

Evaluation title	Evaluation of the Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) in the Context of Malawi 2015-2019	
Evaluation category and type	DE-Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 85%	
<p>Overall, this is a strong evaluation whose findings and recommendations can be used by decision-makers with a high level of confidence. The evaluation is grounded in a strong methodological design that draws on a mixed-methods approach to gather the views of multiple groups of stakeholders, including hundreds of community beneficiaries and local authorities. Drawing on the programme TOC and logframe, the methodology also adopts adequate approaches and analysis methods to assess the contribution of WFP's Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) to improving resilience in Malawi. The findings provide answers to all evaluation questions and sub-questions. These are substantiated by a strong evidence base, which is triangulated by multiple sources of data. In addition, the findings fully integrate considerations of GEWE and equity. The evaluation report also presents a strong set of conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. However, it is unclear why the evaluation effectively began more than one year after the end of the period of the FFA covered by the evaluation and how this may have impacted the timeliness of the evaluation. In addition, the report could have assessed programme performance against the International Humanitarian Principles given climate-related disasters in Malawi. Though well written and comprehensive, the report's readability is limited by its excessive length.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary provides concise information on the evaluation type, features, context and evaluation subject as well as the findings and conclusions. However, the recommendations are presented as is without being summarized and contribute to the overall length of the summary, which exceeds WFP maximum length requirements.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report provides a good overview of the country context, which includes an analysis of the socio-economic and food security situation in Malawi. Gender inequalities in the agricultural sector and particular challenges faced by young women and girls are also discussed, although a strong intersectional analysis would have required considerations of other aspects beyond age, such as ethnicity and disability. The report also presents relevant legal frameworks and a comprehensive overview of development assistance in food security and resilience. However, the gendered dimensions of the programme could have been presented more clearly.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report outlines the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning, which fully integrate gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) considerations. It explains why the evaluation was undertaken at this time and also identifies its users and expected uses. However, the large (over one year) time lag between the end of the evaluation coverage date of the FFA and the finalization of the evaluation inception report raises questions as to the evaluation's timeliness with respect to its stated purpose to identify scaling up strategies of FFA activities to inform the new CSP and ensure strategic shifts in programming where necessary. Lastly, the geographic and programmatic scope could have been explained more clearly.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology presents a strong evaluation design that relies on a theory-based approach to assess the contribution of WFP's FFA work to outcomes. It draws on several data collection methods, including a household survey, to gather the views of multiple stakeholder groups. The evaluation team reached more than 350 individuals and 660 households, which is significant. The sampling strategy is robust, but the degree to which vulnerable groups were purposively</p>		

<p>included remains unclear. This said, the methodology and data collection tools were designed to gather data on gender equality and equity. The evaluation framework is presented through a good quality evaluation matrix that details the evaluation questions/sub-questions, which are accompanied by a series of qualitative and quantitative indicators. Finally, ethical standards are clearly described, as are the evaluation's limitations and mitigation strategies.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings answer all evaluation questions/sub-questions in a transparent manner and present a balanced picture of the programme. These are supported by triangulated evidence and data sources are well referenced throughout. In addition, the report is strong at presenting the nuanced perspectives of different stakeholder groups. The voices of men and women are equally heard and vulnerabilities based on geographies and age are discussed. Drawing on the theory of change and programme logframe, the findings make excellent use of monitoring data, the household survey, FGDs and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) meetings to discuss the programme's contribution to improved resilience among men and women farmers. However, the findings do not assess the implementation of recommendations from the 2016 MTE of the PRRO, nor do they assess performance against international humanitarian principles.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions logically derive from the findings and present a balanced overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, while also making some linkages across evaluation criteria. The conclusions are analytical and forward-looking, although they could have been anchored more explicitly in the current CSP 2019-2023. Furthermore, the conclusions fully integrate GEWE and equity considerations. Finally, the evaluation offers insightful lessons learned that can be used to improve FFA programming in broader contexts.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the evaluation recommendations derive from the findings and are aligned with the purpose of the evaluation to inform WFP's future work on resilience. In addition, recommendations are prioritized and include a specific timeline for action. Likewise, recommendations seem feasible and propose specific actions to guide their operationalization. They also fully integrate GEWE and equity considerations. However, while the recommendations are targeted at specific users, they do not identify a clear lead, thus blurring the lines of accountability for their implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report is well written, logically structured, and uses professional language that can easily be understood. The report also makes excellent use of visuals to convey information in a user-friendly manner. Data are properly sourced throughout but the report makes little use of signposting to cross-reference information. Finally, the annexes are complete but the report exceeds overall maximum length requirements.</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: 8 points
<p>GEWE considerations are integrated into the report to a large extent. GEWE is embedded in the evaluation objectives. It is also mainstreamed across evaluation criteria and includes several sub-questions that seek to examine the differential effects of the FFA programme on women and men as well as its contribution to women's empowerment and shifts in intra-household gender dynamics. In addition, the methodology is gender-responsive and was designed to collect disaggregated data by sex, age and geography. The sampling approach ensured balanced representation of women and men; however, the degree to which vulnerable groups were included is unclear. Similarly, vulnerabilities unrelated to gender are not considered in the context section, although the context of gender inequalities in the agricultural sector and of young women and girls' particular vulnerability to gender-based violence is well explained. Finally, the findings, conclusions and recommendations fully integrate a gender analysis.</p>	

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

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

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.