

<b>Evaluation title</b>	<b>Addressing Climate Change Impacts on Marginalized Agricultural Communities Living in the Mahaweli River Basin of Sri Lanka</b>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	<b>DE-Activity</b>	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory: 77%</b>	
<p>The evaluation report presents credible evaluation findings that can be used with confidence by decision-makers. The evaluation is grounded in a strong methodology that uses multiple data collection methods to gather the perspectives of various groups of stakeholders, especially beneficiaries of the WFP-supported intervention. It presents a strong assessment of the project's performance, and the findings, which provide answers to all evaluation questions, are based on solid evidence. Presented without bias, the findings provide a balanced assessment of the project's strengths and weaknesses, and consistently identify data gaps. In addition, the report effectively presents the nuanced perspectives of different groups of stakeholders, though it is unclear whether the most vulnerable groups (e.g., the elderly or persons living with a disability) were consulted. Furthermore, the evaluation framework, findings and recommendations adequately integrate a gender analysis. However, the description of the project's results chain and underlying assumptions is somewhat weak and, while the conclusions clearly summarize the findings, they do not provide an insightful discussion of the implications of the findings for the future of WFP's work on resilience.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The summary presents concise information on the evaluation type, features, context, and subject. The majority of the findings are clearly summarized for each evaluation criterion, and the conclusions provide an accurate summary of those presented in the main report. However, the summary on the project's effectiveness does not accurately reflect the key findings in the main report. In addition, the recommendations could have provided a more accurate reflection of those presented in the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report presents a clear overview of the country context, including the food and nutrition security situation in Sri Lanka, and the main challenges related to climate change. An overview of development assistance in the country is also presented. The report presents a partial description of the evaluation subject, outlining its geographic coverage, implementation period, main partners, objectives, and gendered dimensions. However, the results chain linking different levels of results and assumptions underlying the project's logic are not clearly depicted. In addition, the report does not provide an overview of the evolution of the project over the implementation period. .</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report clearly outlines the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability and explains the rationale for why the evaluation took place when it did. The report also identifies the primary users of the evaluation and describes how they intend to use it. Human rights and gender equality are effectively mainstreamed, and the geographic scope is well described. However, the temporal and programmatic scope could have been better defined.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report clearly describes the evaluation data collection methods, sampling frame, site visits to beneficiaries, and data analysis methods. The evaluation limitations and mitigation strategies, as well as ethical considerations, are also addressed. Informed by an assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system, the methodology was designed to collect sex-disaggregated data and adequately mainstreamed gender equality considerations. An evaluation matrix detailing the evaluation questions, sub-questions and corresponding indicators is included. However, the questions are not clearly linked to their corresponding evaluation criterion and they do not adequately address the</p>		

coherence criterion. Moreover, the evaluation design and approaches, especially to assess contribution to outcomes, could have been better defined.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The findings address all evaluation questions, are presented without bias, and effectively outline the strengths and weaknesses of the project in a balanced way. Findings are supported by robust evidence and the report clearly and consistently identifies data gaps. Data is triangulated using multiple data sources and the voices of different stakeholder groups are presented throughout. In addition, the findings integrate a gender analysis describing the positive outcomes achieved in terms of women’s economic empowerment. However, the evaluation does not address the project’s unanticipated effects. In addition, the report does not adequately discuss issues of equity and inclusion, although it does acknowledge that the lack of disaggregated data limited the ability of the evaluators to address these issues.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
The conclusions derive from the findings, present the main strengths and weaknesses of the project, and adequately integrate GEWE dimensions. However, they tend to provide a summary of the findings and do not provide an insightful discussion of their implications going forward. More analytical and forward-looking conclusions would have been desirable considering the evaluation’s purpose to explore how climate change adaptation could be integrated into WFP’s future work on resilience.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
All recommendations logically derive from the findings and conclusions, are prioritized, include a clear timeline for action, and are specific enough to be actionable. Recommendations also seem feasible and take into consideration that the project has already ended. In addition, the recommendations adequately address gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE). However, although recommendations are targeted, some target more than one actor without identifying a lead organization.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The report is well written, logically structured, uses clear language, and adequately cross-references information throughout. The report mostly follows the evaluation template and includes most required annexes. However, better formatting and presentation of visuals, combined with more frequent use of key finding statements, could have enhanced the readability of the report.		

<b>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>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 7 points
GEWE considerations are adequately integrated into the report overall. GEWE is mainstreamed in most evaluation criteria and a sub-question sought to examine the project’s effects on increased decision-making power and autonomy among women small holders. In addition, the methodology includes an assessment of the M&E system, which identifies gaps in the availability of sex-disaggregated data. To address this gap, the team conducted focus group discussions with women and men separately to collect qualitative sex-disaggregated data. Although the report ensured an equal representation of women and men in these discussions, it is unclear whether the evaluation consulted with particularly vulnerable groups, such as people living with disability and the elderly. The findings include a relevant gender analysis and present the nuanced perspectives of different stakeholder groups, although they do not discuss the unanticipated effects of the project on human rights and gender equality. The evaluation proposes a recommendation on women and businesses, with equity also mentioned in the recommendations, although in a somewhat generic way and as an element to be considered among others in implementing 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.