos), or key achievements, which essentially serve as a summary of findings. There is a clear effort to show causal connections between UNFPA activities and observed results, although these results are called outputs and outcomes. The analysis suggests that UNFPA has had its largest effect through influencing government policies. An example is the adoption of a decree (No. 2135/09) on prevention and control of AIDS in the armed forces. The analysis includes clear references to contextual factors including the political problems of the country in 2012. There is an effort to ensure that cause and effect links are

	reasonable. For example, the evaluation points to a study UNFPA conducted together with Parliament, which facilitated the mobilization of resources by the government for family planning. The evaluation highlights specifically a national law that was implemented which allocates specific resources from the Nation's General Budget for the purchase of contraceptives (p67). However, the report could have made the cause/effect links clearer, and substantiate these with more in-depth discussion and evidence supports. For example, the evaluation report points to the association of the intervention with improved contraceptive methods and counseling offered, but does not provide sufficient substantiation in terms of evidence that this association is in fact the case.
6. Conclusions *To assess the validity of conclusions* • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.	*Good* The conclusions are organized around themes of strategic positioning, programming, and transversal aspects: monitoring and evaluation; they are clearly derived from the findings and are credible. They are not organized in priority order, but that is less of a problem. There is no evidence of bias in the conclusions.
7. Recommendations *To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations* • Recommendations flow logically from conclusions; • Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible; • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order	*Good* The recommendations are also organized around the themes of strategic positioning, programming, and transversal aspects: monitoring and evaluation. The recommendations flow logically and are clearly targeted and strategic as well as operationally-feasible. There is no evidence, however, about how they have been influenced by stakeholders' consultations, although presumably they have been. Two levels of priority have been shown. The recommendations about improved monitoring and evaluation are particularly well-designed and important, especially in terms of systematic data collection. While there is no direct (and corresponding) alignment between

	the conclusions and recommendations (1 for 1; 2 for 2; etc), the recommendations do flow logically from the conclusions and make explicit and clear reference to specific conclusions made. For example, recommendation 2 refers (and relates) clearly to conclusion 2; similarly, recommendation 3 refers (and relates) clearly to conclusion 4.
8. Meeting Needs To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & 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.	*Good* The evaluation conforms to the ToR in terms of subject matter and question to be answered, as well as general criteria.

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		
TOTAL		88	12	

(*) 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