

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Namibia National School Feeding Programme	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized – Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 85%	
<p>The report of the evaluation of the Namibia National School Feeding Programme (NSFP) presents credible and useful findings that can be used with confidence for decision making. The methodological design and data collection and analysis methods enabled unbiased answers to the evaluation questions. Findings present programme's strengths and weaknesses in a constructive manner and correctly identify WFP contribution to results as well as the unintended effects of the intervention. Conclusions are balanced and present a relevant synthesis of the findings, and the recommendations are realistic, relevant and accurately targeted. The report would have benefited from the inclusion of more detailed information on the context of and on the national school feeding programme, including a presentation of its logic of the intervention and expected results.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary is clear and concise, including most required elements (purpose of the evaluation, short description of the context, an overview of the intervention and intended users; methodology and stakeholders). Key findings for each evaluation criterion and main questions are clearly presented, and conclusions and recommendations are well summarized, without omissions. However, information on the evaluation type, objectives, and scope is missing from this section of the report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report includes a succinct overview of the poverty, food security and nutrition situation as well as relevant national policies and strategies and the latest trend data on relevant basic national indicators in Namibia, setting the context for the presentation of the school feeding programme. On the other hand, the report does not include essential information on the logic of intervention, expected results, modalities of intervention and beneficiary numbers, with some of these provided only in the annexes. Moreover, the overview does not present gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the subject of the evaluation and lacks of an intersectional analysis reflecting combined vulnerabilities of social groups.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The general objectives of accountability and learning of the evaluation are outlined, but the report could have explained more clearly why the third objective of 'Benchmarking' – initially included in the ToR and in the Inception report, was eventually added as evaluation criteria and no longer treated as a separate objective. Moreover, while the evaluation's main users and stakeholders are clearly identified, its expected use and scope is not explained.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design enabled unbiased answers to evaluation questions, including a relevant assessment of the validity of programme monitoring data and measures taken to ensure data reliability. Learning and Benchmarking criteria used in addition to standard evaluation criteria to assess the programme were relevant. The evaluation drew from a diverse range of data sources (government representatives, community members, school staff, board members, cooks, learners, and parents), following a mixed methods approach. Ethical standards were considered throughout and methodological limitations and mitigation strategies for each limitation are well described. However, while the report notes there were no gender equality targets set for the programme and that the baseline questionnaire did not reference gender considerations sufficiently, it does not present any mitigation measures that may have been taken to address these limitations.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory

Findings provide an in-depth analysis of all evaluation questions based on an analysis of primary and secondary sources, showing good triangulation. The programme's strengths and weaknesses are clearly presented. Answers to the learning criterion considered the effects of the programme on vulnerable groups, including students with disability, pregnant learners, and older boys. Positive and negative unanticipated effects (such as enforcement at the community level of gender roles and responsibilities) are described and analysed. However, more details could have been presented concerning the impact of previous reviews of the intervention on programme design and implementation.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The conclusions are balanced and present a relevant synthesis of the findings. However, they do not systematically discuss the strategic implications of the findings for the future of the intervention and could have better addressed wider equity and inclusion dimensions. On the other hand, even though the report does not include a separate section on lessons learned, some useful lessons - such as with respect to improving evidence-based programme design- are included in the report.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Recommendations are well aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives and are logically derived from findings and conclusions. Each recommendation contains a practical list of actions to be taken, while also considering contextual factors and WFP constraints, and making practical suggestions on the responsible actors and timeline for their implementation. However, the recommendations should have been more concise, prioritized (high/medium), and grouped (e.g., strategic vs operational).

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report is clear and easily understood, using precise and professional language, without jargon or excessively complex sentences. Key messages are summarized and highlighted in the text for ease of reading and the annexes include all the required elements. However, the report exceeds the word limit and some sections could have been better sequenced.

Integration of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard

UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets requirements: 8 points
--	------------------------------

GEWE considerations are well integrated into this evaluation report. Gender is mainstreamed across key evaluation criteria and the methodology outlines five measures to ensure that gender considerations were included in the design and administration of data collection tools. The findings include data analysis that triangulated the voices of different social role groups and present sex-disaggregated qualitative and quantitative data. Overall, the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a comprehensive gender analysis.

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.

Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.