

Evaluation title	Evaluation of R4 Rural Resilience Initiative in Masvingo and Rushinga Districts in Zimbabwe January 2018-June 2021	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory	
<p>This is a well written report on which evaluation users can rely on and that can be used with confidence for decision-making. The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clear and the description of the subject of the evaluation is accurate, although a few additional details would have been useful. The methodology was appropriate for the purposes of the evaluation and was able to adequately compensate for the limitations imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. A complete evaluation matrix and data collection tools are provided in the annexes, although the report would have benefited from the inclusion of a more complete description of the methodology. Findings are balanced, including strengths and weaknesses of the programme evaluated, and triangulated from a variety of sources and data collection methods which are clearly identified. Conclusions and recommendations follow logically from the findings. The latter are generally feasible, actionable, with identified responsibilities and timelines. Analysis of gender is generally mainstreamed and provides useful insights in the findings, although these are not followed through in the conclusions and recommendations where they are largely absent. Also, conclusions and recommendations regarding youth are not fully supported throughout the findings, project description, or issues identified in the context.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly satisfactory
<p>The summary is clearly written, is of appropriate length and includes all of the necessary elements. The evaluation features, findings and conclusions are good summaries of the report. Recommendations are summarized, but they do not specify timelines or responsibilities.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context provides sufficient information to understand the setting for the project, although a few general elements are missing. A general gender analysis is provided, and national policies relating to SDG 2 are included, but the context for youth is missing. The overview of the evaluation subject includes the objective, theory of change (TOC), overview of planned activities and expected results. Some of the key findings from previous studies are also included. Data is partially disaggregated by sex, and note the high level of women's participation in various elements. The overview would have benefited from a more detailed breakdown of beneficiaries, specifics of the activities planned and more reference to other donors or activities within the context, changes in the external environment, and description of partners.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The objectives of the evaluation are clearly defined as accountability and learning, with an emphasis on the latter. The geographic and programmatic scope of the evaluation is well described. The rationale and timing for the evaluation are also clear, feeding into planning the next phase. The objectives would have benefited from reference to gender and human rights, the latter not being addressed anywhere in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation methodology and tools are clearly presented, appropriate for the evaluation, and well adapted to the limitations due to COVID. They included telephone surveys, in-person FGDs, site visits by local consulting partner, and KIIs. The evaluation applied OECD DAC criteria with seven evaluation questions (20 sub-questions) under Relevance (EQ1&2), Effectiveness (EQ 3&4), Efficiency (EQ5), Impact (EQ6) and Sustainability (EQ7). The evaluation approach duly considered the findings of the evaluability assessment carried out in the inception phase; limitations and mitigation efforts are clearly defined, and an excellent evaluation matrix is provided in the annex. Ethical guidelines are included. The evaluation consulted with WFP staff, implementing partners and beneficiaries</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings are transparent and impartial, addressing strengths and weaknesses in a balanced way, and making very good use of available data. All evaluation questions and most sub-questions are answered, with few gaps. The findings are explicitly triangulated and anecdotal data, supported by other variable sources, helped to bring the findings to life. A contribution (rather than attribution) focus helped to clarify WFP's role in a volatile context, although a few more references to other external actors would have been useful. Few unanticipated results are noted. Although several studies took place during the implementation of the program, the report does not say if any of their recommendations from these studies were actually implemented and how. The gender analysis provides 20 recommendations for the R4 program, but the evaluation report mentions only one. Youth were not specifically consulted, so findings on youth might not be properly triangulated.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are generally well balanced and draw from across the findings. They will be useful for both accountability and strategic decision making, and clearly lead the way for the following recommendations. A particularly useful innovation included in the conclusions is a table of comments on the assumptions and risks in the TOC, drawing on findings from the evaluation. This will help refine the TOC and improve program planning. Conclusions on youth are not fully substantiated as youth were not consulted and there is no description of the situation of youth in the context. In addition, in spite of significant gender findings, there is almost nothing included in the conclusions on gender.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>There are eight recommendations, presented in the proper format, with timelines, responsibilities, and categorization as strategic or operational. With few, minor exceptions, they are specific, actionable, realistic and targeted. They follow logically from the findings and conclusions. In spite of the numerous findings, there are no recommendations on gender except that along with promoting youth participation, the gender focal point also supports partners more on integrating gender. WFP CO gender capacity was however not assessed in this section. In addition, the recommendation on youth is not well substantiated elsewhere in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is very well written with no significant spelling or grammatical errors. It is clear, logically organized and follows the template closely, with the exception that an expanded methodology annex is missing. Data sources are complete and annexes are properly referenced. Visually, the report is aided with graphs, summary information boxes, and highlighting in various ways. Somewhat more creative means could have been used to accent key points, such as text boxes with quotes to emphasize anecdotal points, and perhaps more varied graphics.</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>Although there is no stand-alone gender criterion or objective, gender is fairly well integrated into the scope and design of the evaluation. There are two sub-questions addressing gender, and two others with gender indicators. The mixed method approach included a survey carried out with a larger proportion of women than men, FGDs were segregated by gender, and carried out by gender appropriate facilitators, monitoring reports available were sex disaggregated, and the evaluation team made good use of a recent gender analysis. The context includes an assessment of gender issues and some information on national gender policies, although not in great detail and without reference to international normative standards on gender or human rights. There is little intersectional analysis that would indicate how age, economic status, rural/urban status, or any other criterion might influence a woman's situation. Given the amount of information and analysis on gender, it is surprising that there is almost no mention of gender in the conclusions, lessons learned or recommendations.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>