

Evaluation title	USDA Mc-Govern Dole FY16 End-line Evaluation in Lao PDR [FY 14-16]	Evaluation report number	DE/LACO/2018/001
Type	Activity evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR)	PHQA date	March 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Approaches requirements: 52%		Meet requirements: 7 points	
<p>The evaluation of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Mc-Govern Dole grant for school feeding in Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR) from 2014 to 2016 approaches requirements. Whilst presenting a sound methodology with GEEW considerations generally mainstreamed and providing a large amount of evidence and information, the report falls short in answering the evaluation questions and does not present conclusive finding statements that systematically address the programme's performance. Recommendations do not answer the accountability aspects and their formulation makes it difficult to act upon.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
The summary cannot stand alone to inform decision-making. Even though it identifies the evaluation's main target audiences, is appropriate in length and presents a lot of evidence, the absence of essential information about the programme (e.g. Theory of Change, beneficiaries and budget), the evaluation (e.g. methodology, criteria and questions), as well as the lack of coherent, complete conclusions, makes it difficult to read and judge whether the recommendations can be used with confidence to inform decision-making.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Approaches
The section does not provide a systematic and coherent overview of the evaluation subject. The contextual information provided, including education, health, and WASH data, are not always relevant to the programme and there is also no discussion of how the context informed the programme, even though changes to the original design are mentioned. The section would have benefitted from an explanation of the analytical basis and result framework. However, the overview provides enough details on beneficiaries, delivery modalities, main partners and their roles.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Meets
Key aspects of the evaluation such as its purpose, objectives, intended users and rationale are outlined clearly in this section. The context analysis provides a sound overview of relevant government policies, strategies and plans and is drawn from reliable sources. In addition, external factors that may have influenced the implementation and achievement of results are well identified. However, discussion on the relationship between nutrition and educational outcomes is incomplete and gender and equity dimensions of the programme are not sufficiently explained.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The evaluation methodology is generally sound and presents all the required elements, including ethical safeguards. Evaluation questions are explicitly aligned to the selected evaluation criteria and the section builds on data from the programme's mid-term review and past evaluations. Whilst limitations and mitigations efforts are clearly identified, their implications for the reliability of findings are not always fully explained.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Approaches
Despite the large amounts of information and evidence, the answers to the evaluation questions are not always clear and there are no conclusive findings stating whether the programme has been relevant and effective, and whether it has achieved its impact and is sustainable. Moreover, the section lacks an explanation of the enablers and factors leading to underachievement, and to what extent they relate to WFP. Nevertheless, even if not explicitly, it provides an explanation of the unintended effects of the intervention. Finally, the assessment of efficiency is based on a clear approach and presents robust, relevant information to arrive at clear findings about the programme's use of resources.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Partially

<p>The conclusions presented against the evaluation criteria are mainly an extract of selected information from the findings, which while significant, does not answer the 'so what' questions. The two overall conclusions are biased in terms of the strengths, challenges and missed opportunities of the programme, and present an unbalanced picture. Furthermore, the lessons learned focus on the programme itself with no indication of potential wider applicability in other contexts.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Approaches
<p>The report lacks a coherent analysis or description of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) issues relevant to the programme. While sex disaggregated data is collected through a range of methods and tools, it is not adequately analysed and interpreted to identify GEEW-related findings and inform the conclusions. The recommendations do not provide a clear way forward to strengthen the gender and equity dimensions of the next programme, either. Nevertheless, conclusions relating to the programme's relevance, effectiveness and impact report on the equity dimensions of the programme.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches
<p>Recommendations do not clearly answer the learning questions and are not clearly sequenced and prioritised. Many of the recommendations focus on operational issues while the strategic elements are often not clearly distinguished. Furthermore, the competency and resourcing requirements, the longer-term sustainability implications and the timing outlooks are not adequate in some cases, with clear implications for the recommendations' feasibility. Nevertheless, the rationale and proposed actions for implementation are generally clear.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
<p>The overall structure of the report is logical, and the tone used is neutral. Maps, graphs and tables are used successfully to illustrate and summarise key information. However, the use of technical jargon in some sections (e.g. methodology) impairs its accessibility.</p>		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	2
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