

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación descentralizada de la contribución de WFP en fortalecimiento de capacidades en Nicaragua de 2019 a 2023	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - CSPE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 99%	
<p>The report of the <i>Evaluación descentralizada de la contribución de WFP en fortalecimiento de capacidades en Nicaragua (2019 – 2023)</i> is a very high-quality document that can be used with confidence to inform decision-making. A complete context overview outlines Nicaragua's geography and demography and provides key information on nutrition and food security, migration, poverty, the status of gender equality, among others. The report provides a complete description of the methodological design of the evaluation including questions associated with the OECD-DAC criteria. The findings highlight strengths and areas for improvement of the intervention and make appropriate use of evidence whose sources are consistently provided. Findings present an assessment of the contribution of WFP outputs towards outcome-level results. The report presents conclusions that adequately reflect the key takeaways from the evidence presented in the evaluation findings. Conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and successfully capture potential future implications of what is expressed across the findings section. Recommendations are few and show an evident link to the information presented across the evaluation findings and conclusions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The summary presents succinct descriptions of the evaluation rationale, its objectives, scope, stakeholders, intended users, and the methodology. It captures the most salient elements of the findings and covers all the evaluation questions and sub-questions, including specific findings on issues of gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE), and broader equity dimensions. Clear and summarized versions of the conclusions, lessons and recommendations are also presented. On the other hand, the context and the evaluation subject could have been better described. Similarly, all four conclusions of the main body of the report should have been included.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents useful information on the Nicaraguan context, notably key information on nutrition and food security, migration, poverty, climate change and vulnerability to disasters. The report addresses the three Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), i.e., 2, 5 and 17 and discusses the way the intervention related to their achievement. The report presents a clear description of the thematic areas and activities that fall under the capacity strengthening component of the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) and a discussion around the status of gender equality in the country is included. A reference model was developed instead of a theory of change, starting from the content of the policy and specifically the ways to change capabilities and intervention areas. This framework was validated in a workshop with 10 members of WFP's country office. The report would have benefited from including a discussion around the 2021 Voluntary National Report, which was the latest available.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The two specific evaluation objectives are identified as learning and accountability with greater emphasis on the former. The purpose of the evaluation was to inform the design of the new CSP (2024-2029), which was being prepared at the time of the evaluation. The evaluation incorporated the gender approach in a cross-cutting manner in its design and implementation beyond the specific question dedicated to this particular issue. Finally, the report includes a discussion around the scope of the evaluation in all its dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report thoroughly discusses the methodological design of the evaluation focused primarily on qualitative and participatory techniques. A diverse range of voices from primary data sources were heard. The report presents a discussion around methodological limitations and mitigation strategies proposed. Moreover, ethical guidelines used</p>		

throughout the evaluation process are addressed. Finally, ethical safeguards used during the evaluation conduct are duly described. However, the report should have included a more substantial discussion around the evaluability assessment presented in the inception report.

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

Findings transparently address strengths and weaknesses of the intervention and make an appropriate use of evidence citing data sources consistently. The evaluation findings address all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and the report identifies inconclusive evidence or gaps. Findings present an assessment of the contribution of WFP outputs towards outcome-level results. Different instances of triangulation of voices of different stakeholder groups are evident in the findings.

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

Conclusions adequately reflect the key takeaways from the evidence presented in the evaluation findings. The messages are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and successfully capture potential implications for future programming. In addition, conclusions address GEWE-related aspects that were discussed in further detail under one evaluation question and its three sub-questions. Lessons are correctly identified, are logically drawn from the information presented in the findings and highlight their applicability in different contexts.

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

Recommendations are few and are linked to the information presented across the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are in alignment with the evaluation purpose and objectives, i.e., learning and accountability. Recommendations are internally consistent and demonstrate a good knowledge of contextual factors and certain limitations. They target primary and secondary entities for their implementation, suggest different degrees of prioritization, and a clear timeframe for their implementation is indicated in each case. Recommendations duly address GEWE issues that should be tackled in future programming.

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

The evaluation report closely observes WFP template and requirements for decentralized thematic evaluations. Information is presented in a very clear fashion and the narrative is free of jargon. No grammar, punctuation or spelling mistakes were found. All sources are clearly cited, and complementary information is consistently signposted to provide additional information on several passages of the document. The report respects WFP word count requirements and all lists and mandatory annexes are included. On the other hand, acronyms should have been consistently spelled out at first use throughout the report and included in the acronym list at the end of the report.

<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>	Meets requirements: 9 points
--	------------------------------

The overview of the intervention presents a discussion around the status of gender equality in the country. Even though the evaluation criteria do not explicitly include a standalone criterion on gender, the evaluation framework provided for the collection of GEWE-related data. The methodology section explains in detail the way the evaluation incorporated the gender approach transversally in its design and implementation. The methodology includes a mixed-methods approach that was appropriate for evaluating GEWE-related issues. Moreover, the report presents instances of triangulation of voices of different stakeholder groups to report on the effects of the intervention on women. The report includes a discussion around the occurrence of some unintended effects relating to human rights and gender equality. Finally, the report presents recommendations that specifically address GEWE issues that should be improved in future programming.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<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.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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.