

## Evaluación Final del Programa de Cooperación del UNFPA en México:

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING:** Good

**Summary:** The evaluation report is clear, comprehensive, and logically structured and has all of the required sections. It would gain from having a specific section addressing lessons learned. The executive summary gives a good overview of the main results of the evaluation and is presented as a stand-alone document. The design and methodology clearly details the objectives of the report and the data collection methods used, and limitations are addressed by triangulation of mixed-methods data collection. Cross-cutting issues were addressed in the design and conduct of the evaluation. The evaluation report clearly defines the sources of quantitative and qualitative data in the main body of the report. In doing so, it discusses the credibility of primary and secondary data sources, and presents the associated limitations with the data. The bulk of data is derived from a review of documentary sources, which are clearly footnoted. The utilization of data from interviews and field visits is less visible in the analysis. The findings and analysis are presented in terms of the evaluation questions that were posed in the design, and were repeated for each of the three programme areas. The main supporting data was from documents, but the data from interviews, and field visits were also used. The issues of causality were well-described. There was careful attention to country context. There was a successful effort to identify unintended results, both positive and negative. In a few cases, the sections under findings are descriptive and the effort to substantiate findings is weaker. Conclusions are in priority order, and organized by focus but certain conclusions do not seem to be based on credible findings. The recommendations are organized by focus and are derived from the conclusions although 2 of the recommendations are not feasible and the report does not provide suggestions to make them operational. The evaluation report responds to the requirements outlined in the ToR but does not identify deficiencies in the ToR.

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> </ul>	Good			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</li> </ul>	
<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>  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>Good.</p> <p>The length is appropriate. In terms of content, it states the purpose, objectives and users of the evaluation as well as reflecting the conclusions and recommendations from the report. The only content that is missing is the description of the geographical scope of the evaluation.</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>• Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p>Good.</p> <p>The description of the methodology was adequate in terms of content and sequence. The techniques for data collection were described properly. The methodology was particularly well designed to identify counterparts to interview based on a stratified sample. Participatory stakeholder consultations were primarily through focus groups, as well as individual interviews. The structure of these was shown in the instruments presented in an annex.</p> <p>Cross-cutting issues were addressed in the design and conduct of the evaluation. Several evaluation questions were explicitly directed towards assessing the country programme's progress in mainstreaming youth, gender and human rights issues and prioritizing intervention strategies that serve vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Certain aspects of this section could be improved: the report states that the evaluation followed the methodology established by UN System Norms and Standards for Evaluation ("La evaluación fue realizada de acuerdo a la metodología regida por las Normas y Estándares de Evaluación del Sistema de Naciones Unidas"). There is also a conceptual confusion when describing the process of analysis: "Los procedimientos de análisis incluyeron una revisión documental del programa existente, consultas y entrevistas a personal técnico y de gestión del UNFPA, a expertos, directivos, funcionarios y personal técnico de las instituciones asociadas en la implementación, entrevistas y discusiones de grupos focales, visitas de campo y el procesamiento y</p>

	<p>sistematización de toda la información recabada y examinada.” It is not clear in this section how the team addressed the changes in the results framework of the programme. This issue appears as one of the limitations encountered but there is no mention of how this limitation was addressed. Cross-cutting issues were addressed in the design and conduct of the evaluation, specifically there is an evaluation question addressing the mainstreaming of youth, gender and human rights. A considerable flaw in the methodology is one of the evaluation questions addresses the extent to which beneficiary groups have taken advantage of the results of UNFPA interventions but the team did not consult final beneficiaries of UNFPA interventions. Final beneficiaries are mentioned under the methodology as being included in the stakeholder map but there is no evidence in the main report or annexes that beneficiaries were consulted for this evaluation (see Cuadro 2 page 10).</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> <li>• Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.</li> </ul>	<p>Good.</p> <p>The evaluation report clearly defines the sources of quantitative and qualitative data in the main body of the report. In doing so, it discusses the credibility of primary and secondary data sources, and presents the associated limitations with the data. The report acknowledges that the sampling methodology was purposive and non-random in nature. The report explains how efforts were made to ensure that sampling included current, past, and potential partners and administrative agencies with diverse levels of involvement in the design and implementation of the intervention. The evaluation team also described how efforts were made to ensure that the sampling frame was diverse in terms of geographic location and involvement in projects with both high- and low-levels of financing. The bulk of data is derived from a review of documentary sources, which are clearly footnoted. The utilization of data from interviews and field visits is less visible in the analysis.</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> <li>• Findings are presented in a clear manner</li> </ul>	<p>Good.</p> <p>The findings and analysis are presented in terms of the evaluation questions that were posed in the design, and were repeated for each of the three programme areas. The main supporting data was from documents, but the data from interviews, and field visits were also used. The issues of causality were well-described. There was</p>

<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>careful attention to country context. There was a successful effort to identify unintended results, both positive and negative, examples: “The academic nature of INSP has resulted in increased research on migrants in transit in the southeast region of Mexico and their release has led to increased preventative care and action in the area, especially in support of migrants linked to the sex trade. In pages 60-61 unintended results are addressed in each program area.</p> <p>In a few cases, the sections are descriptive and the effort to substantiate findings is weaker: a. “Las actividades emprendidas por la OP en este ámbito han devenido en un mejoramiento en el acceso a los servicios de SSR por parte de una de las poblaciones con mayores necesidades en el país, así como en el fortalecimiento de estrategias de participación comunitaria”; b. “la información analizada indica que los distintos grupos de beneficiarios han aprovechado las intervenciones desarrolladas por la OP para el mejoramiento de sus habilidades técnicas, el desempeño de sus actividades o, en su caso, el acceso a servicios de SSR”. In one case, the evidence to back up a finding is based only of one instrument (CO interviews) without presenting evidence of triangulation (page 52 parag 2 – page 53 parag 2). Example of use of one source and no triangulation: page 55 “ Como lo establece el informe anual del PP, dicho sistema ha servido como un insumo indispensable para la elaboración de políticas públicas y estrategias en relación a los cambios en la estructura por edad de la población, las migraciones y otras cuestiones emergentes de población.</p>
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b> <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>Poor</p> <p>Conclusions are in priority order, and organized by focus. Certain conclusions (conclu. 1 page 95) do not seem to be based on credible findings: a. “Conclusión 1: Durante el presente ciclo se logró tener un impacto demostrable en el fortalecimiento de capacidades institucionales en las tres áreas temáticas del Programa de País”; b. “Avanzar en temas comunes a varias agencias del SNU sin que haya traslape o duplicidad ha sido posible mediante la acertada definición, por parte de la OP de.....” not clearly based on finding since no interviews were conducted with other UN agencies.</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b> <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;</li> </ul>	<p>Good</p> <p>The recommendations are organized by focus and are derived from the conclusions. They are organized by priority and to whom they are directed is indicated. The</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>methodology specifies consultations and the drafts were discussed with the Technical Evaluation Committee. There is room for improvement: certain recommendations are not feasible and the report does not provide suggestions to make them operational: "Recomendación 4. Ampliar las capacidades de la OP incrementando el número de recursos humanos con los cuales cuenta". Recommendation 2 page 106 provides no details on how to operationalize it.</p>
<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b> To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope &amp; 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.</p>	<p>Good</p> <p>The evaluation responds to the ToR requirements. The report could have identified one deficiency in the ToR - the ToR did not foresee a consultative process that would include final beneficiaries of interventions even though there is an evaluation question in the ToR addressing beneficiary groups.</p>

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		
<b>TOTAL</b>		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.