

Evaluation title	Support for Strengthening Resilience of Vulnerable Groups in Ethiopia: The Fresh Food Voucher Programme Expansion in Amhara Region	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized-Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 80%	
<p>The evaluation of the Support for Strengthening Resilience of Vulnerable Groups in Ethiopia: The Fresh Food Voucher Programme Expansion in Amhara Region provides readers with a credible assessment of the intervention, with emphasis on GEWE-related issues which are mainstreamed in the evaluation. The context and overview provide a coherent and nuanced analysis of factors affecting the intervention, including astute observations of national level policies and the external environment. The methodology is appropriately described, including an honest assessment of the limitations and mitigation strategies. The findings, conclusions, and lessons learned are presented in a fair and unbiased manner, with useful insights into the intervention's efficacy. However, the evaluation could have been further strengthened by examining the pilot programme that preceded this intervention in terms of its objectives, outcomes, and outputs which would have likely informed and provided valuable information for the design of the current programme. The methodology should also have considered examining and presenting alternative methodological approaches given the stated limitations of remote data collection. Moreover, the evaluation findings and conclusions should have been better delineated, i.e. presented separately rather than combined. Some of the recommendations could have more adequately considered the external environment in terms of constraints for the future implementation of the intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary presents a complete and concise overview of the evaluation report, including clear information on the evaluation type and features. Useful and timely insights regarding the context of the evaluation, particularly the constraints facing WFP Ethiopia operations are also provided. The evaluation recommendations flow logically from the key findings and conclusions (although the latter are not presented separately). However, the evaluation findings do not address all the evaluation questions and the evaluation conclusions are not clearly summarized but rather coupled with key findings which makes it difficult to distinguish them from the findings. Moreover, the recommendations in the summary should have included the level of priority and timeframe for implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context and overview of the evaluation subject is clear and comprehensive, including detailed information on the country context, national policies relevant to the intervention, assessment of relevant humanitarian indicators such as food insecurity, an overview of GEWE-related issues, and the external environment. However, the context and overview of the evaluation subject would have benefited from providing more detail about the pilot programme that preceded the intervention and the rationale for expanding the programme.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, purpose, learning and accountability objectives, and scope are well defined overall. The main users and stakeholders of the evaluation are clearly identified, and the scope provides adequate detail regarding the geographic area, target groups, time period, and specific activities/dimensions covered by the evaluation. While not included in the evaluation objectives per se, GEWE and human rights related issues are mainstreamed into the evaluation criteria.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the methodological approach, data collection methods, limitations, mitigation measures, and ethical dimensions of the evaluation. The evaluation matrix includes all the necessary elements and monitoring data is assessed using the pilot programme as a baseline as well as data collected at intervals over the course of</p>		

<p>implementation of the intervention. However, the methodology could have been further strengthened by adopting a sampling approach that included male household members as this would have allowed assessment of differences between groups for a more nuanced analysis. It could also have examined alternative data collection approaches beyond the use of mobile phones, to which the beneficiaries have limited access.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings assess all evaluation questions and sub-questions in a clear, unbiased, and balanced manner, including discussion of the limitations of the evidence. Qualitative and quantitative data is used effectively to support both the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention. However, the findings did not consider previous evaluations or lessons learned from previous programming, which is surprising given that the FFV programme is an expansion of a successful pilot programme. The findings could also have been improved by assessing the unanticipated effects of the programme, including in relation to GEWE issues.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions and lessons learnt are appropriately derived from the findings and do not introduce new information. GEWE-related issues are adequately addressed and the implications of the findings for the future of the intervention from a strategic perspective are clearly discussed. However, the conclusions are not clearly distinguished from the findings and the lessons learnt could have been further strengthened by identifying areas for potential wider organizational learning.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are specific, targeted, and provide actionable guidance for WFP and relevant stakeholders. They flow logically from the findings and conclusions, focus on areas for improvement highlighted in the findings, and directly address GEWE-related issues. However, some recommendations do not adequately consider WFP constraints given contextual factors in the country, for example the recommendation to strengthen technical IT capacities for better implementation when national telecommunication capacities are limited. The recommendations could also have been improved by identifying their level of priority and timeframe for implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report is structured in a manner that is accessible and clear in accordance with WFP requirements. The language used is professional and devoid of jargon; data is adequately sourced, and visual aids are useful and facilitate an understanding of the written text. However, not all mandatory annexes for DEs are included, such as the summary Terms of Reference, evaluation timeline, and list of people interviewed.</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	Meets requirements: 7 points
<p>The evaluation scope of analysis, criteria, and questions fully integrated GEWE-related issues, including dedicated sub-questions. The evaluation clearly reflects on whether sufficient information was collected with regards to GEWE-related information and addressed one sub-question assessing how well GEWE was integrated into the subject of the evaluation. The evaluation methodology adequately addresses GEWE dimensions in terms of data sources, ethical standards, diversity of stakeholders but did not adequately consider the gendered dimension in the data collection approach in terms of women's limited access to mobile phones. Moreover, since male household members were not included, it is not possible to assess differences between groups as clearly as if both groups had been sampled and data disaggregated. Conclusions address GEWE directly, including implications regarding eligibility, financial inclusion, and key outcomes based on gender and the evaluation report provides clear and adequate recommendations addressing GEWE-related issues. However, the evaluation findings could have been improved by providing an intersectional analysis of specific social groups as well as a discussion of unanticipated effects of the intervention from a GEWE perspective.</p>	

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.