

Evaluation title	Adapting to Climate Induced Threats to Food Production and Food Security in the Karnali Region of Nepal (2018-2022)	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The report of the evaluation of the Adapting to Climate Induced Threats to Food Production and Food Security in the Karnali Region of Nepal 2018-2022 (CAFS-Karnali) project provides quality and credible evaluation findings that can be used with confidence for decision-making. The report provides a good context overview of Nepal and the Karnali region, although it could have been improved by discussing key government policies and strategies relevant to the project. A good overview of the CAFS-Karnali is provided, including its objectives, theory of change, key assumptions, planned activities, beneficiaries, as well as its GEWE dimensions. The report clearly outlines the evaluation framework and methodology and identifies limitations with strategies to minimize their impact. Findings address all evaluation questions, are balanced, and supported by sound evidence, triangulated using multiple sources. The report clearly presents the results chain linking WFP activities and outputs to outcome-level changes and, in so doing, provides an insightful quantitative analysis of the project's performance. This is complemented by an assessment of the project's concrete benefits to beneficiary communities in terms of assets built, short-term jobs created, and the achievement of immediate food security at the household level. The conclusions of the evaluation include potential implications for future decision making. Recommendations are realistic and consistent internally but should have also reflected gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) aspects.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a good overview of the evaluation findings. Conclusions follow logically from key findings presented in the report and recommendations are briefly summarized. However, the summary could have been shortened in parts to comply with WFP's length requirements.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of key aspects of the Nepal context as well as of Karnali Province specifically, with relevant information on other elements such as interventions relevant to the CAFS-Karnali, climate change impacts on agriculture and food security, and specific social groups affected by the issue/intervention, including women. A good overview of the CAFS-Karnali is provided, including its key features such as objectives, theory of change, assumptions, planned activities, beneficiaries, as well as its GEWE and wider inclusion dimensions. The section could have been improved by discussing key government policies and strategies relevant to the CAFS-Karnali, referencing the 2017 Nepal Voluntary National Review, and discussing past WFP analytical work that informed the design of the CAFS-Karnali.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the dual evaluation objective (accountability and learning), rationale, as well as its main users and stakeholders. However, it should have included information on the evaluation scope (time period, geographic, and activities covered by the evaluation). Similar to GEWE, human rights could have been more meaningfully considered.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly satisfactory
<p>The report discusses the methodology which is grounded in a strong mixed-methods approach, drawing on qualitative and quantitative data collection methods to gather the views of a wide range of project stakeholders, including beneficiaries. The evaluation applied a sound sampling strategy (cluster sampling and purposive sampling) to determine the number of key informants and survey respondents, as well as an appropriate theory-based approach to assess the project's contribution to outcomes. Finally, the methodology identifies limitations with sound strategies to minimize their</p>		

<p>impact. The section mentions that the evaluation team reviewed the evaluability of the GEWE aspects of the project, but the results of this review and how they informed the methodology should have been added. Similarly, the specific steps undertaken to implement ethical standards could have been added either in the main body of the report or in the Annexes.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Evaluation findings adequately address all evaluation questions, and they are balanced, supported by sound evidence, and triangulated using multiple sources. Findings provide a solid assessment of the extent to which the objectives of the CAFS-Karnali project remained valid throughout its implementation period and aligned with beneficiaries' needs. Furthermore, the report presents an insightful quantitative analysis of the project's performance, complemented by an assessment of the project's concrete benefits to beneficiary communities in assets built, short-term jobs created, and achievement of immediate food security at the household level. Finally, the findings provide a sound project cost-effectiveness analysis, a balanced assessment of the quality of the M&E systems, as well as a GEWE assessment. The report could have identified negative or positive unanticipated effects on human rights and gender equality, if any, and discussed the extent to which recommendations from the mid-term review were implemented.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation conclusions are pitched at a higher level than findings and draw on evidence that was discussed in the report. The logical links between conclusions and findings could have been better presented, notably by ensuring that reference numbers provided in Annex XXI correspond to the numbers in the main body of the report. Similarly, some of the lessons could have been better formulated to show their potential for wider application and use beyond the context of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are realistic, provide information on responsible actors, and are consistent internally. Furthermore, they are well categorized and prioritized, include a clear timeline for action, and meet WFP requirements in terms of number and word count. References to the findings from which the recommendations are derived could have been clarified. Given that the findings emphasize the lack of baseline gender-disaggregated data/ results as an impediment to the objective assessment of GEWE results, a recommendation reflecting GEWE aspects could have been added.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report follows the WFP template for decentralized evaluations, reads well, uses professional style, and has all requested lists. The report effectively combines tables and figures to aid visualization of content and/or complement information presented in the narrative. As with the findings section, key messages in sections on conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations could have been highlighted using bold and different colours. Finally, the report could have been streamlined to meet 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	Meets requirements: 7 points
<p>GEWE is mainstreamed in the evaluation framework, notably through the inclusion of a GEWE-focused objective and of GEWE as one of the evaluation's areas of inquiry. The evaluation methodology was designed to collect and analyze GEWE-related data, with measures to ensure GEWE data is actually collected, notably through discussions with women entrepreneurs/ women enterprises, women farmers' groups and by interviewing women respondents separately from men. The report discusses the progress made in gender equality and social inclusion at national level and acknowledges that deeply rooted sociocultural norms still impede better outcomes. The report could have been improved by identifying negative or positive unanticipated effects on human rights and gender equality and by including recommendations that address GEWE issues.</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.