

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Mid-Term Evaluation of Integrated Risk Management and Climate Services Programme in Malawi from 2017-2019	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	DE/MWCO/2018/059
<b>Type</b>	Activity Evaluation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Malawi	<b>PHQA date</b>	27/01/2020
<b>Overall category – Quality rating</b>		<b>Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating</b>	
<b>Meets requirements: 70%</b>		<b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>	
<p>The Mid-Term Evaluation of Integrated Risk Management and Climate Services Programme in Malawi from 2017-2019 report meets requirements. The report provides a detailed and comprehensive presentation of the context and of the evaluation subject and is based on a robust, gender aware methodology. Programme results, including unintended results, are clearly identified. While a large body of descriptive evidence is presented to respond to the evaluation questions, the presentation of findings would have benefited from a greater focus on data analysis. Challenges and critical issues identified in the findings are logically addressed by the ten recommendations, which however are not entirely realistic and require a large amount of technical work for their implementation.</p>			

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The summary provides essential information about several important aspects of the evaluation, including its purpose and objectives, subject, users and scope. A concise but complete overview of the evaluation methodology is provided, although more detail on mitigation measures could have been provided. Recommendations are presented without omissions. However, the summary would have benefitted from a more strategic presentation of findings, which are densely written and are not clearly distinguished from conclusions.		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
A comprehensive and well-evidenced overview of the evaluation subject is provided, including a robust presentation of the logical framework and of the changes that were made during the implementation period to strengthen the programme's evaluability. The absence of a gender analysis is transparently acknowledged as a shortcoming. Evidence sources are clearly identified and referenced. The section would have benefited from the inclusion of more information on the analytical basis (e.g. evaluations, studies and assessments) that informed the programme's design.		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The evaluation provides comprehensive contextual information, particularly on humanitarian issues, government policies, priorities and institutional capacity, as well as on other WFP interventions related to the programme. Key information on the evaluation rationale, purpose, objectives, timing and scope is also provided. The main intended users of the evaluation are identified, along with an explanation of how they may use the evaluation findings, especially in relation to its learning objective. The section would have benefited from the inclusion of additional contextual information on the three targeted districts and from an explanation of the lesser emphasis on the accountability objective.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The evaluation criteria are clearly identified, and the weight given to the selected criteria is consistent with the purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation matrix is well prepared, with evaluation criteria, questions, sub-questions, indicators, information sources, data collection methods, data triangulation and analysis methods clearly outlined. An assessment of the availability and reliability of evidence is included. Efforts to mitigate gaps in data are outlined and will feed into end-of-project evaluability. The inclusion of "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE)" and "Learning" as additional evaluation criteria could have been further elaborated.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
Comprehensive, balanced evidence addresses all the evaluation questions. The evaluation provides a clear explanation of internal and external factors that affected programme's effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, and clearly identifies both positive and negative unintended effects. Evidence gaps are acknowledged and explained. Nevertheless, the findings section could have been less descriptive, and the large body of evidence would have benefitted from further analysis.		

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
<p>Conclusions make good use of the evidence presented in the findings section and do not introduce unsubstantiated judgement. They reflect both positive and negative aspects of the programme and are presented in line with the selected evaluation criteria. The section identifies highly relevant lessons for WFP’s resilience programming. While well-substantiated conclusions are presented for effectiveness and impact, conclusions for the other criteria could have more effectively brought the evidence together to provide a strategic overview of related findings.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
<p>The report assesses evaluability of programme’s gender dimensions and identifies associated limitations. The methodology provides for a range of quantitative and qualitative data sources, as well as triangulation of data, which reflect on GEWE issues from different angles. Despite the strong gender awareness in the methodological choices, gender related issues are not always followed through in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations and evidence is not entirely analysed to explore the programme’s gender dynamics beyond their effect on women.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
<p>The recommendations are relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and are logically derived from the findings and conclusions. Critical issues identified in the findings are followed through in detail in the recommendations. All recommendations have a timeframe for action. However, several recommendations are not prioritized, and some are not entirely realistic, with short timelines to implement detailed and sometimes technically complicated steps. Moreover, the recommendations would have benefitted from more specificity on who should be responsible for their implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
<p>The report is generally well structured and coherent. It uses appropriate, professional language to convey positive and negative aspects of the programme's performance in a balanced and objective manner. Maps, graphs and tables are helpful to summarise and substantiate text. The report's accessibility is only impaired by large sections of descriptive evidence and by the lack of short summaries presenting the key findings and conclusions.</p>		

<b>Gender EPI</b>	
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>

<b>Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports</b>	<b>Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator</b>
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