

Evaluation title	Final Evaluation of The Programme "Accelerate Progress Towards Millennium Development Goal 1C (MDG1.C Programme)"	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 73%	
<p>The Final Evaluation of the Programme "Accelerate Progress Towards Millennium Development Goal 1C (MDG1.C)" presents credible evaluation findings and can be used with confidence for decision-making. The findings are credible, balanced and reflect a diversity of perspectives. Recommendations are detailed and relevant and appear to be realistic in the context. A key strength is the methodological design that relied on a mixed-methods approach based on multiple data sources and data collection methods, although insufficient details are provided on how gender-sensitive data collection and analysis were conducted. A key weakness is the absence of an overview of the country context for the programme.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Unsatisfactory
<p>The executive summary has several weaknesses that limit its potential to be used as a stand-alone document for decision-making. Report conclusions are included in lieu of a summary of findings. Neither conclusions nor recommendations are summarized, resulting in a summary that is too long and does not provide an appropriate synthesis of the main information presented in the report. Moreover, some important information related to the process and context of the evaluation is not included.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report includes a concise summary overview of the programme, including main partners and the changes made to the programme after a mid-term review. There is also mention of an important external event that occurred during the programme, that being the El Niño. Further details on programmatic aspects, such as activities, intended results, and targets are provided in annex. However, the report does not include a sufficient overview of the context of the MDG1.C programme, including a general overview of the country context, the features of international assistance that are relevant to the programme, and an analysis of the specific social groups affected by the programme.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The purpose and objectives of the evaluation of the MDG1.C programme are clearly stated. Important elements such as gender are reflected in the evaluation's objectives and rationale. However, the scope of the evaluation, including the time period, the geographic areas covered, the target groups, and specific activities of the programme are not clearly presented in the main report, mentioned only in the annexes.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The description of the methodology clearly demonstrates that the evaluation relied on a mixed-methods approach based on the triangulation of data sources. The report includes useful discussion of the reliability of quantitative and qualitative data sources and analysis and the changes made to the methodology from the inception phase to the final evaluation reporting phase. The data collection methods are described, as are limitations of the methodology, although the sampling frame and rationale are not mentioned in the report nor are the data collection protocols included in annex. The methodological framework includes the OECD-DAC criteria, which are appropriately reflected in the evaluation matrix. However, more details could have been included on how gender-sensitive data collection and analysis was conducted and on the ethical safeguards relevant to the evaluation, including what ethical standards were followed when consulting communities and vulnerable groups.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings of this evaluation are credible and based on robust data triangulation. They reflect a diversity of perspectives, including voices of different social groups that were affected by the programme. The findings clearly answer the main evaluation questions and sub-questions, and the report appropriately identifies limitations to its findings. Strengths and weaknesses, as well as the unintended effects of the programme, are noted. The specific contribution of WFP to the MDG1.C programme is highlighted relative to FAO and IFAD, the other participating agencies. The adjustments made to the programme after its mid-term review are also considered. Importantly, given the context of this evaluation, the key findings include a focus on the humanitarian response in the country, including drought and cyclones. However, throughout the findings, the evidence derived from the various data collection methods could have been more consistently sourced.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS/LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are clearly drawn from the report's findings. However, the conclusions do not effectively connect evidence across the different evaluation criteria and, as such, they do not add further analytical value to the findings themselves. Lessons learned in the report are well written and clearly illustrate their wider application for multisector programmes that would be similar to the MDG1.C programme.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations in the report are comprehensive and include considerations of gender and equity. They appear to derive from the key evaluation findings and conclusions and contribute to both learning and accountability. While they are quite detailed and appear to be realistic in the context of the MDG1.C programme, the responsible actors for their implementation are not identified and the recommendations are not prioritized or effectively categorized.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the report is written in an accessible manner using clear language and without much jargon. It includes a table of contents with an appropriate list of figures, tables, and acronyms and there are visual aids throughout that enhance readability. That said, the clarity of the report could have been improved by ensuring consistent sourcing of the data collected during the evaluation upon which the key findings are based. In addition, the annexes of the report are not well formatted and certain mandatory annexes are missing.</p>		

Integration of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations on UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator		
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Approaches requirements: 6 points	
<p>Gender considerations for the MDG1.C programme are integrated in the evaluation report with specific gender-related questions included in the evaluation framework, although more information related to the different social groups affected by the programme would have helped the reader better understand the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination in Mozambique. With respect to the evaluation methodology, insufficient details are provided on how gender-sensitive data collection and analysis were conducted. The sampling strategy is not presented and there is no mention of what ethical standards were followed when consulting communities and vulnerable groups. However, in the report's findings, the monitoring and evaluation system of the programme is evaluated to determine the extent to which gender-specific data was collected throughout programme implementation. There is also pertinent information on different target groups of the programme and the unintended effects of the MDG1.C programme has had across these groups, most notably those on women and communities. Finally, the report includes two recommendations focusing on gender and equity but they are broadly formulated and not very actionable.</p>		

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.