

Evaluation title	Evaluation of linking Eswatini Smallholder Farmers to the Home-grown School Feeding Market (HGSM) in Eswatini from 2019 to 2021	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized – Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 90%	
<p>The Evaluation of linking Eswatini Smallholder Farmers to the Home-grown School Feeding Market (HGSM) constitutes a highly satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report summarizes with clarity the evaluation purpose and rationale, as well as highly relevant information on the geographic and thematic context during the evaluation period. The report presents findings on all the evaluation questions drawing upon a range of data sources and data collection methods including stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and surveys. The evaluation's methodological design and data analysis were appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in an unbiased way. The evidence base is clearly presented, and information gaps are identified. Evaluation findings are based on multiple sources of credible and timely evidence that were triangulated. The conclusions, lessons, and recommendations flow logically from the findings. The recommendations are prioritized and targeted for implementation within clearly identified timeframes. The evaluation report and annexes are clearly structured and well written, with appropriate use of visual tools to highlight and/or present information. Gender equality considerations are consistently and effectively mainstreamed into the report. The executive summary provides an adequate synthesis of the evaluation's main features, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, the report could have been further strengthened by clearly articulating why the evaluation was taking place at this point; commenting on the availability of monitoring data related to measuring progress on human rights and gender equality results; and discussing if and how recommendations from previous evaluations were addressed.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary provides a clear description of the evaluation context and the subject of the evaluation with a good balance between detail and synthesis. It emphasizes key evaluation features, presents the main evaluation findings and conclusions, and includes the evaluation lessons and recommendations. The findings presented in the summary are clear and, together with the conclusions and recommendations, adequately reflect the ones in the main report. The summary could have been further strengthened by focusing the contextual information on issues relevant to the evaluation subject and the area of school feeding. Similarly, it would have benefited from clearly distinguishing the main recommendations from related suggestions for their operationalization.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context section of the report includes all the required information about Eswatini and the programme. It provides details including information on geography, political and administrative systems, demography, development indicators, humanitarian, and poverty issues. Key indicators are presented from reliable sources throughout and are cited in the footnotes. The report and annexes generally provide a clear overview of the context of the evaluation subject and of the evaluation subject itself, including objectives, outcomes, activities, transfer modalities, and intervention logic. Additionally, planned vs actual delivery is described in terms of beneficiaries, and budget disbursement disaggregated by year.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly states the rationale, purpose and timeframe of the evaluation. Gender equality and human rights considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation's dual objectives of accountability and learning. The report could have been further strengthened by clearly articulating why the evaluation is taking place at this point, and by providing additional information on the evaluation's thematic and geographic scope.</p>		

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed methods approach, chosen data sources and methods of data analysis are clearly described in the main report and in supporting annexes. They were appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in an unbiased way and allowed for effective data collection despite the limitations posed by the absence of relevant baseline data on key indicators. The evaluation included data collection from a variety of stakeholders. Gender equality considerations were addressed through dedicated questions and sub-questions. The evaluation made meaningful use of the reconstructed theory of change for the programme. However, the report could have been further strengthened by commenting on the availability of monitoring data related to measuring progress on human rights and gender equality results.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings address all the evaluation questions in a structured fashion. Supporting evidence is presented transparently and clearly, providing sources for all data and quotes, and using a neutral tone. The report discusses programme contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way, considering contextual factors. The report reflects the voices of different stakeholder groups and reflects a diversity of views. However, the report would have been strengthened by explicitly commenting on the extent to which recommendations from the 2019 National School Feeding Programme evaluation were addressed by the pilot project under review. The report might also have benefited from explicitly noting unanticipated effects of programme implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions are balanced, reflecting positive and negative aspects of HGSF intervention implementation. Conclusions flow logically from findings and cover the major points with an appropriate level of detail. Conclusions also address gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE), equity and inclusion considerations. They could have been further strengthened by including explicit reflections on the extent to which the programme was able to reach the most vulnerable, such as people living with disabilities.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations generally flow logically from key findings and conclusions. They are, for the most part, clearly targeted to relevant and appropriate actors. The report includes a recommendation focused on gender equality, equity and inclusion. Recommendations could have been more clear.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written, clearly structured and easy for the reader to navigate. It meets WFP criteria for length. Evidence is appropriately sourced, and information provided in annexes is cross-referenced. In a few cases, the report could have benefited from using simpler and clearer language to describe elements of the evaluation methodology.</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 effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation, including in the scope of analysis and across the evaluation criteria and questions. It is at the core of the evaluation methodology. In the findings, there is adequate disaggregation of data by sex, and different social groups and quantitative data reporting on gender. Findings and recommendations clearly reflect GEWE considerations. However, evaluability assessment with respect to gender issues is not very explicit in the report. Unanticipated effects related to human rights, gender equality or inclusion dimensions are not explicitly identified in the report.</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.