

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Evaluation title | End line Evaluation of USDA Local Regional Procurement Project in Nalae District, Luang Namtha Province in Lao PDR | |
| Evaluation category and type | DE- Activity | |
| Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating | Satisfactory: 73% | |
| <p>The Endline Evaluation of USDA Local Regional Procurement (LRP) Project in Nalae District, Luang Namtha Province in Lao PDR provides credible evaluation findings that decision makers can use with confidence. The report presents several strengths, including a concise presentation of the context and overview of the LRP project. The evaluation design, data collection and analysis methods, data sources and sampling frame make it clear how evidence was triangulated. The findings address all evaluation questions, presenting strengths and weaknesses of the LRP project and both positive and negative unanticipated effects. All the recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and are identified as either strategic or operational, although not all recommendations appear to be feasible or realistic in the country context. However, conclusions do not adequately discuss the implications of findings for the future of the project and the report would have benefited from the inclusion of lessons with wider applicability beyond the evaluated intervention. Moreover, gender equality as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions could have been mainstreamed more effectively in the report.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The summary presents concise information on the evaluation type, features and evaluation subject. Key findings are included per evaluation criterion, and lessons learned are also presented. However, not all conclusions and recommendations are summarized and more information on the context of the evaluation could have been included.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report presents a clear overview of the context and evaluation subject, including a succinct overview of development assistance in the country. The food security and nutrition situation and multi-dimensional poverty in Laos are considered in detail. The evaluation clearly outlines the project's geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, and evolution. However, neither the Voluntary National Review for the country nor the framework of Agenda 2030 are mentioned, and relevant normative instruments and policies are not covered.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report clearly presents the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability and the evaluation's stakeholders and primary users. Human rights and gender equality are effectively mainstreamed into the evaluation questions and evaluation matrix. The scope of the evaluation is briefly presented but the time period of the evaluation is not consistent throughout the report and information on the target groups is limited. It is not clear why the evaluation took place when it did.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report clearly describes the design, data collection methods, data sources, sampling frame, and analysis methods. A change to the methodology related to the impact criterion is noted and there is a complete evaluation matrix which mainstreams GEWE considerations through dedicated evaluation questions and sub-questions. Methodological limitations and mitigation strategies, as well as ethical considerations, are also addressed. However, there is no clear assessment of monitoring data that informed the methodology and certain evaluation questions were merged but no explanation for these changes is provided.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS | Rating | Satisfactory |

The findings address all evaluation questions, presenting strengths and weaknesses in a balanced way. The report notes both positive and negative unanticipated effects and the redesign of the LRP project is considered very clearly in the presentation of expected and achieved results. Where primary data is included, it is done without compromising the anonymity of respondents. However, the findings for both the efficiency and effectiveness criteria do not give sufficient consideration to gaps in the evidence due to the absence of robust monitoring by WFP CO/implementing partner. The findings could also have gone further in assessing WFP's contributions to results.

| | | |
|---|---------------|----------------------------|
| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS | Rating | Partly Satisfactory |
| <p>Conclusions are correctly pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and flow logically from the findings, providing insights into both the positive and negative results of the LRP project. However, the conclusions do not sufficiently identify the implications of the findings for the future of the intervention and do not clearly reflect important GEWE-related findings. Moreover, while some of the lessons learned reported have wider relevance, others are too tailored to the LRP project without sufficient consideration of their broader applicability to organizational learning.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------------|
| CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>All the recommendations are in line with the objectives of the evaluation and are logically derived from the findings and conclusions. The report clearly distinguishes between strategic or operational recommendations and identifies a lead entity for each recommendation. Importantly, the report includes recommendations that address GEWE and equity more broadly. However, some recommendations are too general to be actionable and do not provide adequate information on timeframe for their implementation.</p> | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------------|
| CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report uses clear and professional language, without jargon or excessively complex sentences, and is well structured, with clear linkages between sections. There is also good use of tables and charts and the inclusion of photos to illustrate certain activities is relevant. However, the report could have made greater use of bold to highlight key messages. Some required annexes are also missing.</p> | | |

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 | Approaches requirements: 6 points |
|--|--|

GEWE considerations are integrated into the report to a certain extent. The evaluation framework included questions and sub-questions that examined the extent to which project design and implementation integrated principles of inclusiveness and equality with respect to gender and vulnerable groups. However, the methodology did not include an assessment of monitoring data that should have informed the choice of data collection methods, including to assess results indicators in relation to human rights and gender equality as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions. While the report details some of the ways the evaluation employed a gender-responsive approach, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques, it is not clear the extent to which processes for data collection were designed and implemented to ensure a diversity of perspectives since, for example, gender- and age-disaggregated focus groups were not conducted. Quantitative data presented in the findings is not disaggregated and the voices of different social groups are not clearly triangulated. That said, the report does well to highlight unanticipated effects of the project on women farmers and some gender-specific recommendations are included. The report also includes recommendations that address GEWE and equity more broadly.

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

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Highly Satisfactory | <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> |
| Satisfactory | <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> |

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| | <i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i> |
| Partly Satisfactory | <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> |
| Unsatisfactory | <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> |