

Evaluation title	Evaluación intermedia del proyecto Resiliencia climática de los hogares rurales del corredor seco en Nicaragua – 08.2020/08.2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>Overall, the report of the <i>Evaluación intermedia del proyecto Resiliencia climática de los hogares rurales del corredor seco en Nicaragua</i> provides quality and credible findings that can be used with confidence for decision making. The executive summary presents a concise overview of the evaluation context, subject, methodology, findings, and conclusions. The context and overview of the intervention are well explained, containing relevant information. While the evaluation objectives are clearly defined, the purpose statement is not distinguished from the objectives and the evaluation scope is not clearly articulated beyond the temporal dimension. The report could have described the sampling rationale, including how vulnerable groups such as rural and indigenous populations were considered. An evaluability assessment is provided, and ethical issues considered. The findings are well supported by evidence but rely heavily on secondary sources. Unanticipated findings are discussed, including issues on gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) aspects. Primary sources and disaggregated data could have featured more prevalently in the findings. The conclusions and recommendations are of high quality, demonstrating that the evaluation provided useful takeaways for stakeholders and should inform future programming. GEWE was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation objectives, criteria, questions, methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary concisely presents an overview of the evaluation context, subject, methodology, findings, and conclusions. The section, however, could have included the purpose, stakeholders, rationale, objectives, scope, and intended users of the evaluation. The recommendations could have better articulated linkages to the findings as well as the additional features (e.g., prioritization, timeframe, etc.). Finally, the executive summary exceeds the word limit.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context of the intervention is well defined, containing general and theme-specific information. Agenda 2030 and SDGs are also discussed in the report. The context section, nonetheless, does not adequately mainstream GEWE dimensions through disaggregated data and an intersectional analysis of specific social groups. The report does not sufficiently provide an overview of features of international assistance and other WFP work. The overview of the intervention, on the other hand, is well defined, containing the necessary features to inform the reader. The theory of change is discussed but could have presented the budget by outcomes/components. In addition, the report does not discuss the CO's analytical work that informed the design of the intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives are clearly defined, including the integration of GEWE dimensions. However, the evaluation purpose/rationale is not clearly articulated or distinguished from the objectives while only the temporal dimension of the scope is presented in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology fully integrates GEWE dimensions into the evaluation, through a dedicated sub-section. While the evaluation criteria are not articulated clearly in the report, an evaluation matrix is presented in the Annexes with an overview of the evaluability assessment. Ethical considerations detail the safeguards for participants as well as obligations of the evaluators. Whilst the evaluation methods and sampling frame clearly capture a diverse range of stakeholders from a gender perspective, it is unclear how vulnerable groups were represented. The rationale for the</p>		

sampling frame could have been more clearly articulated. Finally, the mitigation measures described in the methodology are not sufficient to adequately address the methodological limitations identified in this evaluation report.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
The findings are generally well evidenced and answer the evaluation questions. GEWE dimensions were integrated throughout, including in a dedicated sub-section. Unanticipated effects of the intervention are also discussed. The findings could have cited primary sources and provided disaggregated data more systematically. Finally, the section is somewhat skewed towards a positive assessment.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The conclusions are well defined, and there is a balance between positive and negative ones. They present the implications of the findings clearly and are pitched at a higher level of abstraction. There are clear considerations of GEWE-related issues. However, the linkages to the findings are not always explicit.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The recommendations are well defined, contain the necessary features, demonstrating clear linkages with the conclusions and findings, and integrate GEWE dimensions. However, they exceed the word limit allowance.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report is well structured and accessible. The use of finding statements, bold text, etc. greatly enhances the clarity of the report. The Annexes are complete and data sources are identified. The report is beyond the maximum word length requirements. Cross-referencing to other sections could have been used more as well as more visual aids in the findings.		

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
GEWE was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation. The evaluation clearly integrated GEWE dimensions in its objectives, criteria, and questions, including a dedicated criterion for Gender and Inclusion. The methodology effectively addressed GEWE dimensions, including a dedicated sub-section discussing this topic. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations consider GEWE dimensions, including unanticipated effects of the intervention related to gender equality. However, sex-disaggregated data could have been improved, and the assessment of the intervention monitoring data does not consider GEWE dimensions.	

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>