

Evaluation title	Evaluación final de la relevancia del rol y la respuesta del PMA para avanzar en un enfoque de asistencia alimentaria vinculado a los sistemas de protección social en Ecuador	Evaluation report number	DE/ECUADOR/2017/006
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Ecuador	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 66%		Meets requirements: 9 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's role within the social protection system in Ecuador provides a clear picture of the context and describes in detail the intervention being evaluated. The report is supported by a robust methodology, and gender and equity dimensions are extensively considered throughout the report. Moreover, findings provide a balanced overview of achievements and underachievement. Areas where the report could have been improved include reporting on unintended effects and the presentation of conclusions and recommendations, which could have been presented against the evaluation criteria, as done with the findings.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The summary of the report is very strong and well presented. It describes the evaluation purpose, objective, methods, and limitations, and lists in detail the main intended users, including also a long list of project beneficiaries. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented in full. The section presents only a minor omission in the description of the evaluation subject, namely the information on resources raised against planned budget.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>The overview section is of good quality. Key elements such as the planned achievements, beneficiary numbers, main transfer modalities and geographical scope of the evaluation are presented. Moreover, the section contains a list of the main project partners and includes reference to other WFP interventions implemented in the area. The overview would have benefitted from greater details on the analytical basis, the resourcing profile over time, and any lessons learned from other evaluations and reviews.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The context description contains pertinent data on malnutrition and public health services as well as information on other relevant humanitarian issues. Government policies are also well described. Other key elements such as the evaluation purpose, objectives, and rationale for the timing are all specified. The section could have been strengthened further by including gender considerations related to food security and nutrition issues, as well as information on relevant geographic areas at the provincial level.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The methodology section is very strong and presents only one minor limitation, namely that risks are not explicitly mentioned. The evaluation matrix is very detailed and data collection methods chosen are relevant. The level of triangulation for evaluation sub-questions is high, and a good overview of mitigation strategies adopted to address data gaps is provided. Finally, the section includes a good explanation of how analysis has been conducted against the International Humanitarian Principles.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
<p>Findings are evidence-based, transparent, and address the evaluation questions with no major omissions. They are also balanced, presenting both positive and negative results, with the latter being explained using constructive language. The section could have been strengthened by adding more details on the extent to which recommendations from previous evaluations were addressed by WFP and the extent to which the organization made best use of available resources. Finally, the unintended effects of the intervention are not explicitly described.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches

The conclusions, which are aligned with the evaluation questions, do not logically flow from the findings, which are organized according to the evaluation criteria. The section would have benefitted from the inclusion of a matrix outlining the flow from findings to conclusions, to avoid any gaps in their presentation.

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY

Category Exceeds

Gender analysis is evident in the evaluation findings and recommendations, and equity dimensions are extensively integrated throughout the report. Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions are also included in the evaluation criteria and questions, and a variety of data collection methods were used to gather data from both men and women. The report would have benefitted from a more detailed explanation of lessons learned, challenges, time and resources requested for conducting a gender-responsive evaluation.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS

Category Approaches

Most of the recommendations do not target a specific actor, and the country office seems to be implicitly responsible for their implementation. The section lacks a clear timeframe for action and no prioritisation is given, making it difficult to distinguish between operational, strategic, and gender focused recommendations. Finally, as recommendations appear to be listed by the main evaluation questions, their logical flow from the key findings, which are listed by evaluation criteria, is limited. Nevertheless, the recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives and seem feasible.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

Category Meets

The report uses clear and precise language, free of major grammar or spelling errors. Both positive and negative findings are presented in a constructive manner and sources are provided for most data. The accessibility of the report could have been improved by the use of visual aids such as graphs, info graphics or tables, and by the consistent spelling out of acronyms the first time they are used.

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