

Evaluation title	Evaluación conjunta de la actividad articulada de Progresando con Solidaridad y el Servicio Nacional de Salud, con apoyo del Programa Mundial de Alimentos, para la prevención de la desnutrición y la anemia en población nutricionalmente vulnerable de la República Dominicana 2014 - 2020	
Evaluation category and type	DE Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 89%	
<p>This evaluation report is of high quality and decision makers can use this evaluation with a high degree of confidence. The evaluation rationale, objectives, and stakeholders are well articulated, including GEWE-related objectives and mainstreaming. The report is underpinned by a robust methodological approach, provides comprehensive findings - thoroughly answering the evaluation questions - and present both strengths and weaknesses of the intervention while transparently recognizing and identifying gaps in the evidence or internal inconsistencies. The conclusions and lessons learnt are complete and are of high quality. The recommendations are well defined, logically consistent with the findings and conclusions, and presented in a manner that is realistic and feasible for the stakeholders to implement whilst considering both contextual factors and WFP constraints.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary includes all the necessary elements. The key findings address all evaluation sub-questions, and the conclusions are well articulated and flow logically from the findings, although they do not sufficiently present GEWE-related considerations. The recommendations are clearly presented and categorized. However, the lessons learnt are presented too briefly in the report summary and could have been explained further.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good analysis of other interventions implemented in the country, the evolution of the context over time, past evaluation, WFP's/international assistance in the Dominican Republic, and addresses the gender dimension of the evaluation subject. It provides a thorough overview of the evaluation subject as well as a good overview of national policies, alignment with SDGs, and Agenda 2030. Budget information is provided by source and by year but does not provide information on programme resourcing. The theory of change is clearly presented, including assumptions, activities/strategies, and outcomes but does not clearly state the expected outputs by activity. The planned transfers/outcomes are not presented although actual transfers are included in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, objectives, and stakeholders are clearly presented. Specific objectives address GEWE considerations which are mainstreamed to a certain extent given the type of beneficiaries of the program evaluated. While scope-related information (temporal, geographic, programmatic) is found in the report, it is scattered and should have been grouped in a paragraph presenting this information in a clear manner.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodological approach is appropriate and the data collection methods allowed the evaluation questions to be answered completely. The methodology clearly recognizes the limitations in the availability of monitoring data and the gaps in data, including sex-disaggregated data. The evaluation criteria and evaluation (sub-)questions are clearly presented. The triangulation of research, information, and methods is clearly discussed while the sampling strategy at the regional level is well defined and clearly allowed for diverse perspectives to be captured, including rural-urban and the most vulnerable. The methodology explicitly states that a rights-based approach was integrated, in accordance with WFP</p>		

<p>protection policies. Ethical considerations are fully discussed as is quality assurance. Although limitations are discussed, appropriate mitigation measures are not presented, particularly with respect to gaps in data availability.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings are complete, thoroughly answer the evaluation questions, and present both strengths and weaknesses of the intervention while transparently recognizing and identifying gaps in the evidence or internal inconsistencies. They assess WFP's contribution and interaction with other actors and address GEWE dimensions in a cross-cutting manner, capturing the perspectives a diverse group of people, including the most vulnerable. However, in assessing the effectiveness of the intervention, the findings should have clearly and explicitly stated that there were no baselines or planned outcomes to which actual outcomes could be compared. Positive or negative "unanticipated" effects are discussed but do not explicitly address human rights and gender equality considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions and lessons learnt are complete and are of high quality. The conclusions are presented at a higher level of abstraction, present both positive and negative aspects, flow logically from the findings, and clearly assess GEWE-related considerations. Lessons learnt provide a broader assessment of the intervention, including identifying best/good practices and crucial areas to improve systems/capacity development.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are well defined and complete, and are logically consistent with the findings and conclusions. They are presented in a manner that is realistic and feasible for the stakeholders to implement whilst considering both contextual factors and WFP constraints. The recommendations identify relevant stakeholders including targeting of recommendations by providing sub-recommendations. The recommendations are prioritized and presented in groups based on programmatic/operational and strategic recommendations. The recommendations address GEWE dimensions throughout given the type of beneficiaries and include a standalone sub-recommendation that calls for strengthening of a gender approach.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is accessible and clearly structured. It follows the WFP template and includes all required lists. The report uses accessible language and is devoid of jargon. It also provides sources for all data and quotes. Annexes are complete and contain a significant amount of information. Visual aids are used very effectively throughout the report, such as boxes used to capture key messages and good practices.</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	Meet requirements: 7 points
<p>Overall, the evaluation effectively addresses GEWE considerations beginning with the context and description of the evaluation subject. They are satisfactorily integrated into the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria/questions, but could have been more prominent in the evaluation framework. While recognizing the limitations with respect to data availability, including disaggregated data by sex, the methodology included a deliberate choice of methods, tools, analyses, and techniques to reflect the GEWE dimension, with the sampling strategy clearly supporting the triangulation of a diverse set of perspectives, including of the most vulnerable. The findings provide explicit analysis of GEWE, including triangulation of the voices of the most vulnerable, although unanticipated effects in relation to GEWE dimensions are not discussed. Conclusions and recommendations reflect explicitly on GEWE dimensions.</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.