

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación final del Proyecto School Feeding Response Activity (2019 -2021) Colombia	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>The Evaluación final del Proyecto School Feeding Response Activity (2019 -2021) Colombia is overall a high-quality report. 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 provides an informative description of the national context, which offers a balance between useful general information and specific detail. The information presented is particularly geared towards informing on the target population of the intervention. However, further information on education, health, agriculture and rural development could have been included and the report could have benefited from providing a description of the Country Office's (CO) analytical work that was used to inform the design of the intervention. The evaluation rationale, specific objectives, and scope are clearly described. A sound evaluation framework and methodology were used, including five evaluation questions that guided the evaluation, and gender equality, human rights and equity were mainstreamed throughout the evaluation process, as reflected in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Evaluation findings are substantiated by qualitative and quantitative evidence drawn from a wide range of clearly and consistently cited sources. The report demonstrates balance when discussing the strengths, as well as areas for improvement of the intervention. However, Colombia's main socio-economic trends and indicators could have been better addressed in the context and sub-questions should have been explicitly mentioned in order to ensure that all of them were clearly and satisfactorily answered. Conclusions address both the intervention's strengths and challenges and identify the future implications of the evaluation findings. Recommendations are actionable, feasible and clearly indicate relevant stakeholders for their implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary provides a balanced account of the most important elements of the subject of the evaluation and the evaluation itself. It presents a brief version of the key findings of the evaluation, which are summarized by evaluation criteria. Findings are expressed with clarity and there are specific findings on humanitarian principles, gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE)-related issues and equity and wider inclusion issues are also discussed. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations are also summarized and expressed in a way that can inform decision-making. Conversely, contextual information, such as Colombia's main socio-economic trends and indicators, could have been better addressed. Also, GEWE-related issues could have been further included in the conclusions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides an informative description of the national context and the information presented is particularly geared towards describing the target population of the project. The overview discusses the project, including its objectives and three thematic areas, and the modalities of the intervention are listed per thematic area. The overview section provides a description of the evolution of the project and an excellent overview of the country's standing as both a recipient of official development assistance (ODA) and a provider of South-South cooperation and triangulation. The evaluation could have discussed in further detail important country information on education, health, agriculture and rural development and could have benefited from providing a description of the CO's analytical work that was used to inform the design of the object of the evaluation, i.e., previous evaluations, studies, etc. The overview should have explicitly addressed cross-cutting priorities, and the ways in which the project mainstreamed an inclusion approach could have been outlined beyond the general description of the beneficiaries of the initiative which is by design inclusive. The report could have been strengthened by including a clearer description of the different result levels such as outputs, outcomes and cross-cutting results. Finally, the ER could have mentioned voluntary national reviews (VNR) produced in Colombia.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The report provides a clear and thorough account of the evaluation rationale, its specific objectives, as well as its scope in chronological, thematic, and geographic terms. It also describes the specific objective to extract lessons to improve the human rights and gender equality approach to be used during the implementation of activities, and dedicates a specific evaluation criterion on protection, gender, human rights and equity.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
A relevant methodological design was used supported by an evaluability analysis, which assessed the availability and quality of monitoring data. The evaluation criteria are duly listed, and the report explains that given the modifications to the Results Framework, the objectives set out in the ToR were disaggregated and slightly modified. The methodological design of the evaluation was described as well as the sampling frame, and gender considerations were included in each collection method. The report describes in detail the triangulation and validation processes through which quantitative and qualitative data were drawn from different sources to answer the evaluation questions. Methodological limitations are clearly listed along with mitigation strategies. The report mentions that the evaluation complied with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines. On the other hand, the report could have been strengthened by better outlining who the most vulnerable groups were and how they were considered in the methodology.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
Evaluation findings are supported by both qualitative and quantitative evidence, which is explicitly drawn from a wide range of well cited sources. The report demonstrates balance when discussing the strengths, as well as areas for improvement of the project. The evaluation findings effectively articulate the link between activities/outputs and the contributions made towards outcome-level results. On the other hand, the report did not satisfactorily answer some sub-questions, such as one on unanticipated negative or positive effects of the intervention.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
Conclusions are pitched at a higher level than the findings and address both the project's strengths and areas for improvement while identifying the future implications of the findings for the intervention. Conclusions address GEWE-related aspects. All but one lesson learned reflect what wider relevance they might have in other contexts.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
Recommendations are aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives, i.e., learning and accountability. They are clearly substantiated and based on the evidence presented across findings as well as on information presented in the conclusions. Recommendations are realistic and feasible and consider the implementation context, as well as potential limitations. They are internally consistent and address GEWE and wider inclusion issues.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The report observes the WFP template for this type of report and includes all of the required lists. The evaluation report uses language that is professional and grammatically correct and the information contained in the report is presented in a factual way and free of bias. There is good use of tables and figures to complement the narrative. The report is quite effective at consistently providing a range of sources for the evidence presented. Most of the mandatory annexes, except the ToR, are included. On the other hand, the report should have remained within WFP requirements on length.		

### 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>	Meets requirements: 7 points
The report notes the absence of a clear gender analysis during the design of the intervention, with gender not clearly mainstreamed in the activities, the expected results or performance indicators. Therefore, limited information on GEWE was available prior to evaluation data collection. A specific criterion with specific questions relating to gender were included in the evaluation. The report describes in detail the triangulation and validation processes through which quantitative and qualitative data were collated and disaggregated, where possible, by location and gender, among other	

characteristics. The report also states that the triangulation process ensured that the voices of men, women, boys, and girls were heard but could have better defined the most vulnerable groups and how their voices were captured. Finally, recommendations address GEWE issues and clear guidelines are provided for WFP to strengthen its programming in this regard.

**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>