

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation des activités de renforcement des capacités institutionnelles dans le domaine de l'alimentation scolaire au Togo de 2016 à 2018	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	DE/TOGO/2018/018
<b>Type</b>	Thematic evaluation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Country	<b>PHQA date</b>	January 2020
<b>Overall category – Quality rating</b>		<b>Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating</b>	
<b>Meets requirements: 66%</b>		<b>Partially meets requirements: 6 points</b>	
<p>This Evaluation des activités de renforcement des capacités institutionnelles dans le domaine de l'alimentation scolaire au Togo de 2016 à 2018 meets requirements. The report is well-written, accessible and objective. It clearly outlines the evaluation objectives and purpose and describes the relevant context in which the evaluation takes place. The methodology includes the main elements required and is designed to enable most of the evaluation questions to be answered confidently. Broadly speaking, findings are clearly presented and linked to the evidence. Conclusions and recommendations are relevant and flow logically from findings, although more consideration of different financial scenarios may have helped guide the prioritization of recommendations. A few areas of the report could have been further strengthened, including the overview of the evaluation subject which is missing a number of important elements, gender issues which would have benefited from more systematic consideration throughout the report, and intersectionality and equity dimensions which are not sufficiently addressed.</p>			

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	Exceeds
<p>The executive summary provides a good summary of the evaluation report and is, broadly speaking, succinct and readable. The summary provides an overview of the evaluation purpose, context, and methods as well as a presentation of most of the key findings and conclusions. Recommendations are well-summarised. A few key findings and conclusions are not included in the summary (such as findings related to benefits for the 'mamans cantines' and linkages between school canteens and local producers and conclusions relating to gender and engagement with other actors). More clarity and detail could have been provided in the conclusion section for these areas.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	Partially
<p>The overview of the evaluation subject is missing a number of important details. For example, planned beneficiary numbers, details of changes to geographic scope or initiatives during the implementation, and the analytical basis for initiatives being evaluated are not discussed. Moreover, the logical framework for the evaluation subject is not assessed. More information and discussion of the design would have also strengthened this component of the report. Nevertheless, the overview clearly articulates the type of evaluation and its period of implementation from its date of approval. The resourcing profile over time is also described, with a reference to details of budget revisions provided in the annex.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	Exceeds
<p>The report provides a clear description of the purpose, objectives and time frame for the evaluation. The contextual information provided is relevant to the evaluation subject and includes a good description of the political context and some of the challenges related to food insecurity and education in Togo at the national level. Additional discussion of the broader humanitarian context within Togo, WFP's broader engagement in the region and how the context may have influenced WFP's work and the evaluation findings would have been beneficial.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	Meets
<p>The methodology comprises a description of the essential methodological elements, including sampling rationale, triangulation, limitations and an evaluation matrix comprised of all the key elements. Evaluation criteria, questions, and methodologies are relevant for the proposed purpose and scope of the evaluation. Ethical safeguards are described, including reference to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines, confidentiality, and stakeholder engagement. However, more explanation of the proposed data-collection and analysis methodologies and assessment criteria (success factors) would have strengthened this section – particularly in relation to the assessment of the impact and sustainability of institutional capacity strengthening. Findings from previous evaluations or studies could also have been listed as a data source within the methods.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
Broadly speaking, findings are clearly presented, transparently linked to evidence, and provide a balanced analysis of influencing factors. The analysis considers the extent to which WFP (and other actors) contributed to results, enabling and constraining factors, and gaps in the evidence base. More detailed explanations of some of the main findings, relating to decision-making and efficiency in light of a significantly reduced budget, would have strengthened the findings section further. Moreover, while certain unintended effects of WFP's work are identified, these could have been more explicit.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
Conclusions are balanced and provide a summary of the main findings. Certain conclusions, for example, in relation to WFP management, also provide a strategic overview. However, a number of important conclusions, for example, in relation to gender and coherence, are presented in the form of new analyses rather than drawing together a strategic view of findings presented previously. A more strategic organization of the conclusions may have helped reduce repetition.		
<b>CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Partially</b>
The evaluation addresses gender issues to a certain extent, including in its assessment of the design, implementation, and results of the evaluation subject, as well as the inclusion of one recommendation addressing gender issues. Gender is also considered through a number evaluation sub-questions and consideration of UNEG Ethical Standards and transparency in stakeholder engagement. However, there are a number of areas in which gender integration could have been strengthened, including in the evaluation objectives, discussion of how gender considerations were integrated into specific data collection tools, and specific reference to sex disaggregated data. Moreover, gender issues could have been more systematically considered across all areas of engagement (such as policy work) within the analysis, and a more in-depth reflection on internal capacity (beyond monitoring and evaluation) could have been provided. Intersectionality and equity dimensions are not sufficiently addressed. While the views of a variety of stakeholders are presented within the report, they are not consistently disaggregated.		
<b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
Clear and actionable recommendations are provided, organized under a series of six headline recommendations. Recommendations are clearly derived from findings and conclusions, include explicit time frames for action and are prioritized. However, the relative importance of different priorities based on different financial scenarios could have been highlighted. Given the extreme limitations of the previous budget, scenario planning may have also provided valuable guidance in implementing recommendations.		
<b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The report is well written, with clear and professional language and a balanced, objective tone. Accessibility is facilitated by organizing information using logical headings, summary boxes on key findings at the end of each section, and tables. Data sources are generally provided. The structure of selected areas of the report (such as conclusions where the linkages and distinctions between the three sections could have been clearer in terms of content) could have been strengthened, and there is scope for greater referencing to the evidence base in certain areas (for example, the process of prioritising in response to budget limitations).		

<b>Gender EPI</b>	
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>

<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