



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

Title of evaluation report: **Evaluación Final del VIII Programa de País de UNFPA en Honduras (2017-2021)**

Overall quality of report: **Very good** Date of assessment: **31 May 2021**

Overall comments: This is a Country Programme 2017-2021 evaluation of UNFPA cooperation in Honduras. Its objective is to provide an independent and impartial analysis within the framework of the Country Program, and to contribute to the accountability process and corporate learning with recommendations that serve as input for the next program cycle. The selected methodology enabled triangulation from both primary and secondary sources. All findings are clearly substantiated by evidence, although it would have been useful to see more use of quotes from the stakeholders considering the large and diverse data and perspectives collected from interviews, focus groups and questionnaires. Recommendations appear useful for the intended users, and operational requirements are thorough. The evaluation integrates adequately human rights and particularly gender equality principles, however it does not include, as mentioned, the voices of different social role groups nor does it consider unanticipated effects of the CP on human rights and gender equality. It would also have been helpful to have ethical consideration of the evaluation process be more fully described.

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 colour)*

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting Yes No Partial Assessment Level: **Very good**

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

1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. 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 structure of the report is logical. There is a clear distinction between findings, conclusions. With 70 pages excluding annexes, it is an appropriate length for a Country Program evaluation report.

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)?

Yes The annexes include the necessary elements- ToR, bibliography, list of people interviewed and consulted; evaluation matrix and collection methodological instruments - plus lengthy ones on additional data and the design report.

*Executive summary*

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?

Yes The executive summary serves as a stand-alone document. However, the purpose of the evaluation is not distinguished from the objectives, while in the ToR it is. Additionally, the summary does not explicitly describe the audience for the evaluation.

5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?

Yes The executive summary is reasonable in length at 4 pages.

2. Design and Methodology Yes No Partial Assessment Level: **Very good**

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

1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?

Yes The institutional and development context in which the Country Program is implemented is clearly described. Constraints/limitations include 1) the weakness of the Results and Resources Framework (MR&R) and its impact on the analysis of programmatic effectiveness; and 2) the program is still running and there is a year left for its closure considering that some activities were postponed due to covid19.

2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?

Yes The evaluation team reconstructed the originally proposed theory of change and discussed in detail the changes made and their rationale. Figure 2 presents the intervention logic and the proposed ToC. The report indicates that although the causal relationships established in the ToC and the hypotheses that support the interventions are considered, the evaluation privileges the analysis of the 'contribution' of the Country Program to development changes and not the causal 'attribution', in its restrictive sense.

*To ensure a rigorous design and methodology*

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 The evaluation matrix is summarized in the text and guides the evaluation report. The complete evaluation matrix in Annex VII also includes the evaluation questions, hypotheses, indicators, information sources and data collection tools.

4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?

Yes Data collection tools, which included (i) document review and analysis, (ii) semi-structured interviews (individual and group), (iii) focus groups, (iv) online questionnaires, and (v) audiovisual materials, are described and adequately justified based on the hypotheses and indicators established in the Evaluation Matrix. The three case studies of prioritized municipalities are also described.

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)?

Yes The Evaluation Team built a stakeholder map in consultation with the evaluation group, based on diverse sources, including consultation from key stakeholders. Figure 8 in Annex VII presents the comprehensive stakeholder map. Additionally, it is noted that a workshop was held with the Reference Evaluation Group and UNFPA staff for an initial discussion in order to validate preliminary conclusions and recommendations (p.308).

6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?

Yes Methods and processes for analysis are described in the report and the methodological annex. As mentioned on question 2, the evaluation privileges the analysis of the 'contribution' of the Country Program to development changes and not the causal 'attribution', although it is guided by the causal relationships established in the theory of change and the hypotheses that support the interventions.

7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?

Yes The methodological limitations are acknowledged. The major limitation refers to the implications of Covid19 and the inability to carry out field visits or have direct visual knowledge of the interventions. The described mitigation strategies included (i) detailed survey through interviews with partners and stakeholders benefiting from UNFPA actions; (ii) online questionnaires; (iii) extensive review of documentary sources, and (iv) review of visual material (videos, posters and partner websites).

8. Is the sampling strategy described?

Partial The methodological approach does not describe the sampling strategy in detail. It mentions that 'the stakeholder map served to identify the people to interview'. It is noted that a theoretical criterion was used to guarantee sufficient representation of sectors (institutional and social) and levels of government (national and municipal) for conducting interviews.

9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?

Yes The selected methodology enables the collection and analysis of disaggregated data. The data collection tools presented in Annex VI allow for disaggregation by sex, although the data is not presented in that manner in the report.

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 methodology is explicit in the incorporation of gender and human rights approaches as reflected in the evaluation matrix: evaluation questions and indicators are explicit and adequate; they capture the extent to which the methodology was gender responsive.

<b>3. Reliability of Data</b>		Yes No	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	The evaluation triangulates data from multiple primary and secondary sources including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, online questionnaires, study cases, documental analysis as well as audiovisual material. All sources from data collection are drawn on in supporting the overarching findings.		
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Evaluators identified sources and the limitations of some - for instance the low response rate from most online questionnaires due to incomplete registries.		
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	There is no specific mention of ethical considerations in the methodology annex other than reference to UNEG guidelines (p.7). The semi-structured interview protocols, focus group guidelines, and online questionnaires in Annex IV do mention issues of confidentiality and use of information, as expected. In-depth interviews, focus groups, discussion workshops with the Country Office, six online questionnaires took place. Inclusive language was used and the evaluation team sought to interview women and men in similar numbers. In the techniques of interviews and focus groups, the confidentiality of the information was guaranteed, authorization was requested to record the interviews and also authorization was requested, in case of using a textual quote, to use it in the text ensuring avoid identifying the person.		
<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	The findings are based on evidence according to the agreed methodology, mostly from secondary data, and from primary data. All findings are clearly substantiated by evidence.		
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretation regarding how findings were defined is described, mostly with reference to documents. There are citations from interviews and focus groups, but their use is minimal considering the large and diverse data and perspectives collected from interviews, focus groups and questionnaires.		
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is presented based on the evaluation criteria and questions.		
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	The findings link the Country Programme contribution and outputs to outcomes. They also considering the contextual effects, independent of the CP's work, and its influence on programmatic outcomes. Under the effectiveness criteria, the unexpected results generated by the Program are considered.		
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The analysis differentiates between the most vulnerable and marginalized groups. It identifies the impact on young people and adolescents in the most lagging and rural municipalities, as well as Afro and indigenous youth.		
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Findings include variables from the context of the Country Programme that might have impacted the intended results.		
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The analysis takes into consideration cross-cutting themes of gender and human rights. Under the coordination criteria, the analysis on human rights and humanitarian actions is specifically considered.		
<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	Conclusions flow from findings and are presented also by evaluation questions and criteria.		
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	Conclusions synthesize properly underlying issues of the CP. It incorporates cross-cutting issues, such as the humanitarian response and gender equality issues both at the strategic and programmatic level.		
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	Conclusions are objective, based on findings and the evidence presented.		

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	The recommendations logically flow from the conclusions (they specify which conclusion(s) is linked to each recommendation).	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	Recommendations are targeted towards intended users, with a brief rationale to better understand its importance and the operational requirements it involves. Recommendations, as was done with conclusions, are also divided between strategic and programmatic ones. The operational requirements in some recommendations are quite extensive.	
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?	Partial	Recommendations are balanced and impartial, integrating cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability as well as a gender equality and human rights approach. As noted earlier, disability was not considered in the analysis and is not reflected in the recommendations.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	Recommendations are categorized as high and medium priority.	
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) =2. There is no specific objective on human rights and gender equality, but it was mainstreamed in other objectives.</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) =3. Both gender and human rights are included under the effectiveness criteria and assessed as cross cutting themes.</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) =3. Question 3a makes explicit reference to gender equality and empowerment.</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) =3. The evaluations assess the suitability of the CP under question 3a on the indicators on gender equality and women empowerment.</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) =2. Although the methodology allows for gender disaggregated data, the methodology description is not specific on how the selected methodology would allow to do this.</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) =3. The mixed methodology selected was appropriate to evaluate GEEW considerations.</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) =1. There are few direct quotes/citations throughout the findings section and it is not clear all voices were employed to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility from diverse sources.</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) =1. Since the sampling method is not fully described, it is not clear if the most vulnerable and marginalized were reached. As mentioned, according to evaluators, a theoretical criterion was used to guarantee sufficient representation of sectors (institutional and social) and levels of government (national and municipal) for conducting interviews, however the criterion is not described.</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) =2. Although ethical standards are not made explicit within the methodology (except to adherence to UNEG), data collection protocols reflect respect to confidentiality.</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) =3. The context section explicitly mentions relevant normative instruments and policies related to human rights and gender equality.</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) =1. The findings do not reflect sufficient voices through quotes/citations nor does it show disaggregated data.</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) =3. The evaluation identifies factors that have, positively or negatively, influenced the CP's support to Gender Equality.</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) =3. Evaluation recommendations address GEEW issues and priorities.</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).

0 = Not at all integrated. Applies when none of the elements under a criterion are met.

1 = Partially integrated. Applies when some minimal elements are met but further progress is needed and remedial action to meet the standard is required.

2 = Satisfactorily integrated. Applies when a satisfactory level has been reached and many of the elements are met but still improvement could be done.

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.

**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>			
<i>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</i>	Very good			