

|   |   |                            |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>   | Joint Evaluation of the SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis Programme (2017-2022) |                            |
| <b>Evaluation category and type</b>   | Decentralized - Joint   |                            |
| <b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>  | Satisfactory: 71%   |                            |
| <p>The evaluation report for the Joint Evaluation of the SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis Programme (2017-2022) is well written and provides detailed findings that are credible and can be used with confidence for decision-making. The report provides a comprehensive overview of the rationale, objectives, scope, and methodology of the evaluation. Furthermore, findings are comprehensive in answering all evaluation questions, assessing WFP contribution to results, and in mentioning an unanticipated effect of the programme. Recommendations of the evaluation appear realistic and feasible, and provide adequate detail to be specific and actionable, and also cover GEWE issues. However, the report would have benefitted from the inclusion of budget information broken down by activities, as well as any cross-cutting intended results of the RVAA programme. Furthermore, the conclusions would have benefitted from being pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction, and going beyond a synthesis of the findings. The majority of the conclusions are shorter versions of the summaries of the findings of the evaluation found in the Executive Summary, with some conclusions containing the same content as that found in the Executive Summary. While the recommendations may have benefitted from more specificity in the labelling of timeframes for their implementation and clearer identification of lead entities, they should adequately inform decision-making on the RVAA programme and similar programming in the future.</p> |   |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Rating</b>   | <b>Partly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>While the summary covers most of the evaluation features (rationale, scope, stakeholders, intended users and methodology) and provides a clear overview of the key elements of learning in the main body of the report, a number of weaknesses were noted. These include overlooking some of the key evaluation findings or, conversely, introducing information that is not contained in the findings in the main report; incomplete information on the evaluation's objectives and the subject of the evaluation, beyond its overall goals and its three main components, as well as on the evaluation conclusions. Conclusions related to GEWE, equity and inclusion issues are not included in the summary. On the other hand, the summary would have benefitted from shortening and summarizing the recommendations, this would have contributed to reducing the length of the summary which significantly exceeds WFP's maximum word limit.</p>  |   |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Rating</b>   | <b>Partly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>The report provides a good overview of the regional context, with country illustrations where appropriate, supported by country-specific summaries in the annex. It includes comprehensive information on all relevant elements of the evaluand, including activities, thematic area, as well as geographic coverage, implementation period and main partners. The report also provides an informative overview of the phases of the RVAA programme, and key events that have occurred since 2006. While the logic of the intervention and the programmatic components are described comprehensively, in the form of intended activities, outputs and outcomes, the report would have benefitted from the inclusion of detailed budget information broken down by programme activity, and by funding source. The report would also have benefitted from the inclusion of any intended cross-cutting expected results of the RVAA programme, or a mention of the lack thereof. Gender, equity and wider inclusion issues are not discussed substantively in terms of how the RVAA project addresses them through its intended outcomes, outputs or assumptions (or through any intended cross-cutting results). An overview of trends in other international assistance and work in the region would have added value as well.</p>  |   |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Rating</b>   | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |

The report provides a comprehensive overview of the evaluation objectives, reflecting gender equality considerations (through an objective and a stand-alone evaluation question), as well as explaining the rationale and main users of the evaluation. However, it should have clearly mentioned the time period covered of the programme by the evaluation.

**CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY****Rating**

Satisfactory

The comprehensive evaluation methodology included relevant and diverse data collection and analysis methods, as well as primary and secondary data sources summarized in the report with complementary details provided in the annex. The evaluation matrix includes all sub-elements required and the evaluation sought to consult with several categories of stakeholders, including direct beneficiaries of the RVAA programme. Limitations and mitigation strategies, as well as ethical standards adhered to, are described in the report, although in one instance, confidentiality was not safeguarded. The report would have benefitted from the inclusion of an assessment of programme monitoring data which may have informed the choice of the methodology.

**CRITERION 5: FINDINGS****Rating**

Satisfactory

The report provides evidence to substantiate the majority of its findings, which include an assessment of WFP's contributions to the results and take into consideration the implementation context and other external factors. The use of the Institutionalization Index is a particularly interesting and useful data source for the report's findings. There are, however, some sub-sections in findings related to specific criteria, notably efficiency and impact, where the report would have benefitted from drawing upon additional sources of data, or clearly mentioning if triangulation of evidence was not possible. Moreover, the report would have benefitted from providing sex-disaggregated data when referencing the numbers of interviewees or survey respondents that the evaluation was able to consult.

**CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS****Rating**

Partly Satisfactory

While the conclusions logically flow from the findings, this is due to the similarity of content between findings and conclusions. The conclusions include GEWE-related aspects of the evaluation's findings and touch upon the programme's integration of considerations for other vulnerable populations, such as children and people with disabilities. The report includes several lessons learned, which are formulated in a manner that can serve to contribute to learning for WFP and its partners. However, the conclusions would have benefitted from being pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and going beyond a synthesis of the findings. The report would have benefitted from the inclusion of an annex mapping conclusions to findings and recommendations.

**CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS****Rating**

Satisfactory

The recommendations are logically derived from the findings and aligned with the evaluation's accountability and learning objectives. They sufficiently take into account the notion that the RVAA is a multi-country programme and are formulated in a manner in which they continue to be relevant and nuanced, such that they are broadly feasible for the programming moving forward. Furthermore, one recommendation explicitly addresses GEWE and broader equity and inclusion dimensions of the subject of evaluation. While specific and actionable, the recommendations would have benefitted from providing more detail on which specific teams or units within WFP should be the lead entity for a given recommendation or specify if a recommendation should be taken at country- or regional, or headquarters level, and phrasing of timeframes could have been enhanced by simply noting 'long-term' or 'medium-term' for greater specificity.

**CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY****Rating**

Satisfactory

The report uses clear and easily understood language that is precise and professional, while avoiding excessively complex or technical jargon. Furthermore, the report's use of a variety of diagrams, tables with quantitative and qualitative data, as well as charts, which combine quantitative data and colour coding, serves to add value. However, the report would have benefitted from including a findings, conclusions, recommendations mapping annex to complete the inclusion of all required annexes. Furthermore, the report is in excess of WFP's word limit.

**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**

**Approaches requirements: 6 points**

GEWE is reflected in an evaluation objective and standalone evaluation question. The sampling rationale aimed at ensuring adequate representation of women. However, the methodology section does not include an assessment of monitoring data, which could have informed the choice of methodology. There is mention of the attention paid to women's perspectives during the data analysis. While UNEG standards are mentioned, the report contains one reference to the name of an interviewee, attributing them to a quote. The report would have benefitted from safeguarding this person's confidentiality. The evaluation provides a specific recommendation that addresses GEWE issues. The report would have benefitted, however, from the description of any unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality, or the explicit mention of the lack thereof.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <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>  |