

Evaluation title	Mid-Term Evaluation of Zambia Country Programme 200891, 2016-2020	Evaluation report number	DE/ZMCO/2017/001
Type	Operation evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Zambia	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 66%		Meets requirements: 9 points	
<p>The mid-term evaluation of the Zambia Country Programme 2016-2020 meets requirements. It starts with a very clear presentation of the context, purpose and scope and includes well substantiated evidence and findings. The evaluation demonstrates a clear and consistent awareness and understanding of the GEEW and equity dimensions and integrates these into all evaluation questions. The recommendations provided are relevant to the evaluation purpose and provide very detailed implementation plans. However, conclusions could have been presented more clearly in relation to the evaluation criteria and the report would have benefited from a separate presentation of findings and conclusions.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The summary is clear, concise and easy to understand. It provides a clear and comprehensive summary of key findings and recommendations to inform decision-making. It also includes an explanation of key terms and concepts that provides a helpful reference to understand technical language used throughout the report. However, a few key elements are missing, such as detail about the evaluation methodology, main users, and different components of the Country Programme.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
The overview provides key information about the evaluation subject including beneficiary numbers, the types of transfer modalities, the geographical scope and the main partners. It is also comprehensive in outlining the analytical basis of the Programme and the resource allocation for different activities. Whilst the report explains how WFP Zambia country office is shifting from direct implementation to technical assistance and capacity development, the implications for the program being evaluated are not fully explained. Finally, a clarification of why activities identified as being outside the Programme have been included in the evaluation would have helped contextualise the findings.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The context is clear, relevant and concise. It draws on relevant and current information sources and provides an informative overview of relevant contextual factors, including gender equality issues, climate risks, food production and agricultural practices, which clarifies the rationale behind and the results of the projects being evaluated. The scope of the evaluation is also well defined and presented. However, the evaluation purpose and specific objectives (other than accountability and learning) could have been more clearly identified.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology includes a clear and comprehensive overview of key elements with additional detail in annexes. Evaluation questions are relevant, clear, and well-defined, while the methods appear realistic to ensure they are answered. Challenges related to the availability and reliability of evidence are also identified. However, clarifying the definition of the evaluation criteria and the benchmarks against which the programme's performance was assessed, as well as any risks and mitigation measures, would have given greater substance to the section.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The report provides a comprehensive and balanced overview of relevant evidence against all evaluation questions. Unintended effects of the interventions are highlighted and enablers and constraints for the achievement or non-achievement of results are identified and ascribed along with any gaps in the evidence base. Findings are triangulated and reflect on the extent to which recommendations from previous evaluations have been addressed. Whilst a large amount of evidence is presented and discussed, the report lacks an explicit analysis of the extent to which WFP makes best use of available resources.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches

<p>The conclusions in the main report partially follow a logical flow from the findings and analysis and are not fully consistent with those presented in the executive summary. While they reflect both positive and negative findings, it would have been helpful to explain why they are more focused on challenges related to technical assistance and capacity strengthening rather than on other components.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The evaluation demonstrates a clear and consistent understanding of the Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions, relevant to the subject. The methodology articulates a well-defined and integrated approach to addressing GEEW-related dimensions of the programme's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Evaluation methods demonstrate a gender-sensitive approach (e.g. separate Focus Group Discussions were conducted with men, women, boys and girls) and GEEW dimensions are thoroughly investigated and explained in the findings. Finally, recommendations consistently address issues identified about gender mainstreaming, GEEW and equity.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
<p>The recommendations are relevant and consistent with the evaluation purpose, learning objectives, key findings, and conclusions. Implementation plans for each recommendation are provided, with a clear indication of the steps that need to be taken, as well as the priority, timeline and responsible unit. In general, recommendations appear to be realistic. However, with many high-priority recommendations to be implemented or led by the home-grown school meals Focal Point, feasibility need to be considered in relation to capacity and/or timeframes for implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
<p>The report presents a balanced and objective assessment of the programmes, using precise and professional language. Sources for all data and quotes are provided and clearly referenced. Tables, figures, and annexes are used appropriately to illustrate or summarise information. However, readability could have been enhanced if the detailed analyses were moved to an annex.</p>		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	9

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