

Evaluation title	Evaluación de medio término de la Operación Prolongada de Socorro y Recuperación OPSR 200708	Evaluation Report #	DE/Columbia /2017/009
Type	Operation	Centralised/ Decentralised	Decentralised
Global / Region or Country	Columbia	PHQA date	February 2018

Quality Rating - overall category	EPI – Overall Report Category	
Meets requirements: 60% - 74%	Approaches requirements= 4-7 points	
<p>This evaluation report is of good quality fully meeting and sometimes even exceeding WFP's quality criteria. Only few areas of improvement emerge: i) The very few weaknesses in the methodology relate to the sampling approach which is not sufficiently explained. It is also unclear to what extent previous evaluations were used as data sources in the evaluation methodology. ii) Internal and external factors affecting the operation are only identified for the evaluation criteria of sustainability. At times findings seem overly positive and not sufficiently backed up with evidence. The extent to which previous evaluation recommendations have been addressed by the operation is omitted. iii) The logical flow from the analysis to findings and conclusions to recommendations is not always given. Areas presented as less critical in the analysis can be found in the recommendations section, such as the accessibility of distribution points. A more rigorous prioritisation and sequencing of recommendations according to their relevance would be advisable to facilitate the timely implementation of recommendations. vi) The evaluation uses an equity focus related to gender. Though disadvantaged populations groups such as IDPs benefited from the operation, those were not specifically treated in the evaluation. v) While lessons learnt are correctly identified, two out of the nine lessons are in fact formulated as recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The summary of this evaluation report is of very good quality, with almost all relevant information summarised concisely, satisfying all criteria on minimum information and quality. For this well-structured and well-written summary only one shortcoming emerges: the fact that the evaluation questions were not directly reflected in the summary. Given that there were four main evaluation questions, this could have been included without significantly increasing the length of the summary.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds
<p>The overview of the evaluation subject is well covered in this evaluation report. The assessment is accurate, using relevant and well-evidenced sources. The subject's log frame is referred to, with more details in Annex 2. The transfer modalities are clearly identified. The only weakness is the lack of a financial breakdown per activity which is omitted in the overview of the evaluation subject.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The evaluation contains a relevant and comprehensive analysis of the evaluation's context, purpose and scope. All minimum information about the context is provided and the quality of the information is high. The minimum information on the purpose, objectives and scope is fully provided for all six sub-criteria. The</p>		

<p>quality of the information is high for two out of three sub-criteria. The only weakness identified is that the geographical coverage of the evaluation is not listed in the introduction section but in the following methodology section. While repetitions should be avoided, a short reference to the following section could have been useful to specify the geographical coverage. Otherwise the evaluation's context, purpose, objectives and scope are well covered.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The evaluation methodology is largely credible and relevant. Eight out of nine sub-criteria related to minimum information are fully met. 14 out of 17 relevant sub-criteria for the sufficiency of minimum information sources are met or exceeded. The very detailed evaluation matrix in Annex 4 aligns all evaluation questions to the four evaluation criteria. References are always made to the ToR. Evaluation criteria, linkages to the specific thematic area of assessment, number of question listed in the ToR, Indicators, data source, data collection and analysis method are listed, enabling systematic assessment against the evaluation questions. The very few weaknesses in the methodology relate to the sampling approach which is not sufficiently explained. It is also unclear to what extent previous evaluations were used as a data sources in the evaluation methodology. Limitations rather than risks are identified for the application of the methodology.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
<p>All evaluation questions have been addressed in the findings section. Any gaps in the evidence base are transparently presented. Overall, findings are presented without bias and are well triangulated. Information on cost-effectiveness addresses the best use of WFP resources. Internal and external factors affecting the operation are only identified for the evaluation criteria of sustainability. At times findings seem overly positive and not sufficiently backed up with evidence. The extent to which previous evaluation recommendations have been addressed by the operation is less clear.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>Overall, the conclusion section is of good quality. Evidence is brought together by evaluation criteria and avoiding unsubstantiated judgements. The logical flow from the key findings to conclusions is transparent and clearly presented while at the same time presenting positive and negative conclusions always in a constructive manner. Lessons contribute to wider WFP learning, particularly regarding the decentralisation process. The evidence presented leads at times to overly positive findings, leading to overly positive conclusions, as shown for the strengthening of capacities of producer organisations. While lessons learnt are correctly identified, two out of the nine lessons are in fact formulated as recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Meets
<p>Annex 7 of this evaluation report is fully dedicated to the gender issues and provides an in-depth assessment. As a result of this comprehensive annex, many of the quality criteria on gender are met and this constitutes a good practice for WFP. The in-depth data analysis shows that gender is one of the three evaluation perspectives used for this evaluation and not just a "cross-cutting" theme. Resources in terms of staff, time or funds to implement a gender-responsive approach are not specified in the evaluation report. Lessons or recommendations for conducting a gender-responsive evaluation are less evident. The evaluation uses an equity focus related to gender. Though disadvantaged populations groups such as IDPs benefited from the operation, those were not specifically treated in the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
<p>The recommendations address the main evaluation questions. They are relevant to the evaluation's purpose and objectives. The formulation of recommendations is very specific. This should allow for WFP to take action accordingly. For each recommendation, the responsible implementing agency is identified. Also, for each recommendation, the report indicates a timeframe for action. In the executive summary this is well presented in a tabular format for quick reference. The logical flow from the analysis to findings and conclusions to recommendations is not always given. Areas presented as less critical in the analysis can be found in the recommendations section, such as the accessibility of distribution points, identified as a</p>		

challenge in one out of three sites visited. Given that all but one of the recommendations are to be implemented by the first trimester of 2018, it is unclear to what extent WFP has the capacities at the level of the country office and sub-regional offices to act accordingly. This also provides a challenge in sequencing the implementation of recommendations.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

Category

Exceeds

The report is clearly structured, logically presented with graphics and other underlying evidence. Key findings flow logically to conclusions and recommendations. This ensures the accessibility for the intended audiences. The only weaknesses identified in this clear and accessible report are the omission of page numbers after Annex 4, an incomplete list of acronyms, and the fact that acronyms were not consistently spelled out when used for the first time.

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 & Indicators	2
2. Criteria & Questions	2
3. Methodology	1
4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI SCORE	7

Quality Rating Scale Legend Evaluation Reports		Overall Scoring of Gender EPI Scale Legend Evaluation Reports	
Exceeds requirements: 75% - 100%		UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator	
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	