

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Mid Term Activity Evaluation of USDA Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Grant (LRP-442-2019-011-00) for WFP School Feeding in Cambodia	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 94%	
<p>The Mid-term Activity Evaluation of the USDA Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Grant (LRP-442-2019-011-00) for WFP School Feeding Programme in Cambodia is a skillfully crafted report that users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision making. The Executive Summary, while exceeding length requirements, presents a good overview of the evaluation purpose and scope, programme being evaluated, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The country context and description of the programme being evaluated are particularly well developed, and the methodology is described in detail, including adaptations necessitated by the arrival of Covid-19, and sufficiently robust to elicit meaningful findings. Findings are supported by ample, triangulated evidence; they present programme achievements, successes, challenges, and shortcomings in a balanced way. However, findings do not mention any unanticipated effects of the programme. The Annex 8 findings/conclusions/ recommendations mapping demonstrates clear linkages between all. The methodology, evaluation questions, findings, and recommendations contain a strong gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) focus, although there is no reference to persons with disability in the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The Executive Summary presents an excellent overview of the evaluation purpose and methodology, the programme being evaluated and the context in which it is being implemented. It describes the evaluation as one of three linked pieces of work: a baseline (2020), this mid-term (originally planned for 2021), and a planned endline assessment (2023). It summarizes the evaluation aim, timeframe, intended users, methodology, key findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. However, it exceeds word length limits, and the number of conclusions does not match the number in the main report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The country context is well developed, presents numerous relevant development statistics, and identifies multiple national policies that are relevant to WFP's work. The Country Office's relevant prior work is well described, and the programme being evaluated is presented in depth. The report included an overview of prior analytical work conducted prior to and during the elaboration of the LRP (and current McGovern-Dole) that informed the design, as well as the recommendations for adjustments to the programme implementation of the LRP baseline. The effects of Covid-19 on food production and nutrition status in Cambodia are well described. Gender and wider inclusion dimensions are addressed. While a budget for cash transfers is presented, it would have been helpful to present the budget details by year, as well as by activity. The Results Framework would have been strengthened by identifying the assumptions underpinning the causal links.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation purpose, objectives, and scope are well presented. The geographic scope of the programme is especially well developed. The rationale for this evaluation and its link to other pieces of work and their purposes are detailed. The main users and stakeholder are clearly identified. The report describes the ways in which the evaluation team brought a gender lens into the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory

The methodology, and necessary revisions to it that were caused by the appearance of Covid-19, are described in detail. The mixed methods, theory-based approach is appropriate for this evaluation, combining document review, analysis of secondary quantitative data, interviews with national and sub-national level stakeholders, observation, and focus group discussions. Limitations are well described and related mostly to limitations in the available data. The evaluation matrix is well developed forming the basis for all subsequent tools and methodologies. Two evaluation questions ensured that GEWE data would be collected and are addressed in the findings. The report includes a detailed evaluability assessment and a sophisticated understanding of monitoring data.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Findings are directly linked with evaluation questions and relevant OECD-DAC criteria, balanced, and well supported by triangulated evidence. Findings use visual tools to illustrate where outcomes were achieved or not fully met for the four key activity areas. Findings address gender balances in programme participation and inclusion and provide sex-disaggregated numbers where possible. However, findings make no mention of the inclusion or exclusion of persons with disabilities in the programme and do not explicitly identify any unanticipated effects of the intervention.

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

Conclusions relate directly to the findings reported and provide useful details, serving to strengthen the findings narrative. They reflect gender-related programme accomplishments. They do not contain any major gaps or omissions, or present new information not already included in the findings. Lessons learned, framed within the areas of Procedures, Programme Management, and Monitoring and Evaluation, seem highly useful for this programme. Conclusions are lengthy and could have focused more briefly on higher-level evaluative judgment based on the findings analysis.

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

The report offers seven recommendations, two of which are a repeat of baseline assessment recommendations not yet acted on. Recommendations are well developed and segue logically from the findings and conclusions. They are categorized as strategic or operational and of high or medium priority. They identify who is responsible for their being actioned and suggest timeframes for action. They are highly practical in offering both mid-point corrections and longer-term perspective for programme sustainability, reflecting the Cambodian development context and WFP constraints.

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

The report is well written and meets WFP structure, content and word length standards. It makes good use of visual aids, footnotes and other data sources, and signposting of relevant information. Lessons learned are usefully framed within three categories. Annexes are well developed.

### **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 evaluation takes a close look at monitoring data, which is described as having a strong gender focus, noting that the programme includes gender-disaggregated indicators. While the report indicates that the evaluation aims to assess progress with the inclusion of gender-disaggregated indicators for the programme and indicators in the evaluation matrix include "Evidence of gender perspective in programme documents", human rights considerations are not explicitly addressed in the evaluation objectives. The evaluation report describes multiple ways in which a focus on gender equality and women's empowerment is integrated into the evaluation design, data collection, and data analysis, although human rights considerations are not explicitly addressed in the evaluation objectives. The mixed methods approach strongly reflects gender issues related to programme access and participation and benefit, and two evaluation questions specifically address gender. The evaluation team made every effort to be gender inclusive and 58 percent of all persons interviewed were women. The evaluation addresses participation of women and men, and youth (students). The report detailed the evaluation team adherence to UNEG Ethical Standards and Norms throughout and noted that no children were interviewed alone as part of this evaluation. However, the findings do not explicitly identify any unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality. Two recommendations have a strong GEWE focus.

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.