

|   |  |                     |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>   | Thematic Evaluation of WFP's Country Capacity Strengthening Activities in Lesotho 2019 to 2023 |                     |
| <b>Evaluation category and type</b>   | Decentralized Evaluation   |                     |
| <b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory (94%)  |                     |
| <p>The report of the decentralized evaluation of the Thematic Evaluation of WFP's Country Capacity Strengthening (CCS) Activities in Lesotho 2019 to 2023 is a high-quality document that can be confidently used to inform decision-making. The evaluation report (ER) presents a strong overview of the national context with useful general information and specific detail. The subject of the evaluation is adequately described and includes scope, objectives, planned and actual target beneficiaries reached, as well as the modalities of the intervention. The ER provides a clear description of the evaluation rationale, its specific objectives, and the main characteristics of the evaluation. A relevant methodological design and appropriate data collection methods were used, and they are clearly described in the ER.. The methodology subsection assesses the availability and quality of monitoring data including disaggregated data. Gender equality, human rights and equity were mainstreamed throughout the evaluation process as reflected in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Findings are substantiated by qualitative and quantitative evidence drawn from a wide range of sources that are clearly and consistently cited. The report demonstrates balance and transparency when discussing the strengths and areas for improvement of the intervention. Similarly, gaps in data and inconclusive findings are discussed. Conclusions address both the intervention's strengths and weaknesses and identify the future implications of the evaluation findings. Lessons learned are formulated so as to clearly reflect wider relevance in other contexts. Recommendations clearly indicate relevant stakeholders for their implementation and their priority level. On the other hand, they could have been strengthened by breaking down each recommendation into clearer sub-recommendations.</p> |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The executive summary provides an effective description of the national context in Lesotho and key evaluation elements such as the methodological approach and use and users of the evaluation. Key findings of the evaluation are summarized, clearly explained and presented by evaluation criteria. Findings also discuss GEWE-related issues of the subject of evaluation. Conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations are correctly summarized and are expressed in a way that can effectively inform decision-making.</p>  |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>A strong overview of the national context is presented which couples useful general information and specific detail. It presents a description of the subject of the evaluation including its scope, objectives, planned and actual target beneficiaries reached, as well as the modalities of the intervention. The context overview also discusses relevant national policies and strategies to reduce malnutrition in Lesotho. The report includes a reconstituted Theory of Change for the intervention, a logical framework and a line of sight for CCS activities which underline the results and assumptions. The overview provides a description of the gender dimension as well as equity and wider inclusion considerations of the intervention. On the other hand, the ER could have discussed important country information regarding access to health and education. Furthermore, the overview section could have provided a clearer discussion around the evolution of the CCS activities throughout the implementation period. Graphs and illustrations could have been used to portray any shifts that may have occurred in this sense.</p>  |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report provides a clear description of the evaluation rationale, its specific objectives, and the main characteristics of the evaluation. The ER also explains that the evaluation is specifically commissioned to understand the extent to which CCS activities considered environmental risk and gender-related issues such as gender equality, equity, and discrimination. On the other hand, the ER should have explicitly mentioned the geographic coverage of the evaluation which sought an emphasis in the three southern districts. Also, the period of time covered could have been more specifically established by providing both a start and an end date.</p>   |  |                     |

|  |               |                     |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| <b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The report presents a thorough description of the methodological design as well as appropriate data collection methods. The methodology subsection assesses the availability and quality of monitoring data, including disaggregated data. Similarly, the ER presents the evaluation criteria that were used to guide the assessment. An evaluation matrix is presented which includes all evaluation questions. The sampling framework and the gender considerations of the evaluation are described in detail. The ER explains that the evaluation used a mixed methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative data collection to allow for systematic triangulation of evidence through different data sources and collection methods. The ER explains that the evaluation complied with UNEG Ethical Guidelines and a number of obligations by the ET members are listed. On the other hand, the ER could have been strengthened by presenting a clear list of methodological limitations along with the mitigation strategies applied in each case. Also, the report could have better addressed the evaluability of the equity and wider inclusion aspects of the initiative. Finally, it could have benefited from including a discussion around the way in which the availability and quality of monitoring data influenced the choice of methodology for this evaluation.</p> |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>   | <b>Rating</b> | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The ER presents findings that are underpinned by substantive evidence which is drawn from a wide range of sources. Findings demonstrate balance when considering the strengths and areas for improvement. They thoroughly respond to all 16 evaluation questions, which are clearly listed, and key finding statements are highlighted to capture the essential messages. The report consistently specifies data sources for the evidence presented in each case. Similarly, the report is transparent about indicating gaps in evidence. Findings provide a good account of the causal links between activities/outputs/ and outcome level results. Finally, the evaluation findings address the extent to which the design and delivery of capacity strengthening initiatives were in line with humanitarian principles.</p>  |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>Conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analysis and are not merely the synthesis of the findings. They are organized per evaluation criteria and demonstrate balance, addressing both the subject of the evaluation's strengths and weaknesses. Conclusions highlight the implications of the findings for the future of the activities being evaluated as well of WFP programming in Lesotho in general. They address GEWE-related aspects and messages related to equity and wider inclusion of most vulnerable groups. Finally, the ER presents lessons learned that are correctly identified and are clearly articulated to clearly reflect what wider relevance they might have in other contexts.</p>   |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The report presents eight recommendations that draw on the information presented in findings and conclusions and are aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives. Their links and to specific findings and conclusions are outlined in a mapping of findings, conclusions and recommendations. Recommendations are realistic and feasible and take into consideration the implementation context and potential limitations. They are classified according to their operational or strategic nature and the level of prioritization (high or medium) is indicated for each of them. In addition, the table also provides a clear deadline date for their completion. However, recommendations could have been strengthened by breaking them down into simpler and clearer sub-recommendations. Finally, the report could have benefited from producing recommendations that touched upon broader equity and inclusion dimensions as some challenges in that area were discussed in findings and conclusions.</p>  |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation report observes to a large extent the guidelines of the WFP template for DE reports and includes all the required lists and annexes. The ER uses language that is clear, professional and free of jargon. The information contained in the report is presented in a factual fashion and free of bias. The ER makes good use of tables, figures and maps that complement the information in the report in a clear and reader-friendly fashion. Finally, the ER and the annexes, with the sole exception of recommendations, respect the maximum length for this type of report.</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

The ER explains that the evaluation was specifically commissioned to understanding the extent to which CCS activities considered environmental risk and gender-related issues such as gender equality, equity, and discrimination. Similarly, a gender- and age-sensitive approach was mainstreamed throughout evaluation processes and activities which are described in the methodology section. Evaluation questions include explicit references to GEWE and age. However, the ER does not discuss the way in which the availability and quality of monitoring data influenced the choice of methodology for this evaluation. Also, a discussion around the way in which the initiative was able to monitor the effect that the subject of the evaluation had on disabled people, minority groups, etc, is largely missing. Evaluation questions include explicit references to GEWE as reflected into the evaluation matrix and data collection tools. The evaluation uses a mixed-methods approach that was appropriate for this type of evaluation. It also used a sampling approach that is explained in detail. However, the ER does not include a discussion around the ways in which the methodology foresaw the sampling was designed to reflect a wide variety of respondents, including the most vulnerable. Triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data collected from different sources supports all findings. Finally, the report does not include any specific recommendation on GEWE.

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

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> | <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>   |
| <b>Satisfactory</b>        | <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>   |
|                            | <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>  |