

<b>Evaluation title</b>	<b>Evaluación del modelo de descentralización del Programa Nacional de Alimentación Escolar (PNAE) 2016-2019</b>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	<b>Decentralized Evaluation</b>	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory - 79%</b>	
<p>This evaluation is overall of high-quality, and evaluation users can rely on the findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making. The evaluation draws on diverse data sources and data collection methods, and the data analysis methods used are appropriate, robust, and well described. The methodology used a gender-sensitive approach, and a triangulated analysis is provided across data sources and a diversity of voices. The sampling and sampling rationale are explicitly justified for all stakeholders selected to participate in the evaluation and a complete Evaluation Matrix is included in the annexes. Findings correctly respond to all the evaluation questions and sub-questions and provide pertinent evidence on GEWE issues. Conclusions, in general, provide a higher level of analysis and can inform decision-making. Recommendations are realistic, actionable, and identify implementing actors even though they are not clearly prioritized. Although GEWE dimensions are sufficiently mainstreamed throughout the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations, wider equity and inclusion considerations are not equally included in the ER. Finally, while the methodology identifies methodological limitations, mitigation strategies are not consistently presented for all limitations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The executive summary generally observes all WFP requirements, which makes it a comprehensive, stand-alone document that can effectively inform decision-making. It includes a condensed account of the main features of the evaluation such as its objectives, scope, methodology, stakeholders, and intended users and uses. Finally, it provides a good general overview of the findings, clearly summarizes recommendations, and presents all lessons learned identified in the main body of the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation report presents a strong overview of the country context, which includes relevant development and socioeconomic indices with information presented in a way that is geared towards the subject of the evaluation. Also, the report presents the subject of the evaluation in a clear and comprehensive fashion that includes its coverage, main objectives, and main partners involved in the intervention. Finally, the overview and the annexes for the most part present a complete portrait of the planned and actual results, cooperating partners and gender considerations, wherever feasible. On the other hand, the theory of change should have identified key assumptions linking different results levels, and planned results regarding cross-cutting issues should have also been included in the overview. Finally, the report must only use authoritative sources throughout and should have steered away from tertiary sources..</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report describes the scope, main users, as well as the intended use of the evaluation. It observes good practices in incorporating gender dimensions into the scope of the evaluation. On the other hand, the objectives presented correspond to the rationale of the evaluation and are not in line with the ones outlines in the ToR (i.e. accountability and learning) .</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report provides a good description of the evaluation design, data sources, data collection and analysis methods, as well as methodological limitations. The report also includes a complete evaluation matrix, and ethical considerations regarding the conduct of the evaluation are duly discussed. Even though no stand-alone criterion on gender and human rights was included among the evaluation criteria, the methodology integrates well GEWE considerations into the evaluation design.. The report correctly describes the triangulation methods used in order to ensure the credibility and</p>		

transparency of the evaluation analysis and findings, and the evaluation drew on a diversity of stakeholder views. However, in light of the absence of an M&E system in the PNAE, the methodology should have included other qualitative methods such as a case study that could have better supported the overall analysis by focusing on and probing a particular aspect of the programme. Finally, the methodology could have also been strengthened by including robust mitigation strategies that demonstrate that the evaluation took adequate measures to diminish the effect of the methodological limitations presented.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
Findings are substantiated by evidence that is, for the most part, correctly sourced and triangulated across a range of data sources, which included a wide variety of stakeholder voices. Findings correctly respond to all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Furthermore, findings report on GEWE issues, and sex-disaggregated data is consistently presented. Findings are balanced since they use neutral language and underline both strengths and weaknesses of the initiative. However, the findings section could have more clearly articulated the links between different levels of results and outputs that fed into outcome-level results. Finally, unintended effects of unremunerated work by women who prepare food should have been included in the analysis as this is a situation directly resulting from the implementation of the PNAE.		

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
Conclusions are forward-looking, correctly link the evidence presented in the findings, and are clearly grouped under corresponding evaluation questions in each case. In general, conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analysis and provide an overall assessment that captures the key elements in a fashion that informs decision-making. Conclusions use neutral language and demonstrate a balance between the evaluation subject's strengths and weaknesses, and they make strong reference to GEWE-related aspects. This being said, in some instances (i.e. conclusions 3 and 8) the narrative mostly repeats what is expressed in the findings section and the conclusions would have benefited from further analysis about the potential implications of these findings.		

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents recommendations that are realistic, feasible and actionable since they clearly identify the target groups for action in each case and provide a good amount of detail as to how they should be implemented. Similarly, recommendations are grouped according to whether they are strategic or operational and the report provides clear timelines for their suggested implementation. Finally, recommendations adequately address GEWE-related issues.		

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The evaluation report observes WFP requirements in general regarding the clarity of the information presented, the professional language used, and the format and length expected for this type of report. Cross-references within the report are clearly signposted and the report includes all requested lists including most of the mandatory annexes which are correctly listed in the Table of Contents. On the other hand, data sources should have been explicitly cited in in those cases where the evaluation team prepared tables, charts, etc, based on WFP documents. Also, the map of Honduras in Annex 8 should have included further information so as to effectively contribute to an enhanced understanding of the subject of the evaluation by the reader.		

**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>	Meets requirements: 8 points
--	------------------------------

The report provides an intersectional analysis of specific vulnerabilities of the social groups targeted by the subject of the evaluation. An assessment of the M&E system is presented and it is stated that there was a complete lack of a monitoring and evaluation system that could have tracked the main indicators of the programme, including GEWE-related indicators. However, the ER does not sufficiently explain how this situation informed the choice of the methodology. The ER does a good job at describing the ways in which data collection and analysis methods incorporated the gender dimension. The evaluation used a differentiated approach that is well described in the report; included the presentation of data disaggregated by sex wherever possible; and used an analysis that paid attention to the evidence on real changes in terms

of inclusion, empowerment of women, and their participation in decision-making processes. In addition, the methodology used a mixed-methods approach, and the report describes in detail the triangulation methods used in order to ensure the inclusion, credibility, and transparency of the evaluation analysis and findings. The report explains that the sampling was made with a view to including a diversity of stakeholders, including the most vulnerable. Ethical standards regarding the evaluation design, data collection, data analysis, reporting and dissemination were considered and described in detail. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect the report's extensive application of a gender analysis in the evaluation of this initiative. Also, the findings section effectively presents different pieces of evidence from varied sources, including women and rural boys and girls, to respond to each of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Findings capture unintended positive effects of the initiative, but any negative unintended effects could have been further analysed such as the effects of unremunerated work by women within the initiative. Finally, the conclusions and several recommendations address GEWE-related issues, and actionable measures are suggested to facilitate the implementation of 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:</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.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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.