

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Asset Creation and Public Works Activities in Lesotho 2015-2019	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 93%	
<p>The Evaluation of Asset Creation and Public Works Activities in Lesotho 2015-2019 presents credible and useful findings that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The evaluation's rationale, objectives, scope, and methodology are clearly described. The findings are based on a wide variety of data collection methods and data sources, including documents, monitoring data, beneficiaries consulted via household survey and focus group discussions, and key informant interviews. The report also includes photos of assets created through WFP's interventions, which serve as a useful visual aid and complement to the narrative. Recommendations are clearly and logically derived from the evaluation findings, prioritized, specific, realistic, and actionable. Overall, the report is clear and accessible to the reader, as it uses easily understood language, with key messages highlighted for the reader. Gender equality and wider inclusion dimensions, including disability inclusion, are well-integrated. Overall, while the evaluation's conclusions are comprehensive and flow from the findings, many of them would have benefitted from being pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction than the findings. Conclusions also do not reflect findings related to the efficiency and impact of the intervention which would have been appropriate.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary includes information on the evaluation type, features (rationale, objectives, scope, stakeholders and intended users, methodology), the context and overview of the evaluation subject. It also provides an overall succinct yet comprehensive overview of all evaluation findings and includes a comprehensive summary of lessons learned and the evaluation's recommendations. As such, it serves as an effective stand-alone document. However, the summary of the conclusions is contained in one paragraph and would have benefitted from more content to better capture some of the main points raised in the conclusions in the main body of the report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a comprehensive description of the subject of the evaluation. It includes a concise summary of existing analytical work conducted by the Country Office that informed the design of the FFA interventions, a comprehensive overview of the relevant interventions, and description of the gender and inclusion dimensions of the subject, as well as the evolution over time of WFP's FFA interventions in Lesotho. The evaluation's reconstructed theory of change is of particular value in that it aims at visualizing pathways to change for all three groups of interventions, as well as the pilot project for technical assistance in relation to beneficiary targeting. However, the report would have benefitted from including information on planned vs actual transfers, in terms of tonnage of food or cash amounts. Moreover, the context would have been enhanced with the inclusion of additional specific required data, such as the IPC map, data on wasting, data on agriculture (e.g., percentage agriculture of GDP and smallholder farmer productivity) and data on education (i.e., literacy rates, primary and secondary school enrolment by sex and percentage of population with at least secondary education), as well as data on ODA inflows to Lesotho over time.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation purpose, objectives, and main intended users are clearly described in the report. The scope of the evaluation is defined in terms of geographic coverage, time period and activities covered but would have benefitted from clearly mentioning the target groups covered as well.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology is described in detail, including the data analysis methods, especially cost-benefit analysis and contribution analysis, data cleaning and quality assurance measures. The report provides a clear sampling rationale, including a diverse range of stakeholders. It also includes a useful step-by-step description of the evaluation's use of contribution analysis and cost-benefit analysis. There are no notable weaknesses in the methodology described in the report.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the report's findings are evidence-based and transparently and impartially presented without bias, in a balanced manner. They address all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The report consistently cites sources of data that were used as evidence upon which the findings were based. The report's findings also include an analysis of WFP's contributions to observed effects, including positive and negative unintended effects, although it does not mention any unintended effects in relation to human rights and gender equality, or the lack thereof.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report's conclusions are balanced and reflect both negative and positive findings. The conclusions draw upon evidence from all findings in the report and are categorized according to the evaluation criteria. They also reflect gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE)-related aspects of the evaluation. Lessons for vulnerability targeting and livelihoods programming are formulated to signify their wider relevance, yet also identify the specific conditions/situation under which they are valid. However, while some of the conclusions discuss the implication of findings for the future, many of them serve more as a comprehensive synthesis, or summary, of the evaluation's findings, and would have benefitted from being pitched at a more strategic level that could be useful for accountability and strategic decision-making.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are grouped according to criteria and are clearly derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are realistic and take WFP's implementation context into account. They are also sufficiently specific and actionable. All recommendations indicate a level of priority, timeframe for action, and are associated with lead and contributing entities both in and outside of WFP. The report also includes a recommendation that addresses GEWE and the inclusion of vulnerable groups.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written overall and uses easily understood, precise and professional language. When data or quotes are referenced, the report consistently notes the source of information, either through citing the document referenced, or noting the stakeholder group of the informant, their gender, and in the case of FGD feedback, the geographic area. The report's use of visual aids, in particular its use of photos, strengthens the reader's appreciation and understanding of the evaluation findings. The bolding of introductory sentences for paragraphs in the report's findings also serves to enhance of readability, and to distil the main points of the findings for each sub-question. However, the report would have benefitted from listing the annexes in the order that they are referenced in the main report.</p>		

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
<p>GEWE is integrated in the evaluation's scope of analysis, through a specific evaluation objective and in the evaluation questions. The evaluation's methodology was gender responsive overall. Data collection and analysis methods specify how gender issues were to be addressed, and how evaluation methods were employed to ensure inclusion of a diversity of stakeholders. Data analysis paid particular attention to gender-related and other socio-economic vulnerabilities, with a focus on highlighting gaps or differences that affected specific population groups. The report's findings specify the gender and geographic area of beneficiaries when citing their feedback, and recommendations address GEWE and wider inclusion issues. The report, however, would have benefitted from the inclusion of any unintended effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality, or an explicit mention of the lack thereof.</p>	

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.