

Evaluation title	Programme Activity Evaluation of Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) Project in South Sudan - March 2016 to December 2019	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 87%	
<p>Overall, the Evaluation of the Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) Project in South Sudan is of high quality and can be used with confidence to inform decision-making. The report presents an overview of the country context that is relevant to the subject of the evaluation. The FFA project is clearly described, including its main objectives and partners. Similarly, the report presents a good overview of the rationale, objectives, and scope of the evaluation. Gender dimensions are explicitly incorporated into the evaluation scope and the methodology. The evaluation design, data sources, data collection and analysis methods, and methodological limitations are also clearly identified. Findings are based on evidence that is well sourced and triangulated across a varied range of data sources and stakeholder voices, including the most vulnerable groups. Conclusions identify future implications of findings, and recommendations are clear and logically derived from the evaluation conclusions and findings. However, the report should have presented a discussion of the way in which the availability and quality of monitoring data informed the choice of methodology for this evaluation, as well as provided a clear description of the rationale for the sampling approach used. Finally, lessons learned are not formulated in a way that contributes to organizational learning or demonstrates relevance in different contexts.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary is a comprehensive, stand-alone document useful for decision-makers. It effectively condenses the main features of the FFA project as well as of the evaluation itself, including its objectives, scope, methodology, stakeholders and intended users. Furthermore, it provides a good general overview of the evaluation findings and clearly summarizes conclusions and recommendations, including those related to GEWE issues.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents information on the national context that is relevant to informing the FFA project, including South Sudan's livelihood and food security, relevant national policies and humanitarian assistance in the country. The context discussion could have been strengthened by providing information on the 2018 Voluntary National Review and advancements against SDGs 2 and 17, as well as integrating additional information about South Sudan's geography and demographics, and the country's gender inequality index. The project description and complementary annexes present a complete picture of the project's main objectives and partners, as well as planned vs. actual results, disaggregated by year and by sex whenever possible.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a good overview of the evaluation rationale, learning and accountability objectives, and scope, main users and intended use. Furthermore, the report describes the gender dimensions explicitly incorporated into the scope and methodology of the evaluation. However, all stakeholders of the evaluation beyond its main users should have been explicitly presented in the main body of the report, not only in the evaluation terms of reference.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good description of the evaluation design, data sources, data collection and analysis methods, and methodological limitations are outlined, although mitigation strategies are not provided. The evaluation matrix is robust, and ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation process are discussed. While no stand-alone criterion on gender and human rights was included among the evaluation criteria, a gender-sensitive approach was used and GEWE considerations are mainstreamed through several evaluation questions. However, the methodology section could have been strengthened by providing more information on several aspects, including the quality of the monitoring data available, as well as the way in which the availability of monitoring data informed methodological choices, and a clear description of the rationale for the sampling strategy.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Findings are substantiated by solid evidence triangulated through various data sources and methods. All the evaluation questions and sub-questions are effectively addressed, and positive and negative unintended effects related to such issues as the use of biometric (SCOPE) registration cards and cutting down of tress for group farms are discussed. Findings are presented in an unbiased fashion and are balanced, underlining both the strengths and weaknesses of the project. They clearly articulate the link between WFP's activities/outputs, mid-term and long-term outcomes to impact-level change discussed under the impact criterion. The report also provides relevant information on the findings and recommendations from other evaluations (e.g., BRACE II MTR) that influenced and were incorporated in the FFA project.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions are forward-looking, based on the evidence presented in the findings, and clearly grouped under the corresponding evaluation criteria. They are pitched at a higher level of analysis, presenting an overall assessment that captures the key elements and provides a strategic perspective on the initiative. While the conclusions refer to GEWE-related aspects, they could have been strengthened by addressing wider equity and inclusion dimensions discussed in the findings section. Finally, the lessons presented are not formulated in such a way as to contribute to wider organizational learning.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation recommendations are realistic, feasible and actionable, clearly identifying the timelines and specific actors for their implementation and providing sufficient detail as to how each should be implemented. They take into consideration the implementation context as well as potential limitations, demonstrating a good understanding of WFP's institutional functioning. However, each recommendation's level of priority could have been more clearly indicated, as well as whether they were strategic or operational.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>In general, the report presents information clearly and uses professional language. Data sources are consistently provided and most cross-references within the report are clearly signposted. The report also uses visuals effectively, for example using maps to indicate communities covered and the intersecting vulnerabilities per area and per risk. However, the evaluation timeline should have been included in the annexes and the report could have benefited from a final overall review to ensure that all cross-references within the report, including references to Annexes, were correct.</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>Even though human rights and gender equality are not included as one of the specific evaluation objectives, the evaluation incorporated gender dimensions into its scope and methodology. The collection of GEWE-related data was ensured through specific evaluation questions and sub-questions, such as on unintended effects under the impact criterion. Data collection and analysis methods mainstreamed gender, with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidance on gender used to shape the evaluation approach. The mixed-methods approach ensured the triangulation of gender-sensitive aspects of the project. The context description provided an analysis of relevant gender dimensions and vulnerabilities such as the high rate of sexual and gender-based violence and maternal and child mortality, rural poverty index by gender, land ownership by women, and working rural women rates. Moreover, the report describes in detail the different sources that informed the evaluation findings from a range of stakeholder groups, including government officials, WFP staff, beneficiaries (both women and men), etc. and several recommendations address GEWE issues. However, additional detail on whether and how the sampling strategy was developed with a view to include the most vulnerable should have been included, and any unintended effects that the project may have had on human rights or gender equality are not mentioned.</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.