

# Evaluation Branch - DOS: EQA for- Bolivia

## Country Programme Evaluation (2008-2011)



**External Reviewer:** *Oscar Garcia, senior evaluation advisor at the evaluation office/ UNDP*

**Overall Assessment:** Note that the overall assessment must address, as a minimum, the following issues: *scope of the evaluation; methodological design; findings and analysis; credibility of data; recommendations; conclusion; executive summary.*

This is a **good evaluation report**. The report has all the elements expected in evaluation reports. It describes well the scope, the methodology and the evaluation design. The findings derive from evidence and a good mix of data gathering techniques were used to triangulate the findings and come up with conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary can be read as a standalone piece. It is important to notice, however that the evaluation was conducted against a revised results framework. The evaluation report is too long and risks losing the attention of the reader. The recommendations are generic and general and do not fully benefit from the analysis conducted in previous chapters.

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>Please insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by your main <u>comments</u>.</p> <p><b>Poor:</b> The report has all the content and sequence required in evaluation reports, however, the report is way too long and repetitive (125 pages plus annexes). Long reports lose the attention of decision makers.                      The report mixes two reports in one. The assessment of the monitoring and evaluation system should be kept as a separate report in volume two.</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></p>	<p><b>Good:</b> The Exec Sum does read as a standalone document. The introduction provides the rationale for the evaluation and presents the</p>			

<p>Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</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>highlights of the evaluation methodology. The introduction is followed by a synthesis of conclusions and recommendations.</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>Whenever relevant, specific attention to cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender equality) in the design of the evaluation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good:</b> The methodological choice and data collection techniques are explained in chapter one. A good presentation of the consultation process is made. There is enough information about the criteria for the selection of regions visited and the number of AWP covered by the evaluation.</p> <p>The limitations were identified. The most important limitation is that the evaluation was conducted against a revised results framework and not against the programme's original strategic intent. This limitation was overcome by the evaluation team.</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> </ul>	<p><b>Good:</b> All sources of data are clearly explained and referenced. There are enough explanations about limitations regarding evaluability and the quality of data. There is a good balance between primary and secondary sources.</p>
<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b>  <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>  <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> </ul>	<p><b>Good:</b> The findings emerge from a rigorous use of data, its triangulation and analysis. Most findings are substantiated by evidence. The context is very well described. The contributions of UNFPA can be clearly identified</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>and there is a good analysis of the factors that contributed to results.</p> <p>There is however a concern about the extent to which many of the results in changing the normative framework of the country (constitution and laws recognizing the rights of women and vulnerable populations) can be attributed to UNFPA.</p> <p>As recognized by the evaluators the concept of “capacity development” is also used in a flexible way and includes even the production of studies. The presentation of findings is repetitive. The analysis is overly positive and the areas where results were not achieved such as the law on reproductive health did not have enough attention.</p>
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b></p> <p><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><b>Good:</b> The conclusions are based on findings. The conclusions could be more assertive and reflect better the evaluator’s unbiased judgment. Its presentation is sometimes clearer in the body of the report at the end of each section in chapters 4 and 5.</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b></p> <p><i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</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><b>Poor:</b> The recommendations flow logically from conclusions, however, they are generic for improving the quality of any programme and are not context specific. The recommendations are presented as a handbook for good programming. The recommendations do not benefit from the analysis conducted in previous chapters about the factors that explain UNFPA performance in Bolivia. A stronger linkage between the analysis and the recommendations could be established.</p>

**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.

**Poor:** The evaluation was conducted against a revised results framework in 2011. This hinders the accountability purpose of the evaluation and questions the adequacy of the previous programming exercise. The evaluators alert that without the acceptance of a revised results framework the evaluation would have been unrealistic and not very useful.

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very good
5. Findings and analysis (50)			50	
6. Conclusions (12)			12	
7. Recommendations (12)		12		
8. Meeting needs (12)		12		
3. Design and methodology (5)			5	
4. Reliability of data (5)			5	
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)		2		
2. Executive summary (2)			2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	26	74	

(\*) 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

**OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: [GOOD]**