

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Innovative Pilot Evaluation: Aflatoxin Reduction in the Rwanda Maize Value Chain from October to December 2021	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 89%	
<p>The report of the innovative pilot evaluation of Aflatoxin Reduction in the Rwanda Maize Value Chain presents credible findings that evaluation users can rely on with confidence for decision-making. The report provides a good overview of the situation of smallholder farmers in Rwanda and of the AflaSight pilot activity evaluated, describing key activities, key assumptions, expected results. The evaluation objectives, scope and primary users are clearly outlined. The methodology used was appropriate, combining different methods of data collection and data sources, which ensured systematic triangulation and unbiased answers to evaluation questions. Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) dimensions were also well mainstreamed in the evaluation framework. Well-balanced findings provide answers to all evaluation questions across the evaluation criteria and the factors influencing the achievement of technical objectives are discussed. The evaluation presents forward-looking strategic conclusions and the recommendations formulated are realistic and actionable overall. However, some weaknesses were noted in the AflaSight reconstructed theory of change (TOC) which is largely unclear and the report could have been strengthened by clearly stating the rationale of the evaluation. Moreover, the conclusions could have been improved with clearer linkages to the key findings from which they were derived.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The summary includes the main features of the evaluation and the key findings are well summarized and organized around the key five evaluation criteria and nine questions. The conclusions and recommendations are also generally well summarized. However, the summary could have been improved by including information on the rationale of the evaluation and by showing the logical linkages between the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of the issues faced by smallholder farmers in accessing commercial markets, especially in relation to aflatoxin levels in maize, and of other relevant background information such as data on poverty, food security, government policies and regulations, including reference to SDG 17 (Partnerships), and international assistance in Rwanda in the agriculture sector. Women's discrimination and unequal access to farming inputs are also addressed. The overview of AflaSight includes clear information on its strategic objectives, partnerships, key activities, direct users/ beneficiaries, geographic scope, planned outputs, implementation period and partners, as well as describes key changes in the pilot vis-à-vis its original plan. However, the context section could have been improved by adding information on the country's geography and demographic features and making reference to the 2019 Rwanda Voluntary National Review. While the report describes WFP's previous work on smallholder market integration and aflatoxin control in Rwanda, it is silent about whether WFP work in this area has experienced significant changes and, if any, the key external events which led to these changes. Finally, the reconstructed ToC diagram lacks clear linkages among the various elements, and the results chain lacks proper balance between outputs, outcomes, and long-term development impacts.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The learning and accountability objectives of the evaluation are clearly outlined in the report. Moreover, the time period, geographic scope, and activities covered by the evaluation are well described, with GEWE dimensions mainstreamed in the evaluation framework. The report could have been strengthened by clearly stating the rationale for the evaluation and mainstreaming human rights dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory

The methodology used for this evaluation was varied and appropriate, combining different methods of data collection and analysis as well as data sources, and applying systematic triangulation, which ensured unbiased answers to evaluation questions. A detailed evaluation matrix is presented in the report's annexes. Evaluation questions related to relevance, effectiveness, and impact – and gender-related questions in data collection instruments – considered GEWE aspects. The report presents methodological limitations along with mitigation strategies but could have been improved by indicating whether sufficient information was collected on specific results indicators so as to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The evaluation findings provide answers to all evaluation questions across the five evaluation criteria, without any omissions or inconsistencies. Findings are presented in a transparent way, discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the AflaSight project activity. The report effectively triangulates evidence from multiple sources of data and provides a sound performance assessment of the AflaSight technology and related processes in the Rwandan context, including the factors influencing the achievement of technical objectives. The findings present the views of different groups of stakeholders (government representatives, traders, large-scale processors, smaller millers and markets, as well as consumers). While the report brings in a gender perspective in analyzing the performance of AflaSight, no similar assessment is provided of AflaSight performance on other dimensions of equity and inclusion. The report could also have identified unintended effects of AflaSight.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The evaluation report presents seven forward-looking conclusions that connect findings across the evaluation criteria. They are strategically framed and can be useful for accountability and decision making. However, the logical links between the conclusions and the findings could have been made somewhat clearer and, like the findings, the conclusions do not clearly reflect on wider equity and inclusion aspects, although one conclusion focuses on GEWE aspects.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The report provides a rationale and indications for implementing concrete actions related to each of the evaluation recommendations categorized as either operational or strategic. The recommendations identify a responsible lead actor and entities, as well as the level of priority and specific timeframe for implementation. However, the recommendations could have included a specific recommendation related to gender equality and reflected broader equity and inclusion dimensions.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The report is logically structured, generally reads well, uses professional language, and is consistent with WFP requirements for decentralized evaluations. It systematically provides sources of data and quotes to support the findings. The report makes good use of visual aids (tables, boxes, figures and graphs) to highlight specific content in a user-friendly manner. However, some content streamlining could have reduced the length of the report to keep it within WFP's maximum length requirement.

**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**

<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 7 points
--	------------------------------

The evaluation includes several evaluation questions that consider GEWE-related aspects. The data collection instruments – survey questionnaires, interview and focus group discussion protocols – included specific questions aimed at collecting GEWE-related data. Gender-disaggregated smallholder farmer data collected was used to inform findings on these questions, for example an analysis of how women could be affected by the AflaSight technology differently than men. However, no specific gender-related unanticipated effects of the AflaSight project are presented in the main report and GEWE is not reflected in the evaluation recommendations.

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>