The Evaluation of the Joint Programme on Accelerating Progress towards the Economic Empowerment of Rural Women (JE RWEE) presents credible and useful evaluation findings, which can be used with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The evaluation is grounded in a strong methodological design that draws on a mixed-methods approach to gather the views of multiple groups of stakeholders globally and in-country. The methodology adopted adequate approaches to assess the JP RWEE's contribution to outcomes and test the validity of its impact pathways. The findings provide answers to all evaluation questions and sub-questions. Data are adequately triangulated and provide a strong evidence base to substantiate the findings. A good overview of the context and programme description also helps the reader to contextualize the findings. Conclusions are insightful and position the reader for the recommendations, which are of good quality and respond to the evaluation purpose of informing a second phase of the JP RWEE. Although the evaluation does not use a gender equality framework, it is gender-responsive in that it explores not only the extent to which the programme addressed specific gender needs but also adopted gender transformative approaches. However, the evaluation could have integrated more strongly other dimensions of equity and could have better conveyed the voices of vulnerable groups.

**CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY**

The summary presents information on the evaluation type, features, context, and evaluation subject. Findings for each of the six main evaluation questions are clearly summarized. However, the conclusions are missing from the executive summary. In addition, the information could have been presented more concisely as the overall length of the summary is over twice WFP maximum length requirements. Recommendations are presented as is without being summarized, contributing to the excess length of the summary.

**CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT**

The report presents a good overview of the country context in the seven JP RWEE countries. In doing so, it discusses gender inequalities affecting women's productivity in agriculture and also presents relevant legal frameworks. Furthermore, the report provides a comprehensive description of the evaluation subject and clearly depicts the results chain and assumptions underpinning the programme's logic. However, although the report clearly explains the gendered dimensions of the JP, it could have described in greater detail its equity dimensions. In addition, the report does not provide a clear picture of the JP RWEE over time. Likewise, key features of international development assistance in JP RWEE countries are not presented.

**CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE**

The report clearly outlines the dual evaluation objectives of learning and accountability and explains the rationale for why the evaluation took place when it did. The evaluation objectives also explicitly integrate GEWE considerations. The report identifies the primary users at global and national level and explains how these intend to use the evaluation. Finally, it outlines the timeline covered by the evaluation, as well as its geographic and programmatic scope.
The methodology describes the evaluation design, which relied on a theory-based approach combined with change mapping and life stories to assess the JP RWEE's contribution to outcomes. It also outlines the data collection methods, data sources, sampling approach, and data analysis methods. The limitations and mitigation strategies, as well as ethical considerations, are also addressed. Informed by an assessment of the M&E system, the methodology is gender-responsive. However, the methodology could have used a gender analytical framework to inform the gender analysis. Similarly, the methodology could have explained more clearly how it ensured the inclusion of vulnerable groups in data collection.

**CRITERION 5: FINDINGS**

The findings address all evaluation questions and are presented without bias, effectively outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the joint programme in a balanced way. Findings are supported by robust evidence and data sources are consistently referenced, which makes it easy for the reader to understand how data was triangulated. Data gaps are also identified throughout. The findings are also effective at discussing the JP RWEE's contribution to outcomes and gender equality results using monitoring data and change stories from consulted beneficiaries and unexpected results are also discussed. The evaluation is strong at presenting the perspectives of different groups of stakeholders and the voices of women and men are equally heard. However, the perspectives of vulnerable groups are not clearly presented, and the findings do not discuss the implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations.

**CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS**

The conclusions derive from the findings, presenting the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme, and provide a forward-looking analysis of the implications of the findings for the second phase of the programme. However, the conclusions could have been more analytical had they connected findings across different evaluation criteria. The conclusions reflect on GEWE considerations and men's inclusion but do not fully address equity issues by examining different types of vulnerability among women. Finally, the report includes lessons learned that are of good quality and can be applied to improve programming in wider contexts.

**CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS**

All recommendations, logically derive from the findings and conclusions, are prioritized and include a clear timeline for action. They are well targeted, seem feasible within the context of a second phase, and include enough detail to guide their implementation. In addition, the recommendations adequately address GEWE by proposing actions for gender-transformative approaches and men and boy's engagement, but they do not adequately address issues of equity.

**CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY**

The evaluation report is well written, logically structured, and uses professional language that can easily be understood. Data sources are consistently referenced with adequate signposting throughout. The report effectively uses visual aids and includes findings statements to convey the main messages in a concise manner. The annexes, while complete, exceed the maximum word limit. Similarly, the length of the evaluation report slightly exceeds WFP maximum 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: 8 points

GEWE considerations are integrated in the evaluation objectives and firmly embedded in the evaluation scope. The methodology is gender-responsive and evaluation questions consider multiple aspects of GEWE, including gender-transformative approaches. The methodology also discusses data gaps to inform the gender analysis. The methodology employs a mixed-methods approach, ensuring the inclusion of women and men in data collection but it is unclear the extent to which vulnerable groups were consulted. The evaluation findings strongly integrate GEWE dimensions, including the programme's contribution to women's rural economic empowerment but does not adequately address other equity issues. Lastly, recommendations fully address GEWE by proposing recommendations on gender-transformative approaches and men's and boys' engagement.
## Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Level</th>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</td>
<td>There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partly Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory</strong></td>
<td>There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>