

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación conjunta de la entrega de Alimento Complementario Fortificado en Guatemala	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 96%	
<p>The report of the <i>Evaluación conjunta de la entrega de Alimento Complementario Fortificado (ACF) en Guatemala</i> is a high-quality document that can be used with a high degree of confidence to inform decision-making. The report presents an informative description of the national context and a clear depiction of the intervention evaluated. In addition, the evaluation rationale, specific objectives, scope, and main purpose of the evaluation are clearly described. The methodological design is described in much detail and the evaluation approaches and data collection methods used are relevant to answer the evaluation questions. Evaluation findings are supported by substantial qualitative and quantitative evidence drawn from a wide and varied range of sources that are clearly referenced throughout the report, without compromising the confidentiality of primary sources. On the other hand, the report could have been strengthened by outlining more clearly the causal chain from availability of resources to outcome-level results. The report demonstrates balance when discussing the strengths and areas for improvement of the intervention across findings and conclusions. The conclusions identify the future implications of the findings, and the recommendations are actionable, feasible and indicate the main stakeholders for their implementation as well as supporting actors. Lessons learned are correctly identified and formulated so as to clearly reflect their wider relevance in other contexts. Finally, the report uses language that is clear, professional and free of jargon.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary provides an effective description of the most important elements of the subject of the evaluation and the evaluation itself. Key findings of the evaluation are summarized and are clearly presented under each of the five evaluation questions. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations are summarized and expressed in a way that can inform decision-making. On the other hand, the executive summary should have included a better description of the national context and identified evaluation users, while lessons learned could have been presented more clearly.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides an overview of the national context that demonstrates balance between useful general information and specific detail. It presents a good description of the ACF programme as the subject of the evaluation, including its duration and geographic scope, objectives, planned and actual beneficiaries, and the intervention modalities. Furthermore, the overview section discusses the evolution of the programme design over the years since its inception, accounting for modifications to the design as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic and to two hurricanes that affected the country. The overview presents a theory of change of the intervention that was reconstructed by the evaluation team and the report discusses the underlying assumptions. Similarly, the overview duly discusses the gender dimension as well as equity and wider inclusion considerations of the intervention.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>All of the main features of the evaluation are clearly addressed. The report presents a clear description of the evaluation rationale, its threefold objective (i.e., accountability, learning and enlightenment and its scope. It also introduces a specific, cross-cutting gender, equity, and inclusion objective, to understand the extent to which the programme reduced the nutritional gender gap and whether it generated inclusive practices. The coverage of the evaluation in chronological terms is clearly outlined and the timeline of the evaluation is presented in Annex 2.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation uses a methodological design and data collection methods which were appropriate to address evaluation questions. The report discusses the evaluability of the initiative and comments on the availability and quality</p>		

of monitoring data and the feasibility of the evaluation. The evaluation criteria are listed along with the evaluation questions and sub-questions and a detailed evaluation matrix is presented. The sampling framework of the evaluation is described in Annex 6 and gender considerations are discussed in the main report. The report presents methodological limitations and some of them are listed along with mitigation strategies. On the other hand, the report could have included a discussion around triangulation and validation of sources to ensure that all voices were heard, and it should have addressed the gender imbalance in the sampling. Moreover, the report could have been strengthened by presenting limitations that were more specific. Similarly, when discussing ethical considerations, it would be advisable to make explicit reference to the Ethical Guidelines of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) of 2020 or any other authoritative standard.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

Findings provide extensive qualitative and quantitative evidence which is drawn from a wide range of sources that are identified without compromising their anonymity. Findings consistently respond to all five evaluation questions and 14 sub-questions. In addition, the report demonstrates balance when considering the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme and gaps in data are transparently accounted for. The evaluation findings report on unintended results the *Nutriniños* initiative.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	----------------------------

The report presents eight conclusions that are logically linked to the findings and are pitched at a higher level of analysis. They are balanced, forward-looking and effectively inform decision-makers. The report presents lessons learned that are correctly identified and demonstrate wider relevance for other contexts. Conclusions are internally consistent and address gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) issues, although they could have been strengthened by including messages related to equity, human rights and wider inclusion of the most vulnerable groups.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

The report lists recommendations that are clearly presented and are well aligned with the evaluation objectives. Recommendations are based on the evidence provided across findings and the information presented in conclusions, with Annex 7 highlighting the links among them. Recommendations are realistic, feasible and take into consideration the implementation context as well as potential internal and external limitations and address GEWE issues across.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	----------------------------

The report follows the WFP template for DE reports and includes all the required lists. The language used is clear, professional, and free of jargon. There is good use of tables, figures and diagrams to portray important information in a reader-friendly fashion. The report includes all the mandatory annexes as per WFP requirements and the main report and the annexes respect the maximum length for this type of report. On the other hand, the report could have benefited from using maps to portray the different stages of the CSP which would have provided more clarity.

<b>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</b>	
---	--

<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>
--	-------------------------------------

The ER explicitly mainstreams gender as a specific objective and across evaluation questions. The evaluation applied a cross-cutting approach to gender to understand to what extent the programme reduced the nutritional gender gap and whether it generated inclusive practices that consider people in vulnerable conditions with a higher risk of malnutrition and stunting in children. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations thoroughly address GEWE issues.

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>	
---	--

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<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>