

|  |  |   |               |
|--|--|---|---------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>  | Ethiopia: An Evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2012-2017) | <b>Evaluation report number</b>   | OEV/2017/015  |
| <b>Type</b>  | Country Portfolio                                      | <b>Centralised/<br/>decentralised</b>   | Centralised   |
| <b>Global/region or country</b>  | Country  | <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: 61%</b>   |  | <b>Approaches requirements: 6 points</b>  |               |
| <p>The evaluation of WFP's Portfolio in Ethiopia meets requirements. The evaluation provides a good overview of WFP's portfolio in Ethiopia between 2012-2017 and how it has evolved, as well as a detailed description of the context in which it operates. The methodology sets out well defined and relevant evaluation questions and outlines the limitations and their effects on the evidence base. Findings are clearly presented and supported with examples by evidence. Overall, the tone of the report is appropriately balanced and objective. Nevertheless, the report could have been improved by including an assessment of the logic of the WFP intervention and a discussion of the analytical basis on which it was designed, as well as more systematic analysis of gender and equity issues. Moreover, while the recommendations are, broadly speaking, relevant to the evaluation's purpose and objectives, they do not address some of the key issues identified in the analysis and are often broad with no prioritisation or specific timeframe.</p> |  |   |               |

| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Category</b> | <b>Approaches</b> |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|
| While the summary provides an overview of the evaluation subject, it omits other key information, including, the evaluation questions, the commissioning unit and the intended users of the evaluation. The discussion of the methodology is also limited to a high-level overview of data collection methods. In addition, some evidence is presented in data form (e.g. reference to a graph), rather than as a summary of the findings which partially hinders accessibility. Nevertheless, the summary is broadly readable, and all of the recommendations for the evaluation are summarised, without errors or omissions.  |                 |                   |
| <b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Category</b> | <b>Meets</b>      |
| The report presents a good overview of the evaluation subject and draws on relevant internal and external data sources. It includes the objectives for all the Operations and Trust Funds that comprise the portfolio over the evaluation period, and details key changes in the operations in response to changes in emergency situations. An analysis of global and country-specific policy and strategy is also provided in the overview and in a related Annex. However, the overview does not provide an assessment of the logical framework, including intended results, and there is no reference to lessons learned from other evaluations of WFP activities that have taken place during the period.   |                 |                   |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Category</b> | <b>Exceeds</b>    |
| The evaluation context provides a detailed assessment of relevant trends in food security, the humanitarian and political context, as well as other factors likely to influence WFP's portfolio of operations over the time period under evaluation. The purpose and objective of the evaluation are outlined in detail, including the balance between the dual objectives of learning and accountability. The discussion of context however, would have benefitted from greater detail on non-WFP and government actors operating in country, as well as more explicit reference to equity related issues.   |                 |                   |
| <b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>   | <b>Category</b> | <b>Meets</b>      |
| Evaluation questions and sub-questions are well-defined, relevant and appear feasible. The International Humanitarian Principles are integrated in the evaluation questions and as a cross-cutting line of enquiry. Limitations of the methodology and effects on evidence base are broadly outlined in the report. An overview of proposed analyses is included in the evaluation matrix. Nonetheless, while the methodology is detailed across a number of Annexes in the Inception Report and Evaluation report, some of the different components of the methodology, including evaluation criteria and sub-questions, data gaps, and ethical standards are not consistently outlined or signposted within the main report and the sampling rationale is not provided. Moreover, the basis on which to assess 'success' could have been more clearly provided. |                 |                   |
| <b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>   | <b>Category</b> | <b>Meets</b>      |
| Findings are clearly presented and supported with examples and evidence. The report includes an assessment of the conformity of WFP's engagement with humanitarian principles as well as assessments of the extent to which evaluations have informed learning (both supported by further detailed analyses in Annex). WFP's contribution is described in the context of the leadership role of the Government of Ethiopia and national programmes, as well as WFP resourcing and capacity challenges. However, while a series of detailed analyses provide the basis for many of the findings highlighted in the report,   |                 |                   |

references to the evidence base and evidence of triangulation are both limited within the report and not systematically identified within the annexes. Moreover, findings do not provide an overarching assessment of coverage of WFP assistance in the context of other actors' interventions, nor specific details of coverage from a geographical or beneficiary perspective.

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

Conclusions draw fully on the evidence, with both positive and negative findings presented. This section provides a good summary rather than a strategic overview of the findings. There are also some gaps in the conclusions in relation to efficiency, gender results and analysis of humanitarian principles.

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

Some gender issues are considered across different sections of the report, including in the overview, context, findings and recommendations. Gender is explicitly integrated into two evaluation sub-questions in relation to targeting and impact on gender equality but is not systematically considered in the analysis of each programme component. Similarly, while certain equity issues are identified within the report, these are not systematically analysed as part of the focus for the evaluation. There is also limited evidence of triangulation of voices of different social groups to inform findings.

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

Recommendations do not fully address some aspects of the core areas identified in the analysis (e.g. issues of staff morale, and expertise of staff/ leadership), and other potentially important recommendations have been omitted (e.g. sharing learning from successful interventions). Moreover, the recommendations presented are often broad with no prioritisation or specific timeframe. Nevertheless, the recommendations are overall relevant to the evaluation's purpose and objectives and address some of the core areas identified in the analysis.

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

The report is clearly and professionally written and makes use of visual aids. Overall, the tone of the report is appropriately balanced and objective. Key areas for improvement to strengthen the accessibility of the report include more consistent summary and highlighting of headline findings in the text, and clearer signposting to supporting evidence in the Annexes.

| Gender EPI  |          |
|---|----------|
| 1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions | 2        |
| 2. Methodology  | 2        |
| 3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations              | 2        |
| <b>Overall EPI score</b>                                | <b>6</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   |