

Evaluation title	Evaluación intermedia del proyecto BOOST desde agosto 2018 hasta junio 2021 en Nicaragua en las zonas de Nueva Segovia, Madriz, Estelí, Matagalpa, Jinotega y la RACCN	
Evaluation category and type	DE-Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 91%	
<p>The Evaluation of the BOOST project in Nicaragua is of high quality and can be used with confidence by decision-makers. It uses a strong methodology that draws on a theory-based approach and mixed data collection methods. Multiple stakeholder groups were consulted, including WFP staff, implementing partners, donors, UN agencies, government representatives and community-based stakeholders. Although it is clear that the evaluation team consulted with multiple beneficiaries through focus group discussions (FGDs), it is unclear how many individuals were consulted in total, which points to a need to better describe data sources. Even so, the findings are supported by a strong evidence base, are for the most part adequately triangulated, and provide answers to all evaluation questions and sub-questions. Even though the findings are generally quite effective at presenting the nuanced perspectives of multiple stakeholder groups, women's voices and those of indigenous groups could have been conveyed more consistently. Nevertheless, gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) is generally well mainstreamed. Considered good practice, the conclusions are highly analytical and forward-looking. Similarly, lessons learned and recommendations are of good quality and can be used with confidence to improve similar programming in other contexts.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary, which meets WFP length requirements, provides a good summary of the evaluation features, context and evaluation subject. The summary also provides an accurate reflection of the conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. However, the findings are too brief and could have been further expanded. While well summarized, the conclusions could have been shortened to make more room for the findings.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report provides a good overview of the socio-economic situation and legislative framework in Nicaragua. While the report offers a complete description of international assistance to Nicaragua, it could have described in greater depth the political situation affecting the country since 2018. A reasonably good gender equality and intersectionality analysis is presented, but it is not supported by sex-disaggregated data nor does it discuss all types of vulnerabilities. This said, the report provides a good overview of the BOOST project and how it has evolved over time. Its objectives are clearly stated and the results chain is depicted through a reconstructed theory of change. However, the report does not clearly specify the project's budget. In addition, the gendered dimensions of the project are not adequately discussed.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly presents the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability, and explains why the evaluation was undertaken at this time. It also outlines the evaluation users and expected uses. Likewise, the temporal, geographic and programmatic scope are clearly outlined. While the evaluation objectives integrate gender equality, human rights are not referenced explicitly.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology clearly explains the evaluation design, data collection methods, sampling strategy, and ethical safeguards. It draws on a theory-based approach to assess the project's contribution to results. Having conducted 23 FGDs, the evaluation consulted several individuals from multiple stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries. However, the total number of evaluation participants is unclear. The evaluation framework is presented in a good quality evaluation matrix, which is organized around the evaluation questions/criteria and includes a series of indicators. The methodology</p>		

was informed by an evaluability assessment that considers the availability of sex-disaggregated data and is also gender-responsive. Lastly, limitations are clearly explained but not all propose a mitigation strategy.

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

The findings present a balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the BOOST project and address all evaluation (sub)-questions without bias. The findings draw on the reconstructed theory of change (ToC) as well as baseline and end-line data to demonstrate the project's contribution to results. Findings are supported by a strong evidence base and acknowledge where data gaps exist. For the most part, data is well triangulated and findings present the nuanced perspectives of different stakeholder groups. Although findings present a good gender and equity analysis overall, their robustness is lessened by the fact that the voices of vulnerable groups and women are not clearly presented. Finally, the findings discuss the implementation of recommendations from some but not all previous evaluations.

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

The conclusions logically flow from the findings and present a balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the BOOST project. The forward-looking conclusions are structured around themes and provide an in-depth analysis of the findings across evaluation criteria. The conclusions also integrate a good gender analysis and address equity issues. In addition, the evaluation proposes high-quality lessons learned that can be applied to improve programming in other similar contexts. Conclusions and lessons learned are considered good practice.

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

The recommendations are explicitly linked to their corresponding findings and conclusions. Recommendations are well targeted, prioritized, and include a timeline for action. Recommendations also adequately address gender equality and equity issues. They consider their implementation context and include enough detail to make them actionable, but specific actions would have been clearer had they been presented in the form of bullet points. Recommendations are few but exceed overall length requirements.

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

The report is well written, clearly structured, and easy to understand. Findings are summarized in a textbox, making it easy for the reader to understand key takeaways. The report also makes excellent use of visual aids to convey information concisely. The evaluation complies with length requirements and the annexes are complete. While data sources are identified throughout, the report could have been more effective at cross referencing information.

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

The evaluation integrates gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) in its objectives, includes a separate criterion on GEWE, and proposes a dedicated question and sub-questions on GEWE. Furthermore, the methodology provides an assessment of the availability of sex-disaggregated data at output and outcome levels, which informed the design of the data collection plan. The gender-responsive methodology uses mixed methods to gather the perceptions of multiple stakeholder groups. Similarly, the data collection tools are designed to gather data on GEWE. Furthermore, the ethical approach is adequately described, making reference to the principles of confidentiality and equitable participation of individuals. The findings include a good gender analysis and also discuss the unanticipated effects of the project on gender equality. However, the voices of women and vulnerable groups could have been presented more clearly in the findings. Even so, GEWE considerations are well integrated in the conclusions and recommendations.

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.