

<b>Evaluation title</b>	WFP Contribution to Market Development and Food Systems in Southern Africa: A Thematic Evaluation	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized – Thematic Evaluation	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 80%	
<p>The Thematic Evaluation of WFP Contributions to Market Development and Food Systems in Southern Africa constitutes a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on to provide quality and credible evaluation findings and can use it with confidence for decision-making. It concisely summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale, and methodology, and presents information on the context and evaluation subject. The chosen theory-based mixed methods approach was appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. It utilized the Qualitative Impact Protocol (QuiP) methodology to collect impact-level data, and effectively used the reconstructed theory of change developed by the evaluation team. The report presents clearly formulated findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions and supports these with evidence from primary and secondary sources. It formulates conclusions and lessons and makes ten recommendations. However, some of the conclusions are not pitched at a sufficiently high and strategic level. While most of the recommendations are realistic, targeted and actionable, some of them lack specificity. Readability of the long report would have benefited from keeping within the prescribed word limit, for example by using tables to condense and compare information. The evaluation mainstreamed gender equality, equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The summary presents key information on the evaluation type and features, and accurately reflects all the evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons, and recommendations. It is more than twice the recommended length and would have benefited from synthesizing information rather than copying elements from the main report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation provides an overview of the regional context and presents key features of the subject of the evaluation, including a reconstructed theory of change. Additional information on the evaluation subject is provided in the findings section and in annexes. The report would have benefited from: (i) including a brief summary of contextual features from the reviewed countries in the main report; (ii) commenting on the roles played by actors other than small- and medium-sized enterprises with regard to food systems and market functionality; (iii) presenting the subject of the evaluation in a more coherent way, e.g., by moving related content from the findings chapter to the section on the evaluation subject.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly describes the evaluation objectives, rationale, and the main users and stakeholders of the evaluation, as well as its geographic and thematic scope. While not included as a standalone objective, gender and human rights (inclusion and equity) were mainstreamed into the other evaluation objectives.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The theory-based mixed methods approach, which drew upon a variety of data collection methods, data sources, and methods of data analysis, was appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. Using QuiP for parts of data collection reflected the laudable intent to minimize confirmation bias related to potential WFP contributions to results. It is not clear, though, to what extent the benefits of QuiP outweighed the challenges that this choice implied, e.g., in relation to transparently informing respondents about the purpose of interviews. Gender equality was effectively mainstreamed into data collection and analysis, and the report includes a detailed evaluation matrix, notes limitations and some mitigation strategies applied, and explicitly comments on ethical standards considered. The section on limitations could have been strengthened by clearly articulating the effects of noted limitations on the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory

The evaluation addresses all the evaluation questions. Evidence is generally presented transparently and clearly, providing sources for all presented data, and using a neutral tone. The report discusses WFP contributions to results, mentions unanticipated effects of WFP's work, positive and negative, and reflects the voices of diverse stakeholder groups from inside and outside of WFP. The section on impact would have benefited from drawing more clearly upon more diverse primary and secondary data sources beyond consultations with retailers. Moreover, the report could have been further strengthened by commenting on implications for gender and human rights deriving from unanticipated effects of WFP's work and by - at least occasionally - providing evidence disaggregated by sex.

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

The conclusions are balanced in that they present both strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject and reflect all of the evaluation findings. They clearly and explicitly reflect GEWE-related and wider equity and inclusion dimensions and formulate lessons to contribute to wider organizational learning in WFP. However, the conclusions could have been strengthened by formulating broader, strategically focused statements cutting across findings, rather than summarizing individual findings. In one case, the conclusions introduce information that had not been presented as clearly in the findings. The lessons would have benefited from being limited to practical issues clearly grounded in the concrete experience covered by the evaluation rather than including statements that read more like hypotheses.

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

The report makes a limited number of recommendations (10) that are clearly and, for the most part, logically derived from the findings. The recommendations are prioritized and have a clear timeframe for action, and most of them are realistic and targeted. One of the recommendations focuses on GEWE and wider equity and inclusion issues. The recommendations vary in the extent to which they are specific and actionable. While labelled 'sub-recommendations', several points listed under the main recommendations do not actually constitute separate sub-tasks but merely provide a justification for the main recommendation. The recommendations are longer than the suggested word limit.

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

The report uses clear, understandable and professional language and follows the WFP template. It provides sources for all presented data and quotes, includes internal references to information that can be found in other parts of the report, and visually highlights key messages and examples through the use of bold font and textboxes. The report includes all the required annexes. However, the report is considerably longer than the recommended 30,000 words, and its readability could have been improved by omitting or moving lengthy descriptive elements to annexes, and by placing stronger emphasis on synthesizing key findings across countries. The report would also have benefited from including more tables or figures focused on summarizing and depicting insights across the reviewed countries, and using figures illustrating causal links identified through the QulP methodology more sparingly and accompanied by narrative explanations in order for these illustrations to add value.

**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>	<b>Meets requirements: 7 points</b>
--	-------------------------------------

GEWE considerations are very well integrated into the report. The chosen mixed-method approach was based on deliberate considerations on how to effectively integrate GEWE. While none of the evaluation questions or sub-questions explicitly address GEWE, gender dimensions are effectively mainstreamed through indicators for several questions. The evaluation drew upon a variety of data sources and processes, thereby facilitating inclusion, accuracy and credibility. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholders treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. However, the report would have benefited from providing at least some data disaggregated by sex and could have discussed the implications of unanticipated effects of WFP's market development activities on human rights and gender equality.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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.