



**Organizational unit:** Brazil CO **Year of report:** 2021

**Title of evaluation report:** 6° Program de Pais do UNFPA no Brasil

**Overall quality of report:** Very good **Date of assessment:** 24 August 2021

**Overall comments:** This is a very good evaluation of a politically complex country programme in one of the largest countries in the world. The complexity includes a change in government (and its priorities relative to population) as well as COVID-19. The pandemic influenced the evaluation by making it almost entirely virtual, although the evaluators made an effort to compensate by undertaking some 100 interviews, distributed around the country. The evaluation included an important focus on Venezuelan refugees who came to the North of Brazil. The executive summary serves as a concise, stand-alone document, however the overall report could have been more concisely presented as it exceeds the 70-page limit for CPEs. The analysis was carefully structured around the relevant criteria (including for humanitarian situations) and the conclusions and recommendations were clearly linked to the finding. The connection of the programme to both global and national priorities was clear. The recommendations appear to be useful to formulate the next country plan. The report could have been strengthened with a fuller description of the data analysis methods, and if the stakeholder map, noted as being created by the UNFPA Country Office, were more explicitly described as part of the evaluation design. Gender is effectively integrated throughout the evaluation report; however, it would have been helpful to describe unanticipated effects of the intervention on gender and human rights. In respect to disability inclusion, the evaluation noted that people with disabilities were part of the broader category of vulnerable groups as defined by UNFPA and are briefly described in an annex. However, it did not appear that the perspectives of people with disabilities were obtained as part of the stakeholder consultation process and there is not a specific analysis of disability issues in 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 assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding*

<b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
--	----------------------	-------------------	-----------

*To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly*

<b>1. Is the report structured in a logical way? 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? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?</b>	Yes	The evaluation report follows the norm and is easy to navigate.
<b>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)</b>	No	At 85 pages, the report exceeds the 70 page limit for CPEs.
<b>3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?</b>	Yes	The 13 annexes contain all of the required information.☐

**Executive summary**

<b>4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?</b>	Yes	The executive summary covers all required sections.
<b>5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?</b>	Yes	The executive summary is exactly five pages.

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	-----------

*To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context*

<b>1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?</b>	Yes	There is a thorough discussion of the context, including particularly a comparison between the fifth and sixth programme. The constraints, including political issues, are well-described.
<b>2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</b>	Yes	The report was careful to compare the fifth and sixth country programmes, drawing on the recommendations of an evaluation of the fifth country programme. Evaluators also provide description of theory of change analysis under Q 3.1.

<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>		
3. 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	There is a thorough evaluation matrix in the annexes, and its construction and main elements are contained in the text.
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The tools, document analysis, interviews and focus groups are described, noting that due to COVID-19 all were done remotely. The fact that focus groups were difficult to organize online was addressed by increasing the number of interviews.
5. 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 reference to a stakeholder map being created by the UNFPA Country Office, but it could be more fully described. It is noted that the consultation process included 4 validation workshops including a meeting with the CO team and Reference Group to discuss conclusions and recommendations.
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	No	Data analysis methods could be more adequately described in the report.
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	There is a solid section on limitations and what was done to overcome them.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The text does not describe how certain geographic areas were chosen for interviews. The process was complex, because of the issues of time and COVID-19. The sample itself is described in table 1, but it is less clear how participants were selected from each category.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The evaluation report includes analysis of data disaggregated by gender, race, region and age.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The document review and interviews were appropriate for addressing the cross-cutting issues.
<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Within the limits of the virtual evaluation, there was clear triangulation.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	For each question, the evaluators were able to determine the data needed and use it. Reliability of data is also described in the report.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	References were made to ethical and discrimination issues that were addressed.
<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	In each case, the evidence, both quantitative and qualitative is presented.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for the interpretations are clearly shown.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are organized against the evaluation questions.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Cause and effect links are shown, based on the theory of change relationships between output and outcomes. There are some unintended outcomes noted.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	There is a clear focus on different vulnerable groups, particularly in respect to gender, age, and ethnicity; and the outcomes for each are shown.
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	In all cases, the analysis takes into account contextual factors including geography, political and administrative structures and rural-urban differences.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	There is a thorough examination, particularly of race, but also of gender quality. However, there is not a separate analysis of disability.
<b>5. Conclusions</b>		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>		
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	There are clear links between the conclusions and 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 and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The conclusions cover different aspects of the findings and consolidate them to show the main issues.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias, especially as there was a review of the findings through a series of validation meetings with the Country Office and Reference Group.

6. Recommendations	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Each recommendation is connected with the associated conclusions. Like the conclusions, the recommendations are divided into short-term, medium-term and long-term.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The expected users of each recommendation are shown and there is information on the implications.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The recommendations appear balanced and impartial. They cover cross-cutting issues.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Partial	There is no formal priority, although the time horizon factors imply priority. They are clearly presented to enable a management response.	
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very 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?		<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) Use of a gender or human rights approach is not explicitly part of the scope or objectives of the evaluation. However it is highlighted in the Methodological Approach section and the scope does include the intent of reaching a diversity of stakeholders. Score=3</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3) Gender and human rights criteria are covered in the framework. Score=3</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) There was a dedicated evaluation question. Score=3</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results? (Score: 0-3) Considerable information was collected on these result indicators. Score=3</p>	
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?		<p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) The methodology section notes that the UNEG Guidance on integrating HRGE was used and specifies that gender issues were addressed in the interviews and in document review, including reports that include gender data. Score=3</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3) There is a mixed method approach that deals with GEEW. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) Within the limits of a virtual evaluation, the data sources guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility. Triangulation and validation processes are explained. Score=3</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3) There was an effort to ensure that a range of vulnerable groups were represented in the data collection process, an exception being those with disabilities. Score=2</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) Ethical standards were clearly followed, especially in interviews with stakeholder groups. Score=3</p>	
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?		<p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3) There is a background section on the main social groups affected. Score=3</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3) There is effective triangulation. Score=3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) There is implicit recognition of possible unanticipated effects, although this was not a major concern. Score=2</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3) In several of the long-term recommendations there is reference to GEEW. Score=3</p>	

(\*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.  
 (\*\*) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

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			
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>100</b>			
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>	<b>Very good</b>			