

| Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports | | UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend | |
|---|--|--|----------------------|
| Exceeds requirements: 75–100% | | | |
| Meets requirements: 60–74% | | 11–12 points = Exceeds requirements | |
| Approaches requirements: 50–59% | | 8–10 points = Meets requirements | |
| Partially meets requirements: 25–49% | | 4–7 points = Approaches requirements | |
| Does not meet requirements: 0–24% | | 0–3 points = Missing requirements | |
| Evaluation title | Evaluation of WFP's Lean Season Assistance (LSA) through the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation 200453 in Zimbabwe | Evaluation report number | DE/ZIMBABWE/2016/012 |
| Type | Thematic / Activity | Centralised/ decentralised | Decentralised |
| Global/region or country | Zimbabwe | PHQA date | August 2017 |
| Quality rating – overall category | | EPI – overall report category | |
| Meets requirements: 60–74% | | Approaches requirements: 4–7 points | |

This evaluation report is of overall good quality. The good quality executive summary provides sufficient evidence to inform decision-making as a stand-alone document as evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are well summarised. The minimum information for the overview of the evaluation subject is provided without exception and the evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope are well covered in the report. The report contains a relevant and credible methodology section with two related annexes. On this basis, evaluation questions can be answered in an unbiased manner. The report innovates with a good practice worth replicating across WFP evaluations: Annex 5 describes the approach to data analysis for each evaluation question in the evaluation matrix. The report is structured along the five main evaluation questions and conclusions are presented in a balanced manner. Recommendations are relevant to the evaluations purpose and objectives. They are very specific and action-oriented.

The report shows only few gaps. The following areas of improvement emerge:

- Risks with regard to the methodology should be mentioned in the report;
- Limitations and manners how to mitigate should be explicitly stated in the report;
- The results of interviews are should be systematically analysed and explicitly used in the report. The latter would enhance the credibility of the report. Quotes or the presentation of a quantitative interview analysis should also be presented;
- In the key findings boxes, key findings and conclusions are mixed without a proper distinction. This is not a good practice and obscures the logical flow from findings to conclusions. Key findings should be kept separately from conclusion;
- A prioritisation of recommendations should be provided as well as systematic targeting of recommendations.

| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Category | Meets |
|---|----------|---------|
| The objectives are specified. The overall purpose (learning and to formulate recommendations for future food assistance programming in rural Zimbabwe) is also mentioned. The summary lists key questions, specifies the evaluation type, the evaluation scope and period being evaluated. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are well summarised and the executive summary provides sufficient evidence to inform decision-making as a stand-alone document. However, the main evaluation users and the description of the evaluation subject are contained in the introduction section rather than the executive summary. This is a weakness, given that the executive summary is well within the word limit and therefore there was scope to be more detailed on those two issues. | | |
| CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Category | Exceeds |
| The minimum information for the overview of the evaluation subject is provided without exception. The description of the evaluation subject is accurate and complete. The quality of the overview of the evaluation | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|
| subject is met for 4 out of the 5 criteria. However, the analytical basis of the evaluation subject is only partly described, e.g. the ZimVAC Market Assessment study is mentioned or the lack of a gender analysis. | | |
| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE | Category | Exceeds |
| The evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope are well-covered in the report, with very few exceptions. This is described in the section below. Two shortcomings emerge: i) other WFP activities are not mentioned in the overview section; ii) The context section and other sections are not explicit about the timing of the evaluation. | | |
| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Category | Meets |
| The report contains a relevant and credible methodology section with two related annexes. On this basis evaluation questions can be answered in an unbiased manner. All minimum criteria are met with one exception only. The report innovates with a good practice worth replicating across WFP evaluations, namely that Annex 5 described the approach to data analysis for each evaluation question in the evaluation matrix. The few shortcomings detected include: i) risks with regard to the methodology are not mentioned in the report; ii) paragraph 2 listed in detail the limitations encountered during the evaluation. However, mitigation efforts are not mentioned. Those efforts are referred to in the executive summary but are also not explained; iii) the evaluation criteria are not explicitly explained in relation to the context. Reference to the methodology annex for this criterion is not made. | | |
| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS | Category | Meets |
| The report is structured along the 5 main evaluation questions. The findings address these questions with no apparent gaps. WFP's contribution to results is addressed in the findings. Factors affecting the effectiveness of different modes of assistance are identified. The same is true for assessing the extent to which WFP has made the best use of available resources in its interventions. Findings are generated using secondary data which is referenced and using the expert knowledge of the evaluation team. The results of interviews are not explicitly used in the report however, and this affects the credibility of the report. Quotes or the presentation of a quantitative interview analysis are lacking. The evaluation methodology does not address unintended impacts under the impact criterion, following the terms of reference. As a result, unintended impacts are not reported on. | | |
| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS | Category | Partially |
| Conclusions are balanced. They reflect both positive and negative findings appropriately for the evidence. However, in the key findings boxes, key findings and conclusions are mixed without a proper distinction. This is not a good practice and obscures the logical flow from findings to conclusions. In fact, in the conclusions section, it is hard to distinguish what is actually concluded and what are still findings as this mix still continues. Responses to the "so what" question are not always provided and findings get repeated. The lessons section lists further findings and conclusions. Those do not constitute lessons learned. | | |
| CRITERION 7: GENDER | Category | Approaches |
| Equity dimensions are well reflected in the findings and recommendations section. Findings also include an analysis of gender sensitiveness. United Nations System-Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN SWAP) criterion 3 is met for all sub-criteria, as gender dimensions are reflected in the evaluation methodology. The evaluation overview addresses gender dimensions for most sub-criteria. The three main weaknesses include: i) recommendations don't reflect a gender analysis; ii) the evaluation report does not provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluations; iii) equity dimensions are only once mentioned in the evaluation overview and the methodology section. | | |

| CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS | Category | Meets |
|--|----------|-------|
| <p>Recommendations are relevant to the evaluations purpose and objectives, they address critical issues identified in the report and are also relevant for the operational recommendations aligned with the WFP Country Strategic Plan 2017-2021 Strategic Objectives, beyond the Lean Season Assistance. Recommendations are very specific and action-oriented, even prescriptive. Nonetheless, the recommendations suffer from the key findings and conclusions being mixed up, and a conclusions section where findings are included. This hampers the logical flow of the recommendations. A prioritisation of recommendations is not provided, targeting is not systematically given and for other operational recommendations listed in paragraph 117, a timeframe for action is not always given.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY | Category | Meets |
| <p>The report uses clear and easily-understood language which is appropriate for an official document. The report is accessible to the intended audiences. It meets length requirements, is free of errors and uses a balanced tone. The report is logically structured. This is however not fully reflected in the table of contents where tertiary headings are omitted. Key visual aids are used, however, the report omits an analysis of interview results and a graphical presentation to underpin the evidence base.</p> | | |

| Criteria scoring scale legend – gender integration EPI |
|--|
| 3 points = Fully integrated |
| 2 points = Satisfactorily integrated |
| 1 point = Partially integrated |
| 0 point = Not at all integrated |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Scope and Indicators | 2 |
| 2. Criteria and Questions | 1 |
| 3. Methodology | 2 |
| 4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations | 1 |
| Overall EPI score | 6 |