

Evaluation title	Évaluation du fonctionnement du Projet IPSR « Protéger les vies et les moyens de subsistance et promouvoir les moyens de subsistance » du PAM 2013 - 2017	Evaluation Report #	
Type	Operational	Centralised/ Decentralised	Decentralised
Global / Region or Country	Cote D'Ivoire	PHQA date	17-07-2018

Quality Rating - overall category	EPI – Overall Report Category	
Meets requirements: 60% - 74%	8-10 points = Meets requirements	
<p>The report is well-written, clearly evidenced and accessible. Whilst an overview is provided, a more detailed description and analysis of the evaluation subject and its design, as well as a more detailed description of the context in relation to different elements of the intervention - could have strengthened the report. Relevant humanitarian evaluation criteria were broadly applied, as well as an additional criterion relating to lesson learning and explicit reference to UNEG Ethical Guidelines; however, it may not have been appropriate to include impact. The majority of findings are presented in a transparent and impartial manner with links to evidence; there is scope for greater reference to recommendations from other evaluations and greater balance across different activities of the intervention. Both gender and equity considerations are integrated across key elements of evaluation; recommendations could have been further strengthened by greater specificity, and highlighting opportunities to build on strengths of the IPSR.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
<p>The summary is well within the word limit. It is succinct and contains many of the key elements expected within an evaluation summary. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations of the full report are reflected with few exceptions. In some cases, the brevity hinders the level of information required within a summary, and as such important aspects such as the target audience, and a comprehensive overview of the evaluation subject (include activities and resourcing) have been omitted.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially Meets
<p>A high-level overview of the evaluation purpose, objectives, period, activities and modalities is provided. Concurrent and preceding WFP operations are listed, as well as a new programme approved for 2017-2021. Broad rationale for the evaluation subject is provided, however the basis for its design is not discussed [in this section] in any detail beyond an explanation of budget revisions. Whilst the overview provides a brief assessment of the appropriateness of the activities, drawing on evaluation findings, and an aggregate view of resource allocation (although not disaggregated by activity), further analysis of the logical framework or the basis of evaluation subject design is not discussed.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The introduction/ overview provides a high-level summary of the evaluation purpose, objectives, rationale and time period covered. It also provides an overview of the evaluation context. Whilst the context is briefly described, there is limited analysis on how the context may have affected findings. Discussion on food security, gender and nutrition were provided in more depth, whereas discussion on agriculture/ livelihoods</p>		

was less informative and tailored to geography and wider context. There was also limited detail about evaluation scope.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
Relevant evaluation criteria have been applied, including coherence, connectedness and coverage. An additional indicator related to lesson learning/ adaptability was also added. The methodology details adherence to ethical safeguards (elaborated further in Annex 3) - with specific reference to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines. Broad sampling rationale is outlined in terms of both geographical area and the types of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries represented. This may have been too ambitious given the time required for field travel; and subsequent rationalisation was not provided in detail. Proposed methods were broadly relevant, although the extent to which a full understanding of impact - across breadth of social categories - could be ascertained was limited. This suggests some lack of understanding of the possible data required and available to undertake an analysis of impact.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The majority of findings are presented in a transparent manner, with links to evidence sources, explicatory footnotes and other paragraphs within the report. Findings are impartially presented and reflect both successes and failures throughout. Whilst the evaluation does refer to uptake of recommendations from other evaluations, these are not analysed/ discussed in detail. There appears to be a greater depth of emphasis and analysis on nutrition, compared to for example FFA.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
Conclusions provide an accurate and succinct summary of the evidence; these are clearly and logically drawn from the findings and do not introduce new evidence. Although conclusions do provide an accurate summary of findings, a higher level strategic overview is not introduced. Whilst both positive and negative findings are reflected, some important nuances (e.g. relating to quality of M&E systems and capacity building across different activities) were not identified.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Meets
Both gender and equity considerations are integrated across key elements of the evaluation - in assessing its design, implementation, results and (as far as possible) impact. Different categories of vulnerable beneficiaries are specifically identified - highlighting key strengths and weaknesses of the approach. Whilst important findings relating to gender and equity are identified, the conclusions could have reflected a stronger analysis of the 'so what', whilst recommendations would be strengthened by greater specificity and efforts to build upon the strengths of the IPSR.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, and clearly focus on improving future resilience programming. Time frames and responsible actors have been identified. Recommendations would benefit from a greater emphasis on consolidating learning after years of IPSR implementation, and greater specificity through building on the achievements/ strengths across different activities.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report is professionally written and well-evidenced; it should be accessible to its intended audience. The report has a logical structure; key findings and recommendations are highlighted. The report does make use of graphs and tables to present relevant data, but this could have been extended further - particularly in presenting/ supporting results. Acronyms are often not spelt out at first use.		

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	1
2. Criteria & Questions	2
3. Methodology	3
4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI SCORE	8

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	