

Evaluation title	Evaluación final del proyecto BOOST desde agosto 2018 hasta enero 2024 en las zonas de Nueva Segovia, Madriz, Estelí, Matagalpa, Jinotega y la RACCN	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 94%	
<p>The “Evaluación final del proyecto BOOST desde agosto 2018 hasta enero 2024 en las zonas de Nueva Segovia, Madriz, Estelí, Matagalpa, Jinotega y la RACCN” is a high-quality document that can be used to inform decision-making. The report presents relevant contextual information to understanding the evaluation subject. The evaluation objectives of learning and accountability are clearly identified. The methodological design of the evaluation is relevant and thoroughly discussed and includes an evaluation matrix organized by the OECD DAC criteria. Findings are presented in a transparent and impartial manner, using a variety of data sources and methods. While the report presents findings for each of the main evaluation questions and sub-questions, it could have been strengthened by presenting topline finding statements. Conclusions effectively synthesize the findings, highlighting achievements and challenges. They delve into the implications of the findings for the future of the intervention, offering strategic insights for decision-making. Finally, the report presents four recommendations aligned with the evaluation’s objectives, and clearly linked with findings and conclusions. They are realistic, feasible, and designed to be implemented within existing constraints.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary presents succinct descriptions of the evaluation rationale, its objectives, scope, stakeholders and intended users, as well as a brief overview of the methodology. Key findings are presented for all evaluation questions. Conclusions are summarized in a clear and concise manner and follow logically from the key findings. Clear and summarized versions of the lessons learned, and the recommendations are also presented.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context section includes information on poverty levels disaggregated by region, and relevant recent data and trends on key issues relevant to the BOOST. However, it could have been strengthened by including some relevant information on literacy rates, an IPC map and insights from the latest VNR. The report includes a concise overview of the evaluation subject. It highlights key deviations from the original design, providing insight into how implementation differed from what was initially planned. The section, however, would have benefited from providing more detail about the implementation results, discussing planned and actual transfers of the project.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives are clearly identified as learning and accountability. The scope of the evaluation is well defined in the report, covering all key aspects including the project duration. The geographic and programming scope are clearly outlined as well.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report discusses the methodological design of the evaluation and presents an evaluability assessment conducted during the inception phase that informed it. Each evaluation criterion is broken down into the main evaluation questions and specific sub-questions. The report adequately explains data sources and sampling rationale, describing how data collection and analysis methods incorporated a gender dimension. The limitations of the methodology and their potential effects on the evidence base are adequately discussed, together with mitigation strategies. Finally, the report explicitly states its adherence to WFP and UNEG ethical standards for evaluation.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents findings transparently and uses a variety of data sources and methods to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the project's impact. It presents findings for each of the main evaluation questions and corresponding sub-questions. Gaps in the evidence base are identified. The report clearly explains the contributions of WFP interventions toward outcome-level results. It also discusses several unintended results which provide valuable insights into the broader impact of the project. However, the report could have been strengthened by presenting clearly identified finding statements, ideally numbered, for more effective messaging. Moreover, since the report acknowledges the influence of external factors on project sustainability, findings could have provided a more in-depth analysis of how these factors, such as economic conditions and political stability, might affect the long-term sustainability of project outcomes.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions delve into the implications of the findings for the future of the intervention, offering strategic insights for decision-making and improvement. They demonstrate a clear commitment to GEWE, equity, and inclusion. They highlight the project's achievements in these areas and emphasize their importance for the overall success and sustainability of development interventions. The report presents lessons learned that flow from the findings and effectively contribute to wider WFP organizational learning and guide future action.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents four recommendations that are in alignment with the evaluation's objectives and are clearly linked with the findings and conclusions. They are realistic, feasible, and actionable within the existing financial, operational, and contextual constraints. Recommendations also provide clear guidance on the actions required and responsibilities for implementing them. Each recommendation is assigned a priority level (high or medium), indicating its importance and urgency, along with a clear timeframe for action. The report provides recommendations that address GEWE and other equity issues and prioritize actions for improvement.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report observes WFP template for evaluation reports and includes a detailed table of contents with accurate page numbers, a list of tables and figures, and a complete list of acronyms and their definitions. It uses clear, precise, and professional language. The report's use of evidence is transparent and consistent, with clear citations and references to the sources of information. It generally demonstrates a clear linkage between sections and uses proper cross-referencing. The report includes all the mandatory annexes, numbered and referenced within the main text. However, it could have been strengthened by numbering the findings and using bold to highlight statements to clearly capture them. Finally, some page and annex inaccuracies should have been fixed.</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: 8 points
<p>The report specifically mentions that the project monitoring system included sex-disaggregated indicators, which allowed for a more detailed analysis of gender equality. Although the report does not have a specific objective solely focused on human rights and gender equality, these considerations are mainstreamed into the other objectives. The evaluation includes specific considerations for GEWE in its methodological approach and framework. The report disaggregates quantitative data by sex to highlight the unique experiences and outcomes for both men and women. The report also identifies several unintended results relating to human rights and GEWE. Finally, the report provides recommendations that address GEWE issues and prioritize actions for improvement, also reflecting broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</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.