

Evaluation title	Final Evaluation of the Programme to Strengthen the Socio-Economic Resilience of Smallholder Farmers and Vulnerable Populations in the Democratic Republic of Congo (2018-2024)	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 88%	
The Final Evaluation of the Programme to Strengthen the Socio-Economic Resilience of Smallholder Farmers and Vulnerable Populations in the Democratic Republic of Congo (2018-2024) is a high-quality document that can be used with confidence to inform decision-making. The methodological design, data collection and analysis methods, data sources and sampling frame seem relevant, and they enabled the evaluation questions to be answered. A standalone evaluation criterion and a question for cross-sectional questions regarding gender, equity and inclusion were included. The findings are generated transparently and impartially, presenting strengths and weaknesses in a balanced manner. However, they could have been strengthened by explicitly identifying any gaps or omissions, highlighting inconclusive evidence. Also, while the report discusses the contributions of WFP interventions toward outcome-level results, it does not explicitly compare actual to planned outcomes. The report presents conclusions that are balanced, comprehensive, and connect findings from different evaluation criteria, questions, and themes. Finally, the recommendations are realistic, feasible, targeted, specific, and actionable, with responsible actors clearly identified. However, recommendations should have been more streamlined.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
The executive summary effectively condenses the key information from the evaluation features, context, and overview of the subject. The key findings are a clear summary of those discussed in the main body of the report. The conclusions are presented clearly and concisely, providing a coherent and understandable overview of the evaluation results. The recommendations presented in the executive summary have clear linkages with the key findings. On the other hand, the executive summary should have been streamlined to respect the maximum length as per WFP requirements.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The context section provides a thorough overview of the contextual factors relevant to the evaluation and identifies basic indicators related to poverty, food security, health, education and gender equality. The report discusses recent data and trends related to key issues under SDGs 2 and 17 that are relevant to WFP's mandate and the subject of the evaluation. The objectives of the project, its logic of intervention (Theory of Change), and planned activities are clearly outlined. However, the overview of the subject could have included a more detailed breakdown of the programme's planned and actual transfers.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report identifies the two main objectives of the evaluation which are accountability and learning, with an emphasis on the latter,. The rationale of the evaluation is clearly outlined as is the scope of the evaluation.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The methodology, including data collection methods, sources, sample, and analysis all seem to enable the evaluation questions to be answered. An evaluation matrix comprehensively outlines the evaluation's framework. The approach includes a standalone criterion and a question for cross-sectional issues related to gender, equity and inclusion. The report mentions that the evaluation used various data sources and processes, including triangulation and validation, to ensure inclusion of all voices. However, the methodology could have provided further details on how the sampling frame allowed to reach the most vulnerable populations.		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings are generated transparently and impartially, presenting project strengths and weaknesses. Each main evaluation question and sub-questions are answered using a mix of qualitative and quantitative analysis that triangulates diverse perspectives. However, the report should have explicitly identified gaps in the evidence base or highlighted where it was inconclusive. Some challenges limited the evaluation team's ability to gather complete data and fully address all aspects of the evaluation questions, and the report should have explicitly acknowledged or discussed such instances. Finally, the report should have explicitly assessed performance against the International Humanitarian Principles.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions in the report are balanced, comprehensive, and connect findings across criteria, questions, and themes. They flow from, and are based on, a comprehensive analysis of the findings drawing logical inferences and insights. The conclusions discuss the extent to which gender and broader inclusion dimensions were considered in the project. The report presents lessons learned that contribute to wider organizational learning in WFP and guide future action, as they have the potential for wider application beyond the specific context of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are clearly and logically derived from findings and conclusions, offering specific and actionable steps to improve the project's performance. They are realistic, feasible, and tailored to the specific limitations of the context. They are targeted, specific, and actionable, with responsible actors clearly identified. Recommendations are prioritized and grouped, with a clear timeframe for action. However, some of them should have been could have been better grouped to stay within WFP requirements.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report follows the WFP template for evaluation reports and includes all the required lists. It uses clear, easily understood, precise, and professional language. There are linkages between different sections, including annexes and cross-referencing of information. All finding statements are presented in bold, within a different colour box to enhance readability. The report includes all mandatory annexes, and they follow WFP's template. However, the report could have been strengthened by consistently providing sources for all data and quotes. Also, it could have highlighted and captured key messages in a more consistent fashion.</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 evaluation included a separate evaluation criterion and question for cross-sectional questions related to gender, equity and inclusion. The report describes how the evaluation incorporated the gender dimension in data collection and analysis. The evaluation collected data on, and from, both men and women stakeholders and beneficiaries. A mixed-methods design was used for this evaluation which seems appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations. The evaluation used various data sources and processes, including triangulation and validation, to ensure that the voices of men, women, boys, and girls were heard. However, the report does not detail enough how the methods and sample frame allowed to reach the most vulnerable populations. The evaluation also disaggregates quantitative data by sex to examine the differential impacts of the JRP on men and women. The report mentions some unanticipated effects, including those related to gender equality.</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.