

Evaluation title	Activités du PAM de renforcement des capacités pour l'amélioration du Programme National d'Alimentation Scolaire en Tunisie de 2016 à 2018	Evaluation report number	DE/TNCO/2018/061
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Country	PHQA date	January 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 61%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The evaluation of Activités du PAM de renforcement des capacités pour l'amélioration du Programme National d'Alimentation Scolaire en Tunisie de 2016 à 2018 meets requirements. It is well structured, professional in presentation and accessible to its intended audience. Overall, the report provides a good summary of the evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope, as well as an overview of most of the essential information about the subject. Findings describe the contributions of WFP to results, and recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives, addressing the key areas identified by the analysis. Gender equality dimensions are also integrated in the evaluation. Nevertheless, there are a number of areas which could have been further strengthened in the report. This includes a discussion of the unintended effects of the intervention, whether WFP made the best use of available resources in its interventions, and equity dimensions. Conclusions could also have provided a more strategic overview, rather than a summary, of the key findings. Finally, recommendations could have been more specific with respect to responsible actors in the Country Office and timeframe for action.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The report summary is succinct, accessible and provides a good overview of the main aspects of the evaluation and the evaluation subject. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations are summarised concisely and key messages are highlighted. The summary could be used alone to provide sufficient evidence to inform decision-making. The importance of the funding issues, which delayed the implementation of the intervention is mentioned; additional details on the consequences of this for the evaluation would have further enhanced the report summary.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>The overview presents some of the essential features of the evaluation subject, including type, duration and geographic scope, main partners, and resourcing profile and is based on relevant information sources, but would have benefited from greater detail on some of the other key elements including key activities and changes, previous phases and relevant lessons from previous evaluations. The analytical basis of the evaluation subject could have also been further developed to better explain the rationale for the combination of activities delivered by the intervention. Lastly, the analysis of the logical framework does not highlight the casual chains that should structure the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>Overall, the level of information presented provides a good summary of the evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope. The objectives of the evaluation are linked to the broader purpose, specifically the Government of Tunisia food sector policy. Information on context is up to date and systematically sourced and the balance between learning and accountability is explained. One area of potential improvement is that in a few instances the background information is too broad when detailing the contextual challenges and opportunities, including for gender equality.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
<p>The methodology applies relevant criteria across the evaluation. The evaluation matrix is comprehensive and includes an assessment of the availability and reliability of the evidence and the identification of success criteria. Selected methods are appropriate, and the analysis draws on a range of sources and methods. The evaluation would have benefited from efficiency and sustainability evaluation criteria being better addressed. The methodology section could have also been strengthened by further explanation of the implementation of ethical safeguards and the inclusion of a risk assessment.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Partially
<p>While findings describe the contributions of WFP to results, the evidence base of the evaluation is relatively narrow due to the small number of interviews conducted, primarily with officials. Moreover, although some under-achievements are described, findings are weakened by a positive bias. Successes and failures are presented, but the overall positive tone does not reflect the lack of control on policy decisions by the Ministry of Education, for example. Moreover, an analysis of unintended effects is missing, as well as the follow-up on the implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations. Lastly, the adequacy of the use of WFP's resources is not explored. Nevertheless, the narrative clearly explains the role of WFP on its own, and alongside government ministries and other partners. The analysis goes beyond WFP's corporate results, considering the influence of Government of Tunisia and its contribution. Enabling and constraining factors are thoroughly addressed by a dedicated evaluation question.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches
<p>The conclusions summarise the key findings, comprehensively reflecting the key evidence analysed by the evaluation. They neither introduce new evidence nor unsubstantiated judgments. However, conclusions do not provide a strategic overview of WFP achievements; rather they summarise the key findings without bringing them together under each evaluation criteria. They also reflect the positive bias of the findings. Lastly, lessons learned put forward commonly accepted views, which do not provide significant added value to wider organisational learning in WFP.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
<p>Gender equality dimensions are mainstreamed in the evaluation matrix via a specific sub-question for each of the evaluation questions. They are also addressed specifically in the methodology. Related findings/evidence are presented, and a stand-alone recommendation on GEWE is included. Despite these areas of strength, GEWE related findings could have been based on stronger evidence and disaggregated data is rarely analysed using a gender equality perspective. Unintended effects are also not analysed. Furthermore, vulnerability and equity dimensions are not addressed in the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
<p>Recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives, focusing on how the implementation of the capacity building activities with the Ministry of Education can be improved. They derive clearly from the conclusions and address the critical areas identified by the analysis. Recommendations could have been further enhanced by a clearer stocktaking of WFP's constraints in implementing the recommendations, a more specific timeframe for implementation and greater specificity on responsible stakeholders for implementation within the Country Office.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The evaluation is easy to understand and highlights the key messages throughout the report. The report is concise, well-structured and links the different sections together adequately. The language and tone are professional. Acronyms are introduced the first time they are used and listed in the annexes. Sources are provided for all data and quotes.</p>		

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