

Evaluation title	Évaluation à mi-parcours du programme pays De janvier 2015 à juin 2017	Evaluation Report #	200648
Type	OPEV	Centralised/ Decentralised	Decentralised
Global / Region or Country	Congo, Republic of	PHQA date	26-07-2018

Quality Rating - overall category	EPI – Overall Report Category	
Meets requirements: 60% - 74%	4-7 points = Approaches requirements	
<p>The context provides relevant statistics linked to the four key components of the country program and highlights key factors affecting implementation (such as governance challenges), however there is limited analysis around wider food insecurity issues (such as government capacity, markets and infrastructure), or details of geographical challenges and other development/ humanitarian activity. Findings are organised around evaluation criteria and questions; whilst these are largely addressed, some aspects (e.g. relating to efficiency and impact) are not fully addressed as per evaluation matrix. Greater clarity on the extent to which a revised program/ plan was developed (and could or could not be used as a basis for an evaluation), and the implications of this for the evidence base would be helpful. Gender analysis is evident in the analysis of program design, implementation and results across the two components evaluated, however there is scope for GEEW to be more systematically integrated into the analysis through development of more gender-responsive (sub-)evaluation questions. Whilst recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives, and address key findings - they could be targeted more effectively towards providing the country office with a more strategic orientation/ prioritisation - as identified within the ToRs.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
<p>Key findings, conclusions and recommendations are mostly summarised within the summary. Minimum information related to the evaluation and the evaluation subject are provided. The summary is succinct; whilst most key features of the methodology is mentioned these are not described, and the description of the evaluation subject is partially provided. A few key aspects of findings and conclusions have not been included.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Approaches
<p>The overview provides a reasonable summary of the evaluation subject, including the time period and geography covered, as well as an overview of intended results and activities. A number of adaptations to design are described (for example in relation to activities and geography), in relation to significant budget limitations. Whilst an overview of the logical framework is provided, no assessment of the program logic is provided within the overview. Whilst data sources provided are relevant, where multiple data sources are given these are not individually listed.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Approaches

<p>The context provides up-to-date, key statistics relating to poverty and the four components of the evaluation subject. Wider issues affecting food insecurity - such as governance challenges, climate change and dependence upon extractive resources are highlighted within the context section. Whilst objective and purpose of the evaluation are given, further details - particularly related to its role in guiding WFP and donors in prioritising future programming in light of dramatic budget shortages could have been elaborated further. Relevant statistics linked to the four key components of the country program are given, however there is limited analysis around wider food insecurity issues (such as government capacity, markets and infrastructure); or details of geographical challenges and/or other development/ humanitarian support.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
<p>Evaluation criteria applied are broadly appropriate, although given the timeframe of the evaluation (and restricted implementation) the inclusion of impact may have been over-ambitious. Evaluation questions are explicitly aligned to the selected evaluation criteria, although no sub-evaluation questions were developed. Ethical safeguards are mentioned, including how these were applied and with explicit reference to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines. Although the evaluation matrix comprises key elements, there is a lack of detail of the specific data sources and analysis methods that will provide the basis for assessment against the specific components of the evaluation questions and indicators proposed. Whilst the basis for some sampling decisions are provided; a full sampling strategy across the four components (to the extent they were considered) is not provided.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
<p>Findings are for the most part transparently generated; data sources are cited and triangulation is often explicit. Findings are presented in a balanced manner, and includes discussion on enabling and constraining factors, WFP contribution and unintended effects. Findings are organised around each EQ; these are largely addressed - although certain aspects (e.g. aspects relating to efficiency and impact are not fully addressed as per evaluation matrix/ indicators); relevance also addresses coherence with government and WFP policy, and complementarity with other partners. Whilst a number of gaps in the evidence base are identified, there is insufficient clarity on the extent to which a revised implementation plan/ targets was developed (and could or could not be used as a basis for an evaluation), and the implications of this for the evidence base.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>Conclusions provide a summary of key evidence; these flow logically from findings and analysis and are balanced. Conclusions bring evidence together by criteria, and partially succeeds in responding to the 'so what' question. Stronger/ more coherent substantiation would better support the conclusion related to how funds should have been prioritised following reduction in funding.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Partially
<p>Gender analysis, with an emphasis beyond participation to women's role in society, is evident in analysis of program design, implementation and results across the two components evaluated. The need to further strengthen GEEW capabilities across the programme - principally through capacity building within WFP and government - is a key recommendation. The overview of the evaluation subject does not consider gender or equity issues - however these are addressed as part of the evaluation analysis. Whilst GEEW dimensions are partially integrated into evaluation questions relating to relevance and impact; there is scope for GEEW to be more systematically integrated across more evaluation questions, and/or through sub-questions.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
<p>Recommendations are logically derived from the analysis/ findings, and are specific and actionable. Responsible actors, primarily the WFP country office, are identified. Whilst recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives, and address key findings - they could be targeted more effectively towards providing the country office with a more strategic orientation/ prioritisation - as identified within</p>		

the ToRs. Recommendations could be grouped in order of prioritisation, with specific and clear timeframes proposed across them all.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

Category

Exceeds

The report is logically structured and sequenced and uses clear linkage between sections; key messages are summarised at the end of each criteria/analysis section. The report uses relevant visual aids - including maps, graphs and tables throughout. Limited examples where analysis could have been presented more coherently, and more precise language utilised. Some acronyms are not listed in the acronym table.

**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	1
3. Methodology	1
4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
Overall EPI SCORE	4

**Quality Rating Scale Legend
Evaluation Reports**

Exceeds requirements: 75% - 100%

Meets requirements: 60% - 74%

Approaches requirements: 50% - 59%

Partially meets requirements: 25% - 49%

Does not meet requirements: 0% - 24%

**Overall Scoring of Gender EPI Scale Legend
Evaluation Reports**

UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator

11-12 points = Exceeds Requirements

8-10 points = Meets requirements

4-7 points = Approaches requirements

0-3 points = Missing requirements