

Evaluation title	Central African Republic: An evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2012-mid 2017)	Evaluation report number	OEV/2017/004
Type	Country Portfolio Evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Central African Republic	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 61%		Approaches requirements: 6 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's Portfolio in the Central African Republic between 2012 and mid-2017 meets requirements. It provides well balanced recommendations that are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives. Key evaluation questions are addressed, including a detailed analysis of efficiency across the portfolio of interventions. Wider effects are also considered, such as the influence of the intervention on national policy, capacity strengthening and social cohesion. The evaluation report would have benefitted from more substantial analysis of the portfolio evaluated. More systematic consideration of gender objectives and mainstreaming throughout the evaluation would have strengthened the messaging and learning on gender. Accessibility of the report could have been improved by better highlighting key findings.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
The summary is succinct and broadly accessible, and details the evaluation subject, high level findings and conclusions. However, it does not provide a comprehensive overview of important aspects of the evaluation such as the rationale, details on the methodology and conclusions in relation to gender. Moreover, it introduces new observations and concepts vis-à-vis the main report. The evaluation questions are not explicitly described or referenced either.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially
A thematic overview of the WFP portfolio and a 'chronology' of the context are provided, but these are brief and not accompanied by an analysis that links them together. The strategic outcomes of the current interim country strategic plan (ICSP) 2018-2020 are outlined, but not discussed in the overview. Finally, while no strategic framework existed for the WFP's interventions during the period evaluated, there was no attempt to develop a logic model for the 'portfolio'. Overall, a high-level overview of the evaluation subject is provided, including an outline of key activities, thematic engagement, and broad results achieved.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The evaluation purpose and objectives and the linkages between them are clear and explicit, including an opportunity to provide corporate lesson learning around the capacity to adapt to the complex emergency in CAR demonstrated by the organization. In addition, there is clarity on the rationale and period covered by the evaluation. The contextual information is highly relevant, up-to-date and clearly referenced from reliable sources, even though the report would have benefited from a more extensive analysis of the institutional frameworks as well as of the beneficiary population or geographical areas affected by the crisis.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology incorporates all relevant evaluation criteria and is consistent with the terms of reference. Assessment methods are outlined in detail in the evaluation matrix and integrated household panel surveys are referenced as a key priority within the methodology. Among multiple sources of data, the report references previous evaluations and uses them to inform the findings. The section could have been improved by presenting key ethical considerations (such as confidentiality and do-no-harm) in one coherent section and providing more detail on limitations and mitigation efforts.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The findings are balanced and use a combination of different data sources, supporting the credibility of the evaluation. Both enabling (logistics, partnerships) and constraining factors (insecurity, lack of funding, poor data) are identified and gaps in the evidence-base are acknowledged. An interesting assessment of contribution to both national policy and capacity strengthening is provided in the report. However, the evaluation lacks an overview of the breath of actors working within relevant humanitarian/ development context in CAR and this hinders a comprehensive assessment of WFP's role in the country.		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
Conclusions are organised under the three broad evaluation questions. They are balanced, reflecting both positive and negative findings and for the most part, flow logically from the findings and analysis. Some gaps are identified, particularly in relation to the application of international humanitarian principles.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Partially
Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions are only partially integrated into the evaluation questions, while equity dimensions are not explicitly or consistently addressed throughout the report. Different beneficiary groups are identified through the stakeholder analysis but are not included in the evaluation matrix. The challenges, lessons and recommendations do not reflect a gender-responsive evaluation with the exception of one recommendation that focuses on gender across various aspects of the programme. Conclusions, however, summarise core findings related to gender and apply a gender analysis, particularly in relation to nutrition targeting of people living with HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
Recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives and are specific, actionable, targeted, and realistic. They link clearly and logically to the analysis and findings and address critical areas identified in findings and conclusions sections. However, they are not sequenced or prioritised, and the time frame recommended is very broad. Recommendations would have benefited from a greater focus on protection and vulnerable groups.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
The report is grammatically correct and has an appropriately balanced tone. It makes use of maps, tables and graphs and has a full list of acronyms, which are spelt out on first use. However, it is too long and only headings and sub-headings are used to organise the narrative; key messages are not made distinct or summarised.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI score	6

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
Meets requirements: 60–74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements