

Evaluation title	Final evaluation of the WFP McGovern-Dole funded school feeding project (FFE-679-2017/020-00) in the Republic of the Congo - 2018-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 88%	
The report of the Final evaluation of the WFP McGovern-Dole funded school feeding project in the Republic of the Congo – 2018-2023 presents quality and credible findings that can be used by decision makers with confidence. The context of the intervention is well described, containing useful information for the reader. The description of the evaluation subject presents planned and actual transfers, including disaggregated data but could have better presented past evaluative work and the intervention logic. The evaluation criteria, questions, and matrix are well presented despite some deviations from the Terms of Reference (ToR) that are not explained. While the methodology is generally well explained, the sampling frame could have been more robustly defined. Moreover, mitigation strategies for limitations could have been better described. The findings are well evidenced, with primary and secondary sources noted, disaggregated data presented to the extent possible, and inconclusive evidence recognized. However, the findings could have addressed each evaluation question separately and explicit linkages between outputs and outcomes could have been presented. The conclusions and recommendations are well outlined, considering gender and equity dimensions throughout. However, recommendations could have been better grouped and their implementation strategies better defined. Lessons learned are useful and well presented in a manner that allows for their wider application. Finally, while the executive summary provides complete information on the evaluation objectives and purpose, methodology, conclusions, and lessons learned, it could have better presented the evaluation subject, evaluation features, findings, and recommendations.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
The executive summary clearly presents complete evaluation objectives, purpose, methodology, conclusions, and lessons learned. However, the findings in the executive summary are not consistent with the findings in the main report. Moreover, the recommendations could have been better articulated, including prioritization, timeframe, and targeting.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
The general overview of the context, including of international assistance of WFP and other actors and external events, is very well presented. The report and appendices thoroughly describe the planned and actual transfers, including disaggregated data where possible. However, the geographic coverage of the evaluation subject could have been better defined as well as a more coherent explanation of the results framework and linkages between the output- and outcome-level results. Gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) dimensions could have been more systematically addressed when presenting the evaluation subject.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
The objectives are well defined, stating the accountability and learning dimensions of the evaluation and GEWE dimensions were mainstreamed in the evaluation. The rationale, purpose, expected users and stakeholders are also articulated in the evaluation report. However, the rationale and purpose could have been distinguished from the objectives, while the geographic scope should have been clearly presented given the other evaluative processes during the school feeding project cycle.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The methodological design, data collection methods, data sources, and analysis methods were appropriate for the evaluation. GEWE dimensions are considered in the methodology to an extent. However, the monitoring data collected during the intervention implementation period is not thoroughly assessed in the report, and the sampling frame as well as the rationale could have been more elaborate. Mitigation strategies for the limitations could have been better articulated. In addition, there are some inconsistencies with the evaluation questions in the report and those presented in the ToR/IR. The evaluation matrix is complete, gender and equity dimensions are somewhat mainstreamed in the		

evaluation questions. Gender considerations are discussed but could have been more fully mainstreamed in the evaluation framework.

**CRITERION 5: FINDINGS****Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The findings make clear and consistent use of the results and recommendations from the baseline study and mid-term evaluation. They sufficiently present the perspectives of vulnerable groups and include disaggregated data where possible. The findings are balanced and present primary and secondary sources as well as disaggregated data while considering unanticipated effects. The evaluation questions are addressed, and recognition of inconclusive evidence is made. However, the causal linkages between outputs and outcomes achieved could have been better articulated.

**CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS****Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The conclusions are clearly derived from key findings in relation to each of the evaluation criteria. The conclusions fully assess GEWE dimensions, including considerations of gender and indigenous peoples. The lessons learned are clearly presented in a manner that facilitates wider application.

**CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS****Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, are realistic and feasible, actionable, and specify the relevant stakeholders for implementation. The recommendations provide the necessary disaggregated features. Gender and equity dimensions are considered as well. However, the recommendations could have systematically included implementation strategies.

**CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY****Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The report is accessible and clearly written, with the WFP template consistently followed and word length requirements respected. Visual aids, graphs, and tables are used clearly to convey key information. The report cites data sources and quotes accurately. However, the report could have presented complete Annexes as well as made better use of bold text to highlight key information.

**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**

The report clearly states that gender equality and equitable access for all vulnerable groups were in the scope of the evaluation despite that GEWE dimensions were mainstreamed to a limited extent across the evaluation criteria and questions. The report provides a critical assessment of the lack of gender equity in the school feeding program and insufficient targeting. GEWE dimensions are considered in the methodology and evaluation questions. The methodological approach was useful for assessing GEWE dimensions despite the limitations recognized by the evaluation team. However, while the context and background section assess gender-related issues in relation to education, there could have been a broader discussion across the thematic areas. However, the presentation of the methodology is brief and would have benefited from a more robust discussion, especially with respect to the sampling frame which could have been better defined and disaggregated. GEWE dimensions are well covered in the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**
**Highly Satisfactory**

*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.

*Definition at criterion level:* The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.

**Satisfactory**

*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.

*Definition at criterion level:* There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.

## POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>