

Evaluation title	Evaluation of USDA's Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Programme (Rwanda 2017-2019)	
Evaluation category and type	DE – Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible findings presented in the report of the Evaluation of USDA's Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Programme (LRP) in Rwanda (2017-2019), which can be used with confidence for decision-making. The report was prepared following a robust methodological design, with data collection and analysis methods very well described and a strong sampling frame and rationale. Findings are evidence-based and systematically address all the evaluation questions. The views of smallholder farmers (SHFs) are clearly reflected in the findings and, based on the sex-disaggregated data collected, the differential effects of the programme on women and men are presented where possible. While aspects related to gender equality and the empowerment of women are well integrated throughout the report, wider equity and inclusion dimensions are not adequately addressed. Conclusions are balanced and complemented by a useful set of lessons. Recommendations are realistic and actionable, but the report should also have specified the WFP entity responsible for their implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary offers a useful overview of the evaluation features, context, as well as of the intervention under evaluation. Key findings for each evaluation question are well summarized, while conclusions are too succinct and do not adequately reflect what is included in the main report. Recommendations are, for the most part, clearly linked to the findings reported in this section.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report contains a concise overview of the country context, focusing on the agricultural sector and the role of small holder farmers and cooperatives and their challenges, as well as basic indicators related to health, nutrition and food security. Programme activities, stakeholders, beneficiaries, main partners, expected outputs and outcomes and the modalities of intervention are well described. However, the context section would have benefited from a more detailed description of input suppliers and market conditions for farmers given that programme activities involve promotion of market access and procurement for SHF.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation purpose, objectives (i.e. accountability and learning) and scope are clearly stated in the report, although it would have been useful to present all scope-related information under the relevant section and not under the methodology section. Gender equality considerations are well-mainstreamed in the evaluation objectives.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The various elements of the methodological design are very well described, and the limitations of the methodology and mitigation strategies are clearly presented. The evaluation matrix includes useful information on the quality of available data for each evaluation sub-question, which reflects good practice. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods were used to ensure triangulation and to compensate for data gaps in the documentation. There is also a detailed assessment of programme performance against monitoring indicator targets. Furthermore, given that this endline evaluation was largely focused on comparing the results of the programme against baseline data, changes to some aspects of the methodology used at baseline are highlighted. However, it is unclear why the standard evaluation criteria of sustainability and impact were excluded from the methodological framework given that some findings and conclusions reported on these criteria.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory

The evaluation findings are well balanced, evidence-based and address all main evaluation questions and sub-questions. The contribution of LRP programme outputs to outcome-level results is assessed and any gaps in evidence is explained. The report adequately describes and analyse some unintended effects of the intervention under evaluation. Based on the sex-disaggregated data collected, the differential effects of the programme on women and men are presented where possible. However, in some cases, the evaluation does not sufficiently explore the reasons that might explain these differential effects.

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

The conclusions are well balanced and effectively cut across the evaluation criteria and questions, providing higher level analysis that sets the stage for the recommendations. While most conclusions are logically derived from findings, one conclusion related to environmental sustainability appears to introduce new information not included in the previous section. Gender aspects are sufficiently incorporated, but equity and inclusion dimensions are not reflected in the conclusions. The lessons are logically linked to the findings and conclusions and signify wider application beyond the specific evaluation context.

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

Recommendations flow logically from findings and conclusions and are appropriately identified as operational or strategic. They are also realistic, feasible and very relevant to the programming context and to WFP mandate in general. They are internally consistent and actionable, with clear timeframes for each action. However, they do not identify a lead entity for their implementation and could have been presented in a more concise manner.

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

The report is written in a clear and readable, straightforward manner and is mostly free from spelling and punctuation errors. The report is well structured and information is adequately sourced and signposted within the report and between the main report and its annexes. It effectively uses visual aids, primarily tables and a few graphs, to summarize and convey key information clearly and accurately. However, the introduction could have been more concise and certain sub-sections could have been better structured. Finally, not all mandatory annexes are included, with the evaluation timeline, methodology, some data collection tools, and the fieldwork agenda missing.

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.