

<b>Evaluation title</b>	<b>End-Term Evaluation of Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) in Dhading, Gorkha and Nuwakot Districts of Nepal</b>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	<b>Decentralized - Activity</b>	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory: 61%</b>	
<p>The report of the End-Term Evaluation of Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) in Dhading, Gorkha and Nuwakot Districts of Nepal provides balanced findings and successfully integrates gender and equity dimensions. The context and the overview of the subject are well described, and the methodology draws on a mixed methods approach that gathered quantitative and qualitative data through multiple data collection methods reflecting the voices of community beneficiaries, including vulnerable groups. However, the voices of key stakeholders such as WFP staff and cooperating partners are less reflected in the report, which is an important gap. The evaluation generated relevant lessons learned that have the potential to contribute to organizational knowledge, but its conclusions could have further discussed the implications of the findings for the future of WFP's work in the country. Moreover, the recommendations should have given more consideration to the context and developments within WFP, namely the shift from standalone operations to the Country Strategic Plan (CSP).</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report summary offers readers a clear overview of the evaluation context, subject, rationale, objectives, key stakeholders and intended uses. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations are well summarized. The section would however have benefited from the inclusion of information on the evaluation scope.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report includes a good description of the country context focusing on the earthquake that triggered the PRRO, as well as a good intersectional analysis discussing the vulnerabilities faced by marginalized groups affected by the crisis. The objectives, log frame, intended beneficiaries, and transfer modalities of the intervention are well described and there is a good review of the analytical work that informed the design of the operation. However, there is little information on relevant national policies and strategies on food and nutrition security in the country. The report would also have benefited from a clearer overview of the evolution of PRRO activities over time.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The learning and accountability objectives of the evaluation are well defined, and the report includes a specific objective on GEWE. Key users and uses are well identified, and the evaluation scope is outlined in terms of geographic and temporal scope. More details could have been provided on the reasons for undertaking this evaluation at this time.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation design is robust and draws on a mixed methods approach that gathered quantitative and qualitative data through a household survey and focus group discussions (FGDs). The sampling strategies used for both quantitative and qualitative data collection are particularly strong and ensure the inclusion of both women and men as well as vulnerable groups. Evaluation criteria and questions are correctly identified, and ethical standards followed by the evaluation team are well described. The methodology also included an assessment of monitoring data, in particular baseline data, which informed the analytical framework developed by the evaluators. However, the evaluation matrix is partially complete as it does not identify indicators for the evaluation questions. While the report clearly identified the limitations of the methodology, no mitigation strategies to address these were proposed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The findings provide a balanced overview of the PRRO's strengths and weaknesses and provide answers to all evaluation questions and sub-questions. There is a particularly robust analysis of WFP's contribution to results, supported by household survey data on key outcome indicators, as well as a strong gender analysis and presentation of</p>		

the views of marginalized groups. However, the views of WFP staff and cooperating partners are seldom presented and while data sources are often cited, there are also several instances where important statements are made but it is unclear if these reflects the opinion of the evaluators or were reported by stakeholders. Furthermore, there are a few cases where the source provided compromises the confidentiality of consulted beneficiaries.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	----------------------------

The conclusions present a balanced overview of the main strengths and weaknesses of the PRRO. However, the conclusions could have been more analytical by further discussing the implications of the evaluation’s findings for the future of WFP’s work in Nepal. The report includes a section on lessons learned that have the potential to contribute to corporate knowledge, but the formulation of some lessons could have been improved.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

The recommendations do not fully meet quality standards, in particular because they are not well targeted and prioritized. Moreover, while the recommendations are logically derived from the findings overall, they do not reflect the strong gender analysis presented in the findings and elsewhere in the report. There also appears to be a disconnect between recommendations and WFP’s current shift to the CSP and new working modalities. For instance, several recommendations discuss the need to review the logframe or further develop the impact pathway for a future project like the PRRO. To the contrary, it could have been more useful to provide specific recommendations that could have improved the design/implementation of the CSP on aspects related to resilience, among others.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	---------------------

Overall, the report is well written and easy to understand. It mostly follows the WFP corporate template and makes good use of visual aids, especially to present data from the household survey. Key findings for each evaluation sub-question are highlighted, and so are conclusions, making it easy for the reader to identify the main messages from the report. However, there is little cross-referencing of information and sources could have been cited more consistently throughout the report.

**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**

<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Meets requirements: 7 points</b>
--	-------------------------------------

Considerations for GEWE are well integrated into this report. The evaluation report includes one objective aimed at assessing the project’s contribution to gender equality results and gender equality is well integrated into the effectiveness and impact criteria. The evaluation was attentive to vulnerable groups, including women, ethnic minorities, and the elderly. Its methodology included data collection disaggregated by sex, age and ethnicity and separate FGDs were held with men and women. Importantly, the findings present an insightful analysis of the project’s contribution to gender equality results. Survey data is disaggregated by gender and the diverse perspectives of women, men and vulnerable groups are clearly presented. However, aside from presenting the Gender Inequality Index and sex-disaggregated data on the literacy rate, the gender analysis presented in the context section is rather limited. Moreover, specific unintended effects of the project on human rights and gender equality could have been addressed in the findings and GEWE considerations could have been reflected in the recommendations.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>