

Evaluation title	Evaluation à mi-parcours de l'Intervention prolongée de secours et de redressement (IPSR) Niger 200961 (Janvier 2017 – Décembre 2019) et de la dernière année de l'IPSR 200583 (Janvier 2014 – Décembre 2016)	Evaluation report number	DE/NIGER/2017/012
Type	Operation evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Niger	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 60%		Meets requirements: 7 points	
The mid-term evaluation of WFP's Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation in Niger meets requirements. The report gives a good understanding of the context, purpose and scope of the evaluation, presents findings based on evidence and includes conclusions and recommendations that are relevant to the objectives of the evaluation. The report could have been improved by providing a more detailed overview of how evidence was analysed and triangulated as well as any risk mitigation strategies that were applied.			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
<p>The summary provides a succinct overview of findings and conclusions and summarises all recommendations. It lists all key elements of the evaluation including the questions, period being evaluated, purpose and scope. An important element of the narrative is the level of resources raised against the budget and the planned activities that have been implemented. By addressing these more directly these would have improved the summary. The summary could also have been strengthened by providing some more detail on how data was brought together/triangulated given the limitations.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially
<p>The overview of the evaluation subject is one of the major weaknesses of the report. This section lacks an assessment of the logic model and there is no reconstructed theory of change. The inclusion of a more in-depth explanation of the adaptations made during implementation would have made the report more accessible. However, the overview describes comprehensively delivery modalities and main partners planned and any change, as well as information on resourcing profile over time and WFP operations in the context.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Meets
<p>The evaluation context, purpose and scope present key data and trends related to the achievement of the SDGs and describes well Government policies, priorities and institutional capacity. It also provides a full picture of gender dimensions and food security and nutrition in the area covered by the evaluation. However, the contextual information provided lacks depth. More specific information on relevant geographical areas and a reflection on how the context may have influenced the intervention would have strengthened the section.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Partially
<p>There is limited detail on how data was triangulated and how findings were verified. Limitations are provided, but mitigation strategies are not sufficiently described. The evaluation questions are clearly aligned with the criteria, but the latter are not explained in relation to the evaluation purpose and context. Details on the methodology applied can be found throughout the report, but additional information under this section would have improved the quality of the report.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
<p>Findings are evidence-based and balanced, including both successes and failures of the implementation of activities. The report presents available evidence and explains clearly gaps or challenges pertaining to the availability and reliability of data. WFP's contribution to results is identified, along with the reasons for achievement or underachievement of results. However, the report would have benefitted from a more in-depth presentation of unintended effects, which are discussed implicitly in some instances.</p>		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
Conclusions are comprehensive, stem logically from the analysis and do not introduce new evidence or unsubstantiated findings. However, they often tend to describe the evidence base, rather than answer the 'so what' question. This might be explained by limitations in data availability.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Approaches
Despite its partial integration within the findings and conclusions, gender analysis could have been better integrated into the main body of the report. While all relevant evaluation questions include Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions, the evaluation could have been more explicit on how they were included or not in the intervention design. On the more positive side, data collection tools were reportedly tailored to consider gender dimensions, with focus groups disaggregated by gender, where possible.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches
The recommendations are not sufficiently specific and actionable and would have benefited from greater clarity as to who should take them forward, what is needed to achieve change, and the indicative timeframe. On the other hand, they are relevant to inform the formulation of the Country Strategic Plan and are grouped to enable prioritization.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
Overall, the report is written with appropriate professional language and tone. It is logically structured and sources for all data and quotes are provided. However, the use of visual aids could have been improved and not all acronyms are spelt out the first time throughout the report.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI score	7

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