

Evaluation title	Midterm Activity Evaluation of the KOICA supported Home-Grown School Feeding Programme in Cambodia in Kampong Thom, Kampong Chhnang and Pursat Provinces 1st January 2020 – 31st October 2024	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>The Midterm Activity Evaluation of the KOICA supported Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSFP) in Cambodia in Kampong Thom, Kampong Chhnang and Pursat Provinces 1st January 2020 – 31st October 2024 provides credible findings that evaluation users can rely on and use with confidence for decision-making. The report is well written and consistent with WFP template for decentralized evaluations. It presents a good overview of Cambodia's national context as well as the KOICA-funded HGSFP. A sound methodology is applied, combining different methods of data collection and analysis, and methodological limitations are discussed along with mitigation strategies. The findings are presented in an impartial manner and provide a good performance assessment of the HGSFP, with supporting evidence from multiple sources. Conclusions draw on the findings and do not introduce any information that has not already been presented and discussed in the findings section. Recommendations appear realistic and actionable; they are well targeted, categorized into operational and strategic recommendations, and include the specific timeframe for implementation. The report does not consistently refer to specific groups, such as women, when describing their experience vis-à-vis the HGSFP, which would have been useful. Additionally, the report could have assessed the unanticipated positive or negative effects of the programme, including on human rights and gender equality. The conclusions do not consistently identify future implications of the findings. The recommendations could have clearly reflected Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE)-related aspects, as well as broader equity and inclusion issues.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary includes the main evaluation features and summarizes well the key findings around five evaluation criteria, covering all the evaluation questions. Conclusions and recommendations are also generally well summarized. However, the summary could have been improved by showing the logical linkages between the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations, and by framing some of the lessons learned in a manner that they show broader applicability to other contexts.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>A good overview of Cambodia's national context is provided, emphasizing relevant government policies and programmes developed to end hunger in the country. An excellent overview of the KOICA-funded HGSFP is included, with a comprehensive theory of change and results framework. The report clearly discusses how gender, equity and inclusion have been considered in the design and implementation of the HGSFP, as well as how the HGSFP is transitioning to national ownership. The background section of the report could have been improved by discussing how specific social groups other than women are affected by the issue/intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives (learning and accountability), aim, key users and stakeholders are clearly defined in the report. The temporal, geographical and programmatic scope of the evaluation is clearly outlined and described. While GEWE dimensions are mainstreamed in the evaluation framework, human rights considerations are not explicitly integrated.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory

<p>The approach and varied methods (of data collection and analysis) used for this evaluation were appropriate to ensure unbiased answers to evaluation questions. Evaluation criteria and questions are clearly outlined, including a detailed evaluation matrix (Annex 4) and questions that make direct references to GEWE issues. The sampling strategy is clearly described. The report discusses methodological limitations and related mitigation strategies. The methodology could have been improved by informing whether – during the KOICA-funded HGSFP implementation period – sufficient information was collected on specific results indicators so as to measure progress on human rights and broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Findings provide answers to all evaluation questions and are presented in an impartial manner, emphasizing the strengths and weaknesses of the HGSFP. The report presents evidence from multiple sources of data to support findings on each evaluation question and assesses the factors influencing the achievement of results or not. Findings refer to how recommendations from previous evaluations informed the design and implementation of the HGSFP. Although the report generally indicates the sources corresponding to the stakeholder groups that were consulted, it does not consistently refer to specific groups, such as women, when describing their experience vis-à-vis the HGSFP, which would have strengthened the evidence base underpinning the findings. Footnotes are consistently used to reference documentary sources of information. The report could have assessed any unanticipated positive or negative effects of the HGSFP.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions draw on the information presented in the findings and do not introduce new information that was not already presented and discussed in the findings section. However, they could have been pitched at a higher level beyond summaries of the findings. Four key lessons learned are presented. However, some of the lessons learned are formulated as findings or conclusion and could have been framed in a manner that shows their wider relevance.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are mapped to findings and conclusions, well targeted, with indication of responsible entities, and appear realistic and actionable. They are categorized into operational and strategic recommendations, and by priority (medium or high) with the specific timeframe for implementation. However, the recommendations could have clearly reflected GEWE-related aspects, as well as broader equity and inclusion issues.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is consistent with WFP structure for decentralized evaluations and includes all mandatory lists. The report is generally well written, uses professional language, and consistently provides sources of data and quotes throughout. Visual aids (tables, boxes, figures and graphs) are used effectively throughout, which helps the reader to easily navigate the report. However, the content of the report could have been streamlined to meet the WFP maximum length requirements.</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	Approaches requirements: 6 points
<p>GEWE is well integrated in the evaluation framework, notably under the criteria of coherence and effectiveness, but human rights are not significantly considered. While the report discusses how Cambodia faces significant gender inequalities, the context section does not address the situation of other affected social groups. Additionally, the evaluation report does not assess whether sufficient information was collected on specific results indicators as to measure progress on human rights and broader equity and inclusion dimensions. Data was collected from different sources, and, in each case, the evaluators ensured that women and men were equally consulted, and gender-disaggregated data were targeted. While the report findings present the views of the various stakeholders that were consulted, they do not consistently refer to some specific groups such as women when describing their experience vis-à-vis the HGSFP. Moreover, any unanticipated positive or negative effects on human rights and gender equality are not</p>	

assessed. Finally, recommendations do not include GEWE-related recommendations and do not reflect on broader issues of equity and inclusion.

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