

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Resilience Learning in South Sudan - Impact evaluation endline report of a resilience programme jointly implemented by UNICEF and WFP	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Impact Evaluation	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 87%	
<p>The evaluation describes the impacts of the WFP Integrated Resilience Programme in South Sudan using a rigorous Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT). It applies a multi-arm design to estimate the impact of the cash and food assistance interventions implemented by WFP and the impact of the UNICEF education package. Baseline household survey data was collected in 2021/2022, with high-frequency data collection during 2022 and endline data collection in 2023. The experimental impact evaluation was supplemented by correlational analysis with respect to distance from nutrition centres and health facilities, as well as qualitative insights. While the evaluation is well designed, an important weakness is the small sample size of cluster units. This is partially offset by the evaluation participation in a larger cross-country assessment in the Sahel region, which permits to enhance the overall size. In addition to this, the qualitative information that complements the quantitative analysis could have been enhanced by better triangulation and referencing of sources.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The summary is concisely written, presents an adequate description of the country context and includes a brief version of key findings. It also describes how the report is part of a multi-country evaluation for Resilience Learning in the Sahel. The essential features of the evaluation are well described. However, the executive summary should have included more information on the subject and the multi-arm evaluation design to serve more effectively as a comprehensive stand-alone document.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The subject of the evaluation is clearly described and the main activities are adequately explained. This includes the distinction between Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) versus Unconditional Cash Transfers (UCT). The section also provides details on the school interventions and gives the contextual background with respect to the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall, the main elements of country context are comprehensively provided. A more detailed background section on the existing scientific literature would have been valuable.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The purpose of the evaluation is carefully explained as well as its inclusion in a multi-country experimental evaluation with similar interventions across countries in the Sahel region. In addition, gender considerations are effectively included in the evaluation. As a minor weakness, one notes that the main users or stakeholders and objectives are not listed or identified explicitly.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation is based on a thoroughly planned randomized controlled trial, with two-treatment arms for livelihood support: conditional transfers, in the form of Food Assistance for Assets (FFA), and unconditional (cash) transfers (UCT). In addition, a school-based intervention is also embedded as a randomized trial. The baseline and endline are complemented by high-frequency data collection to estimate the impacts on food security and well-being dynamics over time. A pre-analysis plan was developed for the evaluation and data analysis. The RCT is complemented by non-experimental analysis of the relationship between the impacts and the distance to health/nutrition facilities. While the evaluation overall is adequately designed, it includes a relatively small sample size of clusters. For the education RCT there are only 15 intervention and 15 control schools, which makes the evaluation susceptible to small-sample biases. Sample size for the livelihood component is larger, but still relatively modest (23 and 24 in each arm with 29 controls). This is offset by the analysis being included in a larger cross-country evaluation in the Sahel region.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory

<p>The report provides an extensive and comprehensive discussion of the findings. They are transparent and all econometric results are presented in a clear and logical manner. While the exposition of the quantitative results is convincing and plausible, the qualitative insights, however, do not appear to be based on strong and triangulated evidence. In contrast to the quantitative findings with statistical confidence intervals, the qualitative insights appear anecdotal and should have been better supported and triangulated.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS/LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The conclusions comprehensively summarize the main findings by evaluation questions. They are logically derived from findings, clearly indicating which results can be causally attributed to the interventions, and which results reflect correlations, i.e. not necessarily causal. As a minor weakness, one may point out that sometimes the magnitude of the estimated effects is not explicitly discussed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>
<p>The Considerations for Future Programming are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. This section provides effective suggestions for programme modifications that should be considered. The section could have been improved, however, by making sure that considerations and conclusions are not presented in the same section, and by improving the clarity and targeting of the considerations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report is accessible and clearly written. All main estimation results are presented in graphs, which makes the report accessible to a lay audience. Technical details, e.g. the econometric methodology, are given in annexes. On the other hand, the list of references is incomplete and the qualitative insights from the qualitative interviews are given excessive space in the report.</p>		
<p><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></p>		
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>	
<p>The report meets the requirements and attains nearly all possible points. The impact evaluation incorporates gender considerations at all stages, from evaluation design, data collection tools and questionnaires, survey procedures, data analysis and presentation of the results and derivation of conclusions and considerations for future programming. The only weakness refers to the country context and background sections, which provides a detailed background on food security, but no detailed analysis of various groups or aspects relevant to gender equality aspects.</p>		