

Evaluation title	Cameroon: An Evaluation of WFP's Portfolio	Evaluation Report #	OEV/2017/002
Type	Country Portfolio Evaluation	Centralised/Decentralised	Centralised
Global / Region or Country	Cameroon	PHQA date	26-07-2018

Quality Rating - overall category		EPI – Overall Report Category	
Exceeds requirements:	75% - 100%	4-7	points = Approaches requirements
<p>Overall, the CPE is a strong piece of work that captures a complex portfolio. It would be improved by providing greater detail about the trajectory of the constituent operations in the portfolio and how they have changed over time. Specifically: what they were, who provided resourcing, what were their intended outputs, modalities, and activities and how did these change over time. The methodology is not described in adequate detail. There is a mismatch between the information provided in the Inception Report and that presented in the Evaluation Report (e.g. did focus group discussions take place?). Description of the methodology does not include a description of how analysis will be conducted against the International Humanitarian Principles, how the specific methods will provide information about the impact on beneficiaries, what the rationale for sampling was, and what the limitations and efforts to mitigate these were. There is no mention of ethical safeguards applied or how risks were dealt with. The analytical methods are not described. The findings section is generally strong. The CPE makes good use of evidence. However, evaluation findings do not clearly align to the evaluation sub-questions. The report discusses WFP's work to align itself to national policy but does not move beyond WFP's corporate output to policy influencing- beyond being a provider of food security information. The findings do not provide a clear assessment of performance against the International Humanitarian Principles which should be considered given the importance of WFP's contribution to Cameroon's humanitarian situation. The availability of resources is presented but the report does not provide an assessment of whether WFP has made the best use of resources. The conclusions, while providing a useful summary, are not organised by criterion/theme/question. Often, it is useful to present the evaluation criteria and provide an evaluative conclusion against these as a way of conclusion. GEEW principles and objectives are not mainstreamed in the evaluation. Rather than addressing gender as an add-on, the extent that the CPE has integrated GEEW into the design and achieved gains therein should be addressed throughout the evaluation. The methodology should be clear about how gender and equity issues were assessed. Critically, the extent that the intervention has responded to WFP and system wide gender objectives should be considered. The report should state what equity issues are at play in Cameroon explicitly and then assess the extent that the design responded to these needs and results have been achieved. In terms of accessibility, the report should use bold text or call-out boxes to signpost key messages to enhance the logic and accessibility of the report.</p>			
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY		Category	Exceeds
<p>The report summary includes the required information. The summary meets WFP requirements on length and does not exceed 5000 words. The subject of the evaluation is described, supported by the information</p>			

presented in Figure 2. The main findings, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in the report-supported by effective use of visuals, tables, and graphs. The report is succinct and readable with effective use of headings. Areas of improvement include: the methodological approach is not presented in full; the methodology description does not include a rationale for the approach taken, or a description of the analytical approach, or the major limitations encountered; and, the users of the evaluation are not explicitly listed.

CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT

Category

Exceeds

The CPE clearly states the type of evaluation and the duration of the evaluation subject. The planned achievements are set out in section 1.1. and the planned beneficiary numbers, disaggregated by gender and activity are provided in the factsheet and in section 1.1. The planned geographic scope of the evaluation subject is stated. The CPE addresses all of the operations in Cameroon and refers extensively to previous evaluations. There is mention of the development of a CSP though for the timeframe the CPE covers, there is no CSP. The overview is based on relevant and well-evidence sources which are appropriately referenced. The shift from development assistance to an L3 emergency is well-documented. Although the main activities are listed, the operational factsheet and the overview of the evaluation fails to provide a clear sense of what changes have occurred since design. It is also not clear how the activities have changed over time. The amounts of transfers planned are also not detailed. The resourcing profile is described but the report does not state which donors funded which operation.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Category

Exceeds

The CPE presents a comprehensive and useful description of the country context which presents key development and humanitarian challenges. Key external events are discussed in the report. The information presented is relevant to the main areas of WFP's portfolio in Cameroon and refers to up-to-date contextual information. The purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation are set out clearly. The whole of the portfolio is covered in the report. Beyond mentioning the donors present, the report does not provide detail about the other key actors operating within the context of Cameroon. The report also does not provide an explicit statement about why the evaluation is needed at this point in time. Further, gender and equity dimensions are not mainstreamed in the discussion of food security and nutrition.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY

Category

Approaches

A comprehensive evaluation matrix is provided in Annex 3 of the report which allows for systematic assessment of the evaluation questions against the evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria are consistent with the evaluation questions and the evaluation questions are well defined. Areas of improvement include: the methodology section does not provide a rationale or a description of how sampling (if any) was conducted; there is no mention of ethical standards applied; there is a limited description of the limitations encountered and how gaps in data and the methodology were mitigated; and, there is no description of anticipated or unanticipated risks encountered.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Category

Exceeds

Evidence is drawn on effectively and consistently to derive findings. The analytical basis of the portfolio is analysed. Gaps in the evidence base are signposted. Reasons for achievement and underachievement are identified. Findings are balanced and presented without bias. Previous evaluations are referenced consistently throughout the report, with reference to the extent that their recommendations have been implemented. The CPE provides a clear assessment of the extent that WFP has been strategic in its alignment. The report describes WFP's work in Cameroon with other UN agencies. Areas of improvement include: the report does not systematically address evaluation sub-questions and there is omission of a substantive narrative around some of the evaluation sub-questions including sub-question 3.3; the report does not provide a clear assessment of WFP's policy influencing; humanitarian principles are not explicitly addressed in the findings section even though these are signposted in the evaluation matrix; unintended

consequences are not explicitly discussed in the report; and, the report does not provide an assessment of whether WFP made the best use of available resources in the interventions.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
The conclusions draw effectively on the evidence presented in the findings section without introducing new evidence. The conclusions highlight both positive and negative findings in a proportionate manner. For example, the ability of the programme to respond effectively to the L3 crisis is set out while highlighting the challenges encountered, and outstanding unmet needs, in the transition to a humanitarian programme. The conclusions provide a useful and comprehensive summary of evidence without gaps or omissions of key evaluation questions. The conclusions, while following the overall logic of the findings, are not organised by theme/criterion/or evaluation question.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Meets
GEEW dimensions are integrated into all Evaluation questions and the evaluation indicators mainstream gender issues. Evaluation findings reflect a gender analysis and issues of empowerment and equality feature in the findings. Equity issues are addressed in the conclusions and recommendations. Although the inception report refers to gender specific focus groups, it is not clear how or if this has been carried out The CPE does not refer to corporate policy on gender. Further notable areas of improvement include: the report does not provide a detailed assessment ow how the CPE has been guided by system-wide objectives on GEEW; the inclusion of gender indicators is mainly qualitative which means that there is a dearth of gender data; the report does not demonstrate how or if specific resources, time, or efforts to integrate a gender perspective has been attempted; the report does not provide clear recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluations; and, equity issues are not explicitly integrated in the report and the indicators do not provide a strong basis for assessing equity which is reflected in the light analysis of equity in the findings section.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds
Recommendations are relevant to the evaluation's purpose of informing the development of the CSP and future programming for 2018-2020. The Recommendations provide clear actions for the country office and are largely actionable. The report could be improved by the timeframe and the level of prioritisation of the recommendations being made more explicit as a general timeframe 2018-2020 is provided and it is not clear how the recommendations should be provided. Also, given that the recommendations' rationale comes from the findings, reference to the Cameroon context and operations would provide more context.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The CPE provides the required information and follows WFP guidance on content. The report is generally well written, using appropriate language and a balanced tone. The report's accessibility would be improved by more consistent use of sub-headings to highlight key messages (e.g. in the conclusions). The overall logic of the report would be enhanced by referring more consistently to evaluation questions and evaluation criteria.		

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

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	

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