

Evaluation title	Évaluation thématique des activités de renforcement des capacités institutionnelles en Guinée - juillet 2019 à juin 2021	
Evaluation category and type	DE-Thematic	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 74%	
<p>Overall, this is a good quality evaluation report whose findings and recommendations can be used by decision-makers with confidence. The evaluation is grounded in a strong methodological design that draws on a mixed-methods approach to collect the perceptions of a wide range of stakeholders, including multiple partners and beneficiaries in several localities in Guinea. Overall, nearly 500 individuals were consulted, which is significant. Cognizant of the lack of internal monitoring data to assess WFP's contribution to country capacity strengthening (CCS), the evaluation used a reconstructed TOC (which drew on elements of WFP's CCS framework) to guide the evaluation. The findings provide answers to nearly all evaluation questions and sub-questions, which are for the most part substantiated by a strong evidence base. However, even though an evaluation question inquires about the application of humanitarian principles, this is not discussed in the findings. The evaluation presents a good gender and equity analysis, although the overview of the subject of the evaluation does not clearly explain the gendered and equity dimensions of WFP's country capacity strengthening work in Guinea. Furthermore, while the voices of women and men are clearly presented, those of particularly vulnerable groups are not conveyed as clearly. Finally, the evaluation presents good lessons learned and recommendations; however, its conclusions could have been improved by making them more concise.</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, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. However, the executive summary surpasses WFP maximum length requirements by more than 10%.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of the county context in Guinea, presents basic statistics by sector, and discusses relevant national policies and strategies. It also presents a succinct overview of international development assistance in the country. Even though some elements of the intersectional analysis could have been presented in more depth, the context offers a reasonably good gender analysis supported by sex-disaggregated data. The report also presents a comprehensive picture of the evaluation subject, which consists of WFP's country capacity strengthening (CCS) activities in Guinea. The report uses a reconstructed theory of change to depict clearly the results chain linking CCS outputs to outcomes, which is particularly helpful considering that WFP's CCS work is not adequately captured in the CP logframe. However, the description of the evaluation subject presents some gaps. The gendered and equity dimensions of WFP's CCS work in Guinea are not well defined. The report could have described WFP's partners more comprehensively, perhaps through a detailed stakeholder analysis in annex, even though this annex is not mandatory.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report outlines the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning, which also include gender equality considerations. The objectives, however, do not consider human rights issues. The report explains the rationale for undertaking the evaluation at this point in time and also includes a description of its users. While the chronological and programmatic scope of the evaluation is clearly outlined, the geographic scope could have been better explained.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the evaluation is grounded in a sound methodology that draws on a theory-based approach and the Kirkpatrick model to assess WFP's contribution to country capacity strengthening in Guinea. The data collection sources, sampling strategy, data analysis methods as well as limitations and corresponding mitigation strategies are well outlined. The methodology used mixed methods to collect data from multiple stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, government,</p>		

CSO, and UN partners as well as WFP staff. However, it is unclear the extent to which vulnerable groups were consulted. Overall, the methodology is gender responsive but the exact issues to be explored through the gender analysis could have been presented in more depth. The evaluation criteria and (sub)questions are organized in an evaluation matrix; however, some indicators in the matrix do not provide a comprehensive measure for their corresponding (sub)question. Finally, ethical safeguards are only very briefly discussed and lack clear protocols to ensure the safety of participants in data collection.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Findings present a balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme and address nearly all evaluation questions – with the exception of two sub-questions. Even so, findings are generally supported by strong evidence. They also present the nuanced perspectives of multiple stakeholder groups, including women, but the voices of vulnerable groups are not strongly conveyed. Findings draw on the reconstructed TOC and WFP's own CCS framework to demonstrate contributions to capacity strengthening, which is helpful given the lack of monitoring data on CCS activities. Findings integrate a gender and equity analysis and also discuss unintended results (though unintended results on gender equality are not presented). However, findings do not discuss the implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations and do not address humanitarian principles which are relevant in the Guinean context.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

Conclusions logically flow from the findings and discuss their implications on the future of WFP's CCS work in Guinea. While the conclusions are an accurate summary of the findings, they do not provide an analysis that goes beyond the findings and that spans across evaluation criteria. In addition, the conclusions include new information presented in large tables, which makes this section very lengthy. This said, the conclusions present a good gender analysis. However, other equity dimensions are not adequately addressed. While the overall quality of conclusions is weak, the evaluation offers insightful lessons learned that can be used to improve similar programming in broader contexts.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The recommendations logically derive from the findings and propose concrete actions to improve WFP's CCS work in Guinea, taking into consideration WFP's dual humanitarian/development mandate and the different roles of the regional and country offices. Recommendations are targeted at specific users and include a clear timeline for action. However, all recommendations are prioritized as 'high', making the prioritization process less useful. Finally, recommendations adequately address gender equality but not equity per se.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The evaluation report is well written, logically structured, and uses professional language that can easily be understood. Data are properly sourced throughout but the report makes little use of signposting to cross-reference information. The evaluation could also have made greater use of visual aids and summary finding statements to convey key information. As for the annexes, they are mostly complete with the exception of the 'mapping of findings-conclusions-recommendations', which is missing. Finally, both the main report and annexes comply with WFP length requirements.

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
--	------------------------------

GEWE considerations are adequately integrated into the report. GEWE is integrated into the evaluation objectives. Although there is no standalone criterion on GEWE, it is mainstreamed across evaluation criteria and includes several sub-questions addressing GEWE. The methodology is also informed by an analysis of data availability to assess gender. Overall, the methodology is gender-responsive and was designed to collect sex-disaggregated data (notably through gender-specific FGDs). However, the methodology could have further detailed the gender aspects to be examined by the evaluation. It is also not clear if and how vulnerable groups were considered in the sampling. Finally, the context includes a reasonably good gender and intersectional analysis. Similarly, findings and recommendations adequately address gender equality issues. However, the findings do not discuss unintended results on gender equality.

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>