

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Final Evaluation of WFP's USDA McGovern – Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Programme's Support in Afar and Somali regions in Ethiopia 2013-2017	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	DE/ETHIOPIA/2017/016
<b>Type</b>	Thematic evaluation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Ethiopia	<b>PHQA date</b>	January 2019
<b>Overall category – Quality rating</b>		<b>Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating</b>	
<b>Meets requirements: 70%</b>		<b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's USDA McGovern Dole (MGD) International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Programme's Support in Afar and Somali regions in Ethiopia in 2013-2017 meets requirements. It provides an excellent presentation of the evaluation subject and of the context where the intervention took place, as well as a very robust methodological approach. Findings are systematically presented against the evaluation questions and rationale for recommendations is given, making it possible to link them back to evidence and conclusions. The report would have been further improved by a discussion of key lessons learned and by a broader consideration of stakeholders in the targeting of recommendations.</p>			

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The summary presents effectively most elements found in the report, especially the recommendations, which are provided in full. It is also succinct, readable, and accessible to readers and details the intervention including activities, budget and value of the programme over its 4 years of implementation. However, the change of structure away from the key questions makes it hard to track consistency against the main report.		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The overview of the evaluation subject is short and concise, adequately informing the reader and comprehensively referencing internally to annexes and externally to appropriate and up to date sources. Any adjustments made to the design are also clearly described. The section could have been strengthened by a more complete account of the Theory of Change, which is nevertheless given under another section (i.e. methodology).		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The presentation of the context, purpose and objectives of the evaluation is effective and easy to follow. The information on context is relevant and up to date and there is good cross referencing to other national programmes and their impact on the localities. The section provides appropriate explanation of the evaluation purposes, namely the assessment of performance and the provision of evidence for future decisions. In terms of the scope, there's an explanation that the evaluation covers all relevant aspects of the programme and it is clear how it differs from some other MGD programmes.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The methodology is comprehensively described in the main text and in the annexes. The evaluation criteria follow the specifications in the terms of reference and fit the purpose and scope of the evaluation. There is also detailed information about sample sizes and locations, as well as an analysis of Education Management Information System (EMIS) and desk data. However, large sections in the annexes could have been edited to reflect past tense, as they were taken from the inception report, raising a question about whether information had been fully updated to take account of actual events.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The presentation of findings and analysis is done systematically against almost every evaluation question, drawing widely on various sources of data and providing explanatory footnotes and referencing resources and sources in the annexes. WFP contribution to results is presented, with clear distinction between results deriving from WFP support, actions by government or other parties such as FAO. The key weakness of the section is, however, the lack of a comprehensive answer to the evaluation question on learning which is not addressed in the final report.		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches
There are no lessons identified in the evaluation, even though there was a specific question on it in the TOR. Nevertheless, the overall assessment broadly follows evaluation criteria and adds a critical assessment of assumptions included in the theory of change. Major themes of relevance, delivery of results, effectiveness, and sustainability are well addressed in the section.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Meets
Gender and equity dimensions have been practically applied throughout the report, building up on their integration in the inception report. The evaluation includes a gender specific question and a dedicated annex provides a comprehensive explanation of gender in the country. The methodology includes specific gender indicators and gender disaggregated statistics and specific recommendations address GEWE issues and point out priorities for actions in this area. Despite the comprehensive guidance for the data collection exercise, there is insufficient clarity as to how to avoid gender bias and gender discrimination when conducting field interviews and surveys.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
The recommendations flow logically from conclusions and are supported by a statement clarifying the rationale for their formulation. All appear to be realistic with specific actions identified and grouped in three relevant clusters to enable prioritisation. All recommendations include a timeline for their implementation.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
The report is logically structured and presents information in a straightforward and effective style. Language used throughout the report is professional, clear and concise, avoiding unnecessary technical terminology. Moreover, there is an appropriate number of tables which are easy to read and use. However, the lack of summaries for each evaluation question makes it hard for the reader to bring the evidence together and assess the completeness of the conclusions.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	8

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