

Evaluation title	End-line evaluation of the target public distribution reforms project in Bhubaneswar	Evaluation report number	DE/INCO/2018/055
Type	Activity Evaluation	Centralized/ Decentralized	Decentralized
Global/region or country	India	PHQA date	February 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 66%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The “End-line evaluation of the target public distribution reforms project in Bhubaneswar” meets requirements. It provides a comprehensive description of the context in which the intervention took place and the rationale for WFP support. The discussion of the methodology is complete, with an appropriate level of detail about the selected evaluation criteria, the evaluation questions, the mixed methods used and the limitations, although some information could have been provided in the annexes. Findings answer systematically each evaluation question and reflect the focus on women beneficiaries, a core part of the evaluation design. The report would have benefitted from the inclusion of lessons and good practice, which were not provided despite being requested in the evaluation design.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The presentation covers all the main issues in a concise and accessible way and provides a comprehensive presentation of the key findings. Information on the evaluation period, users and scope is provided, while details on evaluation questions, limitations to the methodology, and resourcing profile of the intervention are omitted or not presented in useful detail. The summary would have benefitted from the inclusion of a summary of conclusions and recommendations that is more in line with the text provided in the main report.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
The section presents a clear description of the distribution system and the key rationale for WFP intervention in support of its reform. Information on planned achievements, beneficiaries, activities and main partners is provided. The report also makes correct use of evaluations and reviews to accurately describe the intervention. However, the section misses the opportunity to explain how this project fits in the context of the Country Strategic Plan. Even though the intervention logic is quite simple, there is no assessment of the theory of change.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The evaluation context, purpose and scope are well described with detailed information about the workings of the distribution system and the errors and inefficiencies that have been found. The purpose of the project (i.e. introduce new methods to tackle implementation problems) is evident. There are no major weaknesses. The report would have benefitted from the inclusion of a description of any other WFP activity in the state or elsewhere in the country.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology section is quite comprehensive and provides an appropriate level of detail about the evaluation criteria, the mix of quantitative and qualitative data and limitations to the methodology. Ethical considerations are considered and presented in detail. The indicators for assessment, the sampling design and key methodological risks could have been described better in the main report, with greater detail and supporting information provided in the annexes, and the evaluation questions could have been revised and refined compared to what was provided in the Terms of Reference. The evaluation matrix would have benefitted from a clearer explanation of the analytical methods used.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The findings and analysis answer systematically the evaluation questions, presenting results in a balanced way and highlighting key successes and areas of under-performance. Evidence from a range of sources was used and a description of unintended effects (e.g. women receiving a poorer service than men, unexpected weakening of community oversight and less community participation/ ownership due to process automation) is provided. The presentation could have made more use of the qualitative interviews to explore why some actions did not achieve the expected results and also to explore the wider policy implications from the programme and its cost-effectiveness.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches

Conclusions are well- presented, structured according to the evaluation criteria and follow logically from the findings in the study. The report misses the opportunity to draw out lessons and good practices from the intervention, even though the terms of reference explicitly list this as a key feature of the evaluation.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Meets
A strong awareness of GEEW is evident in the evaluation framework, methodology, analysis, findings, conclusions. A focus on women for the ration card system was a core part of the evaluation and is reflected in all parts of the study. Although gender issues were integral to the design, the evaluation did not explore issues more widely than the specific questions in the framework and made little use of the qualitative data to explore the voices of diverse social groups or to explore equity issues and unintended effects of the system.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
The recommendations follow logically from the findings and conclusions and treat the various topics in a practical and considered way. All recommendations are realistic and feasible and are relevant to the evaluation purpose and scope. The recommendations would have benefited from the inclusion of additional details about the responsible actors, prioritization and the timeframe for implementation. Three areas highlighted in the conclusions concerning cost effectiveness, food security and effects on GEEW would have deserved some recommendations from the evaluation.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
The report has a logical structure and makes effective use of tables and figures. Findings are presented in an objective way with appropriate quotations and reference to sources of data, although their presentation would have been improved by the use of short summaries. In a few places the text would have benefitted from careful editing to correct some missing words, explain the use of technical terminology and spell out the few acronyms not listed in the annex.		

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