

Evaluation title	Evaluation Décentralisée: Programme de Pays 200326 du PAM en Guinée 2013-2017	Evaluation report number	DE/GUINEA/2017/014
Type	Operation evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Guinea	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 61%		Approaches requirements: 5 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's Country Programme in Guinea between 2013-2017 meets requirements. The evaluation provides a high-level description of the context, including an overview of key government policies and capacities. Key findings present both successes and challenges and are often transparently generated, although they could have been strengthened further by providing more consistent and explicit linkages to evidence. Overall, the report addresses the main evaluation questions and criteria through a systematic analysis and a logical presentation of conclusions. Analysis of gender dimensions could have been improved through bringing the discussion beyond beneficiaries' participation and targeting. Finally, a clearer presentation of recommendations would have increased their feasibility and usefulness.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
While the summary is succinct and readable, it would have benefited from the inclusion of additional narrative and further details to make it a standalone document. Indeed, it does not capture the breadth and depth of the methodology, conclusions and recommendations. Several findings are summarised very succinctly, while other key elements are omitted in this section (e.g. partners, users, beneficiaries and resources).		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Approaches
While the overview appears to be based upon relevant and well evidenced information, data sources are not consistently referenced. The section does not include an assessment of the logical framework nor an explanation of the analytical basis of the programme. A systematic description of transfer values and delivery modalities is also missing. On the more positive side, the section lists other WFP interventions in the country as well as lessons learned from previous evaluations and reviews.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Meets
The purpose and objectives of the evaluation are well presented, along with a rationale of the balance between learning and accountability. The evaluation context provides an overview of the key national policies relevant to the evaluation subject, outlining main priorities and an assessment of government capacity. However, the context description does not include a detailed analysis of how the wider country situation may have influenced the findings. Furthermore, the scope of the evaluation does not explicitly describe the target groups, nor the geographical areas to be covered.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The evaluation framework enables systematic assessment against the EQs, which are well-defined and appear feasible. Findings from previous evaluations are explicitly identified, as well as details as to how these have informed the evaluation. Potential data limitations have been identified, along with a presentation of mitigation strategies adopted. Data collection tools and data sources are presented in detail. However, triangulation of data and information is not explicitly presented although the evaluation matrix indicates that multiple data sources have been utilised to support findings. Finally, the section would have benefitted from greater specificity on data sources, sampling rationale and analytical methods used.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The findings address all evaluation questions, which are used to organize the narrative of the report. Gaps in the evidence base are identified throughout, particularly in relation to assessment of results (outcomes and impact). The findings also consider how recommendations and lessons from previous evaluations and reviews have been considered, including an explicit and detailed analysis of efficiency. However, whilst findings appear to be transparently generated, they are not consistently and explicitly linked to the evidence and the application of triangulation is rarely identified.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches
While most key conclusions are captured, summative statements on important findings- such as those related to the development of local markets, nutrition, and logistics- have been omitted. Although lessons identified have the potential to		

be valuable to the wider organisation, there is no analysis of how the learning can be applied to other contexts. Nevertheless, the conclusions have a logical flow from the findings and analysis and are largely balanced.

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY

Category

Partially

The report methodology would have benefited from a greater integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions (e.g. in the evaluation questions, indicators, data sources). There is limited discussion of gender analysis beyond participation and targeting within the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Regarding equity considerations, findings provide some analysis of the extent to which vulnerable groups (including PLW, malnourished children and PLHA) were targeted and reached by the intervention.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS

Category

Approaches

Some recommendations appear ambitious and sub-recommendations are often nested within overarching recommendations. Furthermore, they are not sequenced or grouped to enable prioritisation, and clear time frames have not been proposed. On the positive side, the recommendations are evidently derived from the findings and target specific sub-units within country and regional offices.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

Category

Exceeds

The report is logically structured, clearly written and well supported by the use of visual aids. The tone is largely balanced and the report is accessible for the intended audiences. However, key messages could have been better summarised and referencing to data sources could have been made more explicit.

Gender EPI

1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions

2

2. Methodology

2

3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations

1

Overall EPI score

5

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
UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator**

7–9 points = Meets requirements

4–6 points = Approaches requirements

0–3 points = Missing requirements