

|  |   |   |                 |
|--|---|---|-----------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>  | Evaluación final del proyecto regional “Respuesta al fenómeno de El Niño en el Corredor Seco” | <b>Evaluation report number</b>   | DE/REG/2018/001 |
| <b>Type</b>  | Operation evaluation  | <b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>   | Decentralised   |
| <b>Global/region or country</b>  | Central America   | <b>PHQA date</b>  | November 2019   |
| <b>Overall category – Quality rating</b>   |   | <b>Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating</b> |                 |
| <b>Meets requirements: 74%</b>   |   | <b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>   |                 |
| <p>The Evaluation of the regional project ‘Response to the El Niño phenomenon in the Dry Corridor’ in Central America largely meets requirements. The summary is accurate, concise and useful. The information on context, purpose, objectives and scope is of high quality, as is the evaluation methodology, which applies relevant evaluation criteria and sound data collection methods. Limitations and the mitigation measures are clearly outlined, as are ethical safeguards. Evaluation findings are transparently generated, addressing all three main evaluation questions. The comprehensive and balanced conclusions bring evidence together, guided by evaluation criteria and questions. Gender and protection issues are suitably covered. Recommendations are usefully grouped into those that are strategic or operational. However, a key limitation relates to the lack of direct correspondence between the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions and sub-questions. The report would have benefitted from a more detailed examination of interviews, held with many informants, including different beneficiary groups. Finally, the presentation of results is done primarily through tables and could have been further strengthened using more visuals and graphics.</p> |   |   |                 |

|   |                 |         |
|---|-----------------|---------|
| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Category</b> | Exceeds |
| <p>Overall, the summary is accurate, concise, useful, and accessible to intended readers. It provides a comprehensive overview of the key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation type and subject are mentioned, as well as the intended users of the evaluation. The main shortcoming in the summary relates to the methodology section. Data analysis methods are not mentioned and the rationale for the evaluation approach chosen is not included.</p>  |                 |         |
| <b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Category</b> | Exceeds |
| <p>The overview clearly explains the analytical basis of the project and uses reliable and internationally recognized information sources (such as UNDP, FAO, CEPAL and the Human Development Index). Transfer modalities and resource allocation are also presented in detail. While there are no major strategic weaknesses, tables in this section could have provided more information on planned achievements (beneficiaries and transfers) by country, for instance specifying timeframes and milestones.</p>   |                 |         |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Category</b> | Exceeds |
| <p>The information on context, purpose, objectives and scope is of high quality. The context section describes the climatic, geological and economic challenges for the four project countries, including how the context of the project might have influenced wider project results due to the adverse effects of the El Nino phenomena. The main objectives of accountability and lesson learning are balanced, well defined and inter-linked. The evaluation coverage is provided. The report could have been strengthened by better detailing the other relevant on-going WFP activities in the region, country and at sub-national level.</p>  |                 |         |
| <b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>   | <b>Category</b> | Meets   |
| <p>The methodology is of high quality. Relevant evaluation criteria are used and are consistent with addressing the objectives of accountability and lesson learning. The evaluation matrix is well developed listing evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators, data sources, methods for data collection and analysis and the quality of evidence. The sampling criteria applied and data collection methods are sound. Limitations and the mitigation measures are clearly outlined, as are ethical safeguards. The main weakness relates to how evaluation criteria are linked to evaluation questions and their sub-questions. Criteria are indeed bundled by main evaluation question, which is suboptimal.</p> |                 |         |
| <b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>   | <b>Category</b> | Meets   |

Findings are transparently generated, with all three main evaluation questions and gaps in the evidence base addressed. The report explains WFP's contribution to project results and discusses the reasons affecting performance. The findings are triangulated, presented in a balanced way and free of bias. While the report refers to positive unintended effects of the project, the utility of the report could have been enhanced by providing more insights and following up on the extent to which recommendations made in a previous evaluation were addressed.

|                                 |                 |                |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS</b> | <b>Category</b> | <b>Exceeds</b> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|

The conclusions are comprehensive and presented in a balanced manner. The conclusions bring evidence together, guided by the evaluation criteria and questions. Lessons learned are identified and many lessons are applicable beyond the context of the project. The table that shows the flow from findings to conclusions adds great value to the section. In a few cases, conclusions are mixed with findings in text boxes. When this occurs, the logical flow from findings to conclusions is hampered.

|                                       |                 |              |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY</b> | <b>Category</b> | <b>Meets</b> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|

Gender and protection have been applied across the evaluation criteria and integrated in specific sub-questions. The sections show the degree of lack of equality in the four project countries. Gender and equity are discussed in the findings, conclusions and recommendations section, for example findings on community capacity building and conclusions on women empowerment issues in WFP programming. However, the rich diversity of views from 440 interviewees could have been examined in more detail in order to provide greater insight into the views of different beneficiary groups. Neither gender nor human rights are discussed under unintended effects.

|                                     |                 |                |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b> | <b>Category</b> | <b>Exceeds</b> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|

The report transparently presents the logical flow from findings to conclusions and recommendations. The recommendations are directly related to the main issues addressed in the evaluation findings. Recommendations are realistic, targeted and actionable. A minor area for improvement concerns the prioritization of recommendations which could have been more explicitly provided; the section indirectly provides a prioritisation through the suggested timeframe for action.

|   |                 |              |
|---|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b> | <b>Category</b> | <b>Meets</b> |
|---|-----------------|--------------|

Overall, the report is logically structured, with clear links between sections and a logical flow connecting findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report uses clear, appropriate and easily-understood language, as well as a balanced tone. Key messages are summarized at the end of each section on the main evaluation questions. However, despite the availability of substantial data sets, the presentation of results is limited to tables and the use of graphics is limited. The report includes some editorial weaknesses such as incorrect page numbers and the list of acronyms is incomplete.

| Gender EPI  |          |
|---|----------|
| 1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions | 3        |
| 2. Methodology  | 3        |
| 3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations              | 2        |
| <b>Overall EPI score</b>                                | <b>8</b> |

| Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports | Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports<br>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   |