

<b>Evaluation title</b>	<b>Contribution du Programme Alimentaire Mondial au Système de Protection Sociale Adaptative en Mauritanie depuis 2018</b>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	<b>Decentralized - Activity</b>	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory: 88%</b>	
<p>The evaluation of WFP support to the Adaptative Social Protection System (SPSA) provides a good analysis of the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of WFP's contribution to the five pillars of the SPSA and its coherence with the RCA national protection system. Overall, the report presents a credible assessment of the major strengths and weaknesses of the intervention, highlights key success factors and potential constraints for achieving expected results and ensuring sustainability, namely national ownership, and funding. There is a clear link between the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, with recommendations capturing the critical areas for improvement. Nevertheless, the main report would have benefited by a description of the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality that supported the intervention and the inclusion of more granular information on the intervention logic and budget.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The executive summary of the evaluation report includes concise information on the evaluation type, features (rationale, objectives, scope, stakeholders and intended users, methodology), and the context and overview of the evaluation subject. The key findings for all evaluation questions and recommendations are clearly summarized. Gender considerations are included in most elements of the summary. Nevertheless, the summary did not include important conclusions on efficiency and sustainability and the recommendations section should have provided more information in terms of prioritization and targeting.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The general overview of the country context includes information on geography and basic data on demographic issues (including Malian refugees and displaced persons) and on inequalities and vulnerabilities related to gender. It provides a relevant description of the SPSA concept, its five pillars, main activities, thematic area, as well as its geographic coverage, implementation period and main partners. The context provides a succinct overview of the Social Protection National Policy and related programs, in addition to information on the Partnerships framework in social protection. Nevertheless, the report would have benefited from the inclusion of references to the framework of the Agenda 2030, and on the National Voluntary Report against SDGs, as well as on relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality that supported the intervention.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The objectives of the evaluation are clearly presented with a focus on learning. Human rights and gender equality considerations are effectively mainstreamed in the different sections of the report. The main stakeholders and users of the evaluation are clearly presented as well as the scope. While information on geographic and temporal scope are provided under this section, information on the activities covered by the evaluation are specified under the methodology section.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The methodology section includes summary information on the methodological design (mixed methods, sources, triangulation, analysis methods) that is relevant to answer the evaluation questions. The methodology includes specific evaluation questions on GEWE for the main evaluation criteria that enabled understanding how gender issues were addressed in the SPSA. Methodological limitations related to the impact of COVID-19 on the geographic coverage and on the field mission in the country are correctly identified in the report. Nevertheless, the evaluation would have benefited</p>		

from the inclusion of an assessment of monitoring data, including data on equity and gender equality issues that should have informed the choice of the methodology. It should also have explicitly clarified how the UN Code of Conduct Ethical Standards was applied in the evaluation (e.g. integrity and respect for confidentiality).

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

Findings rely on a strong analysis of primary and secondary sources. For each finding, the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject are presented, with weaknesses explained in a constructive manner. The analysis relies on detailed information on what has been accomplished versus what was planned and provides guidance to decision-makers on what needs to be improved to achieve the expected results. GEWE considerations are addressed in relation to each evaluation criterion. Contributions by WFP interventions (i.e., outputs) supporting the implementation of the five pillars of the Adapted Social Protection System to achieve the Mauritania Strategic Plan (outcome-level results) are clearly articulated and explained. There are no major weaknesses in this section of the report, although positive or negative unanticipated effects, including those relating to human rights and gender equality, could have been better described and analysed.

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

Conclusions flow logically from findings and are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction. They go beyond the synthesis of findings to identify their implications for the future of the intervention, which will be useful for decision-making. The report includes three relevant lessons learnt (on capacity development, inter-agency cooperation and WFP's leadership) that could contribute to wider organizational learning in WFP and guide future action. Conclusions are balanced and reflect GEWE-related aspects and wider equity and inclusion dimensions. Nevertheless, elements of Sustainability and Coherence that are critical for the future of the intervention should have been included in the conclusions section.

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

There is a clear link between the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. All seven key strategic and operational recommendations are broken down into actions to be taken to implement them. The recommendations are realistic, feasible, targeted, specific and actionable. The report provides relevant recommendations addressing GEWE issues and priorities for action to improve GEWE in the intervention or future initiatives in this area. Nevertheless, the section would have benefited by better taking into consideration WFP constraints for the implementation of the recommendations and by identifying specific responsible actors within the organization to implement them.

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

The report uses clear and easily understood, precise and professional language. Sources are provided for all data and quotes; and the report uses visual aids to convey key information consistently throughout. The evaluation methods and document analysis ensured a diverse range of data sources and processes. Nevertheless, the evaluation timeline, methodology, data collection tools, fieldwork agenda, and mapping of findings, conclusions and recommendations should have been included in the annexes.

### **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: 7 points
--	------------------------------

Gender equality and equity considerations are effectively mainstreamed in the various sections of the evaluation, including in its design, with the evaluation matrix including specific questions related to GEWE. The mixed-methods approach was appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations, and the diversity of stakeholders is reflected in the evaluation methods. The evaluation report provides specific strategic and operational recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE within the intervention or across future initiatives in this area. Despite the findings section includes a reference to the national strategy on gender institutionalization, the context does not present the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality that supported the intervention.

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>
<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>