|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General** | **Comments** |
| **Independence of the evaluation process:**   * The evaluation team maintained a professional independence and was able to work freely and without interference * The relationship between the evaluation team and WFP was characterized by mutual respect and trust. |  |
| **Credibility of the report:**   * The tone of the report is constructive and not accusatory * The report raises critical issues when necessary, and does not avoid or hide problems * The evaluation presents successes and failures, positive and negative sides in a balanced way * The evaluation does not draw conclusions unless evidence clearly points to them * The evaluation report uses language sensitive to gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) issues throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc. * The evaluation is GEWE and culturally sensitive and respects the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed; it indicates the extent to which GEWE issues were incorporated and addresses implications for GEWE under each section of the evaluation report * The evaluation report illustrates the extent to which a GEWE perspective is incorporated into: (i) the design and implementation of the WFP country strategic plan; (ii) the assessment of the results; and (iii) the evaluation process itself   **Timeliness:** The evaluation report is submitted on time, in line with the agreed schedule |  |
| **Length:** The evaluation report does not exceed 30,000 words (approx. 50 pages) excluding recommendations and executive summary. Annexes do not exceed 40,000 words. An additional 15 percent (4,200 words) is allowed for reports written in French, Spanish or Portuguese. Recommendations should not exceed 1,500 words |  |
| **Accessibility:**   * The evaluation report is written in a clear and accessible manner * The structure of the findings allows the reader to understand readily evaluation findings and their inter-relationship * Key messages are summarized and highlighted * Specialized concepts are used only when necessary and clearly defined * There is a good balance between descriptive and analytical information * The language used in the report is simple and clear |  |
| **Editing:**   * The template has been followed * Acronyms are spelt out the first time they are used * Paragraphs and pages are numbered electronically * Cross-references are used * Tables and diagrams are used as relevant and are numbered |  |
| **Cover Page:**   * The Office of Evaluation EQAS template/layout is used – including formatting for cover page, inside cover, etc. * The title of the evaluation is identical to that in the ToR (unless agreed otherwise) * Date and status of the report (draft/final) is indicated on the cover page |  |
| **Executive summary** | |
| **1. Introduction** | |
| **1.1. Evaluation features** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Brief overview of the evaluation features to explain why and how the evaluation was carried out. It should include information about: * The rationale, objectives and scope of the evaluation, stakeholders and users * Methodology and limitations, main activities including timing and duration of fieldwork, evaluation team, and quality assurance   + - This section should be short (about 1 page); full details are to be provided in annexes | **Assessment criteria**   * The section is sufficient to explain to readers how the evaluation was undertaken and generate trust in impartiality and credibility of the evaluation. * The section is brief * Annexes are included and coherent with summary presented here |
| **Comment:** | |
| **1.2. Context** | |
| **Expected content**  Build on the country context section of the ToR and inception report, with any update as needed and relevant  Key headings of this section should include:   * General overview. Include basic information on: * Geography: territorial extension and borders * Demography: i) total population disaggregated by sex and age group, and ethnic groups as relevant; ii) life expectancy; iii) total fertility rate; and iv) adolescence birth rate * Basic macroeconomic indicators, including poverty rate and GINI coefficient. * If applicable: disasters, including a timeframe graph with main disasters and affected people * National policies and the SDGs. Overview of national development plans and policies in the framework of the 2030 Agenda * If available, overview of National Voluntary Report on SDG * Food and nutrition security. Include IPC map. Include data on food insecurity levels, stunting, wasting disaggregated by sex * Agriculture. Data to include: percentage agriculture of GDP and smallholder farmer productivity * Climate change and vulnerability * Education. Include data on literacy rates, primary and secondary school enrolment by sex and percentage of population with at least secondary education * Gender. Elaborate on gender inequality index and related issues * Migration, refugees and internally displaced people. Provide an overview as relevant to the country * Humanitarian protection * International Assistance, UNDAF / UNSDCF | **Assessment criteria**   * Information is relevant and necessary to understand the implications of the context for the WFP strategic plan, its thematic focus and type of activities * Relevant indicators have been identified and trend data used * There is a good balance between amount of details and synthesis * Draws from and is coherent with IR |
| **Comment:** | |
| **1.3. Subject being evaluated** | |
| **Expected content**  This section should describe the following:   * The objectives and the intervention logic of the CSP and its key assumptions and how they were informed by previous evaluations * Data on the operations/activities that fall within the scope of the evaluation - number, types, geographical distribution, number of beneficiaries, tonnage of food, levels of funding * WFP gender work in the country, how it relates to the rest of the WFP portfolio and its implications * Planned absolute numbers and percentage of beneficiaries disaggregated by sex and age * Key external events that led to significant changes in WFP work, etc. * “New” initiatives and their relative weight (e.g. cash and vouchers, P4P, grants/trust funds, EC food facility project, etc.) * CSP performance, including: a) outcome and output targets achievement rate, as feasible with available data in reporting documents; and b) up-to-date budget implementation by outcomes and activity * Overview of CO’s analytical work (e.g. needs assessments, food security, market, livelihoods, conflict analysis, GEWE analysis, monitoring systems, research, reviews, decentralized evaluations etc.) * The evolution over time of the CSP in response to changes in the external (and sometimes internal) environment * **Mandatory:** include a graphic representation of the major phases in the evolution of the portfolio over time and major changes in the external context * **Note:** much of this analysis will have been developed and presented in the ToR and IR. It should be updated and further deepened, if work done during the evaluation phase indicates this is necessary to provide a sound overview of the context in which the portfolio was developed and implemented | **Assessment criteria**   * The section is drescriptive, not analytical: It does not pre-empt the analysis of the findings section * Information is relevant, complete and important to understanding the WFP country strategic plan and to feed into the full report * Country strategic plan mapping is complete and illustrated by tables/graphs according to explicit criteria relevant to the evaluation * The strategic focus of WFP and its modes of engagement are situated in relation to the humanitarian/development/peace nexus, and the country macroeconomic classification * The CSP performance is described to provide a starting point for further quantitative and qualitative analysis to be reported in the findings section |
| **Comment:** | |
| **1.4. Evaluation methodology, limitations and ethical considerations** | |
| **Expected content**   * This section should provide an overview of the evaluation methodology, limitations and ethical considerations and how they have been addressed * Details for the methodology should be provided in Annex 2 on Methodology | **Assessment criteria**   * Relevant evaluation criteria defined and applied, consistent with the purpose/scope and explained in relation to context * The evaluation matrix enables systematic assessment against the evaluation questions (must include as a minimum: evaluation questions and criteria, performance indicators, data sources, data collection methods, and analysis methods) * The specific methods are relevant and will enable the evaluation questions to be answered; The sampling rationale is adequate and appropriate for the evaluation; efforts are made to mitigate any gaps in data, where appropriate; findings from previous evaluations or reviews are applied as a data source within the methodology * The methodology applied triangulation principles to produce and validate findings * The limitations of the methodology and their effects on the evidence base and findings are explained, including how they were addressed * The methodology is GEWE-responsive and considers wider equity and inclusion issues * The methodology description explains how any risks arose to the methodology and ethical safeguards, and provides appropriate mitigation measures * Analytical methods are described (how data have been analysed) |
| **Comment:** | |
| **2. Evaluation Findings** | |
| **Expected content**   * Findings should be structured around the standard evaluation questions and corresponding subquestions as presented in the inception report * All evaluation questions and subquestions should be addressed, and any gap as compared to the scope agreed in the inception report should be justified | **Assessment criteria**   * Findings are transparently generated and make explicit use of evidence (sources provided for data/quotes) * Findings explicitly address all the evaluation questions, with no gaps or omissions (unless explained and justified) * Any gaps in the evidence base are clearly explained, and any places where the evidence is inconclusive are also explained * WFP contributions to results (or lack of) are explicitly explained * The analysis moves beyond WFP corporate output and outcome results to consider other effects produced, such as policy influencing * Any unintended effects produced by interventions are explained * Reasons (enablers and constraining factors) for achievement and under-achievement are identified and their effects on results made clear as internal (WFP-related) or external factors * Findings are impartially presented, with absence of bias/unsubstantiated opinion * Findings are balanced, presenting successes and failures, positive and negative sides in a balanced way * Findings consider how recommendations from previous evaluations have been addressed or not addressed * Findings assess performance against the international humanitarian principles (if applicable) * Findings take different stakeholder groups into consideration, and carefully consider gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions. Findings are examined with the appropriate level of GEWE analysis as defined/agreed in ToR and inception report * Findings are triangulated from different sources to ensure credibility * Findings assess whether WFP has made the best use of available resources in its interventions |
| **Comment:** | |
| **3. Conclusions and recommendations** | |
| **3.1 Conclusions** | |
| **Expected content**   * Provide a balanced assessment of results based on the findings related to the four main evaluation questions and related subquestions * Focus on explaining why WFP performed as it did: issues that affected the performance and results that should be highlighted * Comment on the validity of the implicit/explicit logic of intervention and its key assumptions by sector, if relevant * Include conclusions on the extent to which: 1) WFP CSP was GEWE-responsive; 2) GEWE results and transformative gains were achieved; and 3) challenges and lessons regarding GEWE issues were addressed in the CSP | **Assessment criteria**   * Conclusions are substantiated by and logically flow from the findings * Conclusions should connect findings across different evaluation criteria and discuss the implications from a strategic perspective that can be useful for accountability and strategic decision making * They should be pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and should go beyond the synthesis of the findings. For example, they could discuss any trade-off between efficiency and timeliness of delivery, relevance, appropriateness of targeting and protection, or any other relevant connection that may emerge from the analysis presented in the previous sections of the report * Conclusions should refer to the intervention logic of the I/CSP and discuss the underlying assumptions, highlighting any plausible causal linkages to national development goals and the relevant SDGs. In so doing, they should consider sustainability and up-scaling by government institutions * Conclusions should refer to GEWE and social inclusion, namely to what extent and why WFP achieved transformative GEWE results and managed to reach marginalized, vulnerable, and hard-to-reach groups * **Note:** Do not introduce new evidence at this stage. This is the time to conclude |
| **Comment:** |  |
| **3.2. Lessons (optional)** | |
| **Expected content**   * This section of the report is optional in case the evaluation team has identified lessons worth noting but that do not lend themselves to concrete recommendations * Lessons contribute to wider organizational learning for WFP and partners * They can be positive or negative | **Assessment criteria**   * Lessons clearly build on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation * Lessons contribute to wider organizational learning in WFP and guide future action * Lessons have the potential for wider application and use beyond the context of the evaluation (this implies clearly identifying the conditions/situation(s) for which they are valid) |
| **Comment:** |  |
| **3.3. Recommendations** |  |
| **Expected content**  This section includes a series of short paragraphs describing up to six recommendations flowing logically from the findings and conclusions. Recommendations should be presented as per the table provided in the evaluation report template | **Assessment criteria**  Recommendations should:   * Be few (six maximum) and do not exceed 1500 words * Follow logically from the findings and conclusions * Be relevant, actionable and realistic (implementable) * Be prioritized (high/medium), grouped by type of recommendation(s) (strategic/ operational) * Be clearly targeted (should make clear/specify who should implement them – CO, RB or specific HQ unit * Where appropriate, include recommendations on how to improve: GEWE results, targeting of interventions and social inclusion |
| **Comment:** | |
| **Annexes** | **Comment** |
| * Annexes should not exceed 40,000 words. They should be supporting/expanding on text in the main report and should not include all working documents * They should be listed in the order in which they are cited in the main text * If the full report, including annexes, exceeds 100 pages consider separating essential annexes (to be included) and supplementary annexes (second volume) * Ensure to include the following annexes: * Summary Terms of Reference. * Evaluation Timeline(only if actual timeline differs from the one originally outlined in the ToR) * Methodology – this should summarize intended and actual methods applied and clearly indicate any limitations to validity. Where appropriate, it should provide reflection on experience and lessons for future evaluation. It should indicate the extent to which GEWE considerations were incorporated where applicable (e.g. GEWE as a cross-cutting theme), and how GEWE was integrated into data collection methods) * Evaluation Matrix * Data Collection Tools * Fieldwork Agenda, detailing the required schedule of meetings for each team member to be set up by the country office * Findings-Conclusions-Recommendations mapping * List of People Interviewed * Bibliography * Acronyms * As feasible, include a separate annex to analyse GEWE in more detail, as it relates to the WFP CSP. * Others (list titles)   Any technical annexes agreed at inception | * Additional technical annexes are relevant and necessary to supplement the main text * References are made in the main part of the report to relevant annexes * Annexes are complete and necessary * Annexes are numbered in the order in which they appear in text |