

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Thematic Evaluation of Supply Chain Outcomes in the Food System in Eastern Africa from 2016 to 2021	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized – Thematic	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 93%	
<p>The Thematic Evaluation of Supply Chain Outcomes in the Food System in Eastern Africa from 2016 to 2021 is a well written report whose credible and useful findings evaluation users can rely on and use with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report clearly describes the context for this regional evaluation, which clearly ties the evaluation subject to the regional context, both externally and internally, in terms of WFP's operations and commitments. A compelling overview of food and nutrition insecurity in East Africa is presented, describing changes in the external environment that include growing numbers of displaced persons and refugees, climate shocks, Covid-19, and fluctuations across countries in food surpluses and deficits. The evaluation report clearly defines the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. Gender and equity issues are integrated in evaluation questions and tools. Data is disaggregated by gender wherever possible, and outcomes were assessed in terms of gender differences. The report makes skillful use of the outcome harvesting methodology, presents findings by key thematic areas, and distills complex data into succinct, overarching conclusions and recommendations. Recommendations include steps for actioning that will be useful to report users. The report makes good use of visual tables, figures, and boxes.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The Executive Summary is a useful summation of the detailed report and describes evaluation type, time period covered, timeline for the evaluation, rationale, objective, primary users, geographic scope, context and overview of the subject of the evaluation, and methodology. Key evaluation findings are succinctly summarized with key thematic areas bolded. Five conclusions summarize findings, and five recommendations segue logically from the conclusions. The Executive Summary only slightly exceeds WFP word length requirements.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's report context/overview section skillfully describes the context for this regional evaluation. The information presented clearly ties the evaluation subject to the regional context, both externally and internally, in terms of WFP's operations and commitments. The report also strongly addresses gender dimensions relevant to the evaluation subject. The overview presents a compelling overview of food and nutrition insecurity in East Africa and describes changes in the external environment that include growing numbers of displaced persons and refugees, climate shocks, Covid-19, and fluctuations across countries in food surpluses and deficits. The overview further notes that due to funding constraints, WFP has been forced to implement ration cuts for refugees in many countries in the region.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report clearly defines the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. The evaluation's objectives include the aim to differentiate effects according to gender or other groups when appropriate, and thereby to make recommendations to improve future interventions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The choice of outcome harvesting methodology enabled presentation of the findings by key thematic areas, which was a useful strategy for an evaluation with such a broad scope. Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) issues are strongly represented in the methodology. The evaluation focuses on relevance, results, sustainability, and factors affecting outcomes. The evaluation matrix is well formed and includes criteria, questions and sub-questions, indicators, data sources, data collection and analysis methods, and assumptions. GEWE issues are strongly represented in the methodology. Four methodological limitations and mitigation strategies are clearly described.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
Findings are based on the evaluation's use of outcome harvesting through which a limited number of thematic areas were identified where supply chain interventions had clearly resulted in food system outcomes. The use of thematic areas for the evaluation report's findings provides a useful structure for presenting a wide breadth of evidence from multiple countries. The findings present the strengths and challenges of the intervention in a balanced way and identify areas where evidence is inconclusive. Findings give strong attention to important GEWE issues within the evaluation's scope. The report would have benefited from the identification of any unanticipated effects of the intervention.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The report's conclusions distill multiple, detailed findings into higher level summaries from which recommendations can be developed. Conclusions flow logically from findings and represent the array of findings details well. They do not present additional information not already contained in the findings. They align well with findings, are articulated in a way that supports their use for strategic decision making, and lead toward aligned recommendations. Conclusions address GEWE-related aspects within the thematic areas of Knowledge Sharing and Collaboration, Data Collection and Analysis.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
Recommendations accurately represent the report's findings and conclusions, are internally consistent, and contain specific steps to enable evaluation report users to successfully incorporate them into planning and operations. Recommendations align with the report's thematic areas of focus and identify responsible actors and other contributing entities. Recommendations seem realistic and feasible and reflect WFP's operational context.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The report is well written and formatted and includes all components in WFP report templates. The use of key thematic areas and sub-headings through the Findings section enables readers to absorb complex evidence in a focused manner. Text boxes highlight details within findings that reach across multiple countries. Recommendations are placed within a table that helps the reader to see the 'whole picture' of overarching recommendations and suggested steps to action each.		

### **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

The context strongly addresses gender dimensions relevant to the evaluation subject and highlights the fact that gender equality and equity, human rights, and wider inclusion are major challenges across the region addressed by this evaluation and that, in the 2019 Human Development Index (HDI), the nine countries covered by the evaluation all ranked in the lower half of the Gender Inequality Index. The report emphasizes that as established entrepreneurs, African women are active at about 85% of the level of men, and that these average figures suggest a level of gender equity that is not actually reflected within regional food systems. It indicates that although small food retail outlets are largely dominated by women, this does not reflect their empowerment but rather the fact that the capital investment in small retail is minimal, so that the occupation is one of the few that women with limited finance can access. The report acknowledges varying progress in gender, disability and inclusion in the region and the lack of a coherent regional policy approach. The evaluation's objectives and questions reflect both a gender and vulnerability focus. The report focuses on women's inclusion across the supply chain, especially in larger commercial enterprises. Gender and equity issues are integrated in evaluation questions and tools. Key informants were selected to ensure a gender balance. Data is disaggregated by gender wherever possible, and outcomes were assessed in terms of gender differences. Report findings and recommendations provide sufficient detail to enable the Regional Bureau for Eastern Arica to take focused action to address identified gender inequities.

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.