

Evaluation title	Evaluación Final del Programa de País del PMA en el Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia – PP 200381 2013-2017	Evaluation report number	DE/BOLIVIA/2018/012
Type	Operation evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Bolivia	PHQA date	November 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Exceeds requirements: 75%		Meets requirements: 8 points	

The Evaluation of the WFP Country Programme in Bolivia exceeds requirements. The report has a strong summary and provides a comprehensive and up-to-date description of the context and the evaluation subject. The evaluation questions, data collection methods and limitations are described accurately and in detail. Evidence is presented in a balanced manner and gender and equity issues are well-addressed. Findings are triangulated, and WFP's specific contribution is clear. Lastly, recommendations are relevant, actionable and targeted. The report would have benefitted from a more explicit discussion of the unintended effects of the country programme on human rights and gender equality. Moreover, given the large amount of quantitative data, more visual aids would have been helpful while tables could have been used more selectively.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
The report summary is of high quality. Overall, the summary is accurate, concise and fully accessible to its intended audience. The evaluation subject, users and features of the methodology are duly described. All findings, conclusions and recommendations are summarized. While there are no major weaknesses, the description of the methodology in the summary could have included more detail on data analysis methods and approaches.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
The overview provides a comprehensive description of the evaluation subject with details on the country programme's key activities and achievements, duration, geographic scope, amounts of transfers, delivery mechanisms, main partners and resourcing profile. The section also provides a short description of the log frame's quality and uses trusted international and national information sources to describe the evaluation subject. The use of resources allocated is analysed in detail and changes in transfer modalities are transparently presented. However, the section would have benefitted from a more comprehensive justification for budget and programme revisions, as well as further explanation of the analytical basis of the subject, which does not cite specific studies or assessments.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The evaluation purpose, objectives and scope are well presented, including a clear definition of the timing and the period evaluated and of the geographical focus of the evaluation and its change over time. These sections also adequately present the SDG-related trends, humanitarian issues and government priorities, as well as an analysis of how the government's policies might have influenced WFP results. Up to date and reliable data sources by international and national organizations are used and referenced. The inclusion of information on other activities implemented by WFP in the country would have further strengthened this section.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology section clearly describes the data collection methods, as well as limitations on data availability and how these were mitigated. The evaluation criteria are consistent with the evaluation's purpose and their relation to the context is very well explained. Evaluation questions are also well-defined, and the sampling criteria are transparently presented. However, greater use of quantitative data gathered through primary data collection (i.e. surveys and interviews) and the linkage of each evaluation question to evaluation criteria could have further enhanced the report.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
The key findings of the report are presented in an impartial and balanced manner and effectively address all the evaluation questions. The section provides a clear description of the evidence base and triangulates data from different sources to ensure credibility of findings. WFP's specific contribution to results in Bolivia is presented, along with an explanation of factors enabling and hindering the organization's performance. Unintended effects are considered, and efficiency aspects are well covered. Primary data, mainly collected through interviews, could have been better leveraged and analysed in greater detail,		

especially given the large number of interviews conducted. The use of quotes would have also enhanced the presentation of findings.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
The conclusions flow logically from the key findings and are balanced, reflecting both negative and positive findings. The report includes a table indicating the direct links between the key findings and conclusions which is a good practice. The lessons learned presented complement the evaluation findings and add value to the report. Some lessons are very specific to the local context and therefore are limited in their contribution to wider organizational learning.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Meets
The report addresses gender and equity issues well, including the extent to which they were explicitly integrated in the design and implementation of the country programme under evaluation. Human rights and gender equality considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation criteria. The report specifies the data collection and analysis methods applied to obtain sex-disaggregated data for the evaluation, and includes recommendations addressing gender and equity issues. One shortcoming is the lack of discussion of the unintended effects of the country programme interventions on human rights and gender equality, given the inclusion of a specific question in the Terms of Reference. Moreover, while the methodology section stated that focus group discussions were conducted with women and children, those voices are less evident in the findings section.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds
Recommendations are relevant; they clearly reflect the evaluation purpose and objectives and address all the critical areas identified by the analysis. They flow logically from findings and conclusions with explicit links made to the evaluation questions. Recommendations are specific, actionable, targeted, and realistic. A distinction is made between strategic and operational recommendations, with a clear indication of sequencing and a timeframe for action.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
Overall, the report is accessible to its intended audiences; the language used is clear and of appropriate tone. The report is logically structured with explicit linkages between findings, conclusions and recommendations. Key findings are well summarized for each of the three main evaluation questions in a box at the end of each section, which is a good practice worth replicating. Given the large amount of quantitative data, the use of visual aids such as graphs would have made the main body of the report more accessible. In addition, sources are not clear for some of the qualitative data in the report, not all acronyms are listed, and page numbers contain some errors.		

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