

Evaluation title	Évaluation des Activités de Résilience au Tchad Septembre 2018-Septembre 2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The report of the Évaluation des Activités de Résilience au Tchad Septembre 2018-Septembre 2022 provides quality and credible evaluation findings that decision makers can rely on with confidence. Sufficient details are provided in terms of the performance of the intervention generally and in relation to specific operational and strategic dimensions to be able to consider next steps for future programming. Extensive efforts were made to gather diverse primary and secondary data sources and to triangulate the data. The findings cover all the questions/sub-questions. and the analysis demonstrates that it draws upon multiple sources such that data is effectively triangulated. Consideration of gender and equity is quite well done in terms of collecting data and incorporating diverse perspectives into the findings. However, a more clear and consistent identification of the vulnerable populations in the conclusions and recommendations would have been needed. Issues were also found with the indicators in the evaluation matrix and the theory of change diagram and narrative. In some cases, wording from the evaluation terms of reference was overlooked, such as critical reference to the humanitarian dimension which should have been given more attention including in the conclusions and recommendations. Additionally, some recommendations are too specific, while some could have been divided into two separate recommendations. The report also overlooks some of the broader and more relevant components of the intervention that would have warranted the development of recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary is concise and well written, including some of the essential information from the main report. However, it does not include critical information summarizing the country context, and the lessons learned, and recommendations reflect the weaknesses found in the main report. Finally, this section should have been more specific in identifying the vulnerable populations that are concerned by this intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report includes some useful and important information about the context that is relevant to the intervention. It enables an understanding of the intervention and its key characteristics such as main partners, funders and some aspects about its evolution. Some details are provided about government policies and strategies, particularly at the national level and a general reference is made to SDG7. However, some critical information is overlooked, including details on tonnage. Greater clarity would have been needed on the funders and when and how much they contributed to the intervention. The theory of change diagram and description are unclear. The details on the evolution of the intervention, including clear referencing of evaluation reports considered, are insufficient.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives of learning and accountability are outlined in the report. There is a bullet referencing consideration of gender and human rights which suggests that these are reflected in the objectives. However, a definition of the evaluation rationale or purpose should have been included, while the scope and purpose should have been clearer and aligned with the TOR.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section is detailed and clearly presented. It includes specific descriptions of the approach taken to conduct primary and secondary data collection and describes how data was analyzed. It provides ample detail to understand steps taken for both the primary and secondary sourcing of data as well as for the collection of quantitative and qualitative data to demonstrate that multiple sources were procured to enable triangulation. The Annexes contain additional information to enable a better understanding of the methodological approaches. However, the number of the</p>		

indicators in the evaluation matrix do not comprise indicators that would facilitate measurement. Limited detail is provided as to the limitations and how they were mitigated, and this was not included in the main section of the report. Moreover, more information could have been provided about monitoring data to substantiate the choices of methodology.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The findings cover all the questions and sub-questions aligned with each of the criteria. The description and analysis are well presented. In most cases, the analysis draws upon multiple sources such that data is effectively triangulated. The use of tables and figures provides a good complement to the narrative. The use of summary boxes is helpful. Unintended effects of the intervention are clearly and effectively presented. The consideration of gender and equity could have been integrated more systematically in places where there is reference to beneficiaries. It would have been helpful to be specific and consistent to identify the vulnerable populations being considered. The analysis of protection could have been more directly connected to the humanitarian situation in Chad and the International Humanitarian Principles.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The conclusions are presented in a manner that focuses on strengths and weaknesses of the intervention. They connect to the evaluation criteria. Most of the conclusions are strategic and relevant to assisting WFP in its decision-making moving forward. It is helpful that the lessons learned cite some of the effective strategies that the intervention adopted, such as the use of participatory approaches which contributed to local ownership of the intervention. The equity conclusion is too general and lacks detail on the specific vulnerable groups. The conclusion on impact places too much focus on youth while overlooking the protection/ humanitarian dimension. Some of the lessons learned read like findings/conclusions and are too specific, overlooking some of the broader points that would be relevant to decision making and learning.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The recommendations are categorized as either strategic or operational, are prioritized and note the responsible stakeholder. Some of the recommendations are too specific and could have been formulated in two separate recommendations.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report follows the template. It includes a comprehensive listing of tables and figures. The report makes good use of graphs and tables to complement the narrative. The length of the main document and annex is acceptable. There are a few cases where references were not been correctly signposted. The way that the annexes are numbered with a number and then an annex number is a bit confusing.

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
--	------------------------------

The report explains how gender and equity were tackled to ensure that the voices of women and specific vulnerable populations were accommodated in the evaluation. The gender and equity dimensions are quite well considered, particularly in the stand-alone sections. There are two specific recommendations focused on gender. The gender-focused recommendations should have been reviewed and revised to ensure they were appropriate and that they factored in the equity dimension as well.

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>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<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>