

Evaluation title	Évaluation finale du Projet « Solutions pérennes sociales pour les populations hôtes, les réfugiés et les migrants les plus vulnérables » à Djibouti, 2018 à 2024	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 95%	
<p>The report is overall a high-quality document that can be used with confidence to inform decision-making. The report emphasizes the inclusion of various groups through a participatory evaluation approach focused on utilization. Cross-cutting aspects such as gender, equity, and accountability to affected persons were considered. The findings present analytical statements that integrate evidence from various sources, moving beyond mere descriptive accounts. They are balanced and address both strengths and weaknesses of the project. The conclusions are correctly pitched at a higher analytical level, synthesizing evidence across various evaluation questions and criteria and are substantiated by, and logically flow from, the findings. The evaluation recommendations and sub-recommendations are actionable, coherent, forward-looking, and clearly aimed at fulfilling the evaluation's purpose.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary serves as a standalone document as it presents key messages in a concise and effective manner. The executive summary effectively summarizes the main evaluation conclusions and key messages, which are supported by relevant findings. The evaluation recommendations have clear linkages to the findings and conclusions. However, the executive summary could have been strengthened by including visual aids such as graphs and charts.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a context section that details Djibouti's low Human Development Index (IDH) ranking, poverty rates, and presents data on acute food insecurity, data on global acute malnutrition (MAG) and chronic malnutrition among children and women. The project's overall objective is described as to support the state's social safety net system for vulnerable host populations, refugees, and migrants. The geographic scope is clearly defined as well as the project's implementation period.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report clearly discusses the purpose and timing of the evaluation, its objectives and scope. The temporal scope of the evaluation is also stated, i.e., July 2018 - June 2024, along with its geographical scope, i.e., the two communes of Balbala and Boulaos, in Djibouti-ville. Inclusions and exclusions in the thematic scope are well outlined.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report reflects the way in which the methodology was informed by an evaluability assessment. An evaluation matrix is included which clearly describes the logical connections of the elements in a coherent way. Evaluation questions appear manageable, coherent, tailored to the Djibouti context, and were appropriate to meet the evaluation's objectives of accountability and learning. The evaluation integrates GEWE, equity, and accountability to affected persons. The methodology details the sampling frame and rationale. The report also discusses the ethical standards that were considered throughout the evaluation. However, no mention is made of the necessity to reconstruct a theory of change for the purpose of the evaluation, which is a major shortcoming.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation findings present analytical statements that integrate evidence from various sources, moving beyond mere descriptive accounts of information. They balance both strengths and weaknesses of the project. Findings address all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and they make good use of strong evidence to underpin the assertions made. The analytical findings are supported by specific, sufficient, and comprehensive evidence triangulated across different sources and methods. The report effectively incorporates information from various stakeholder groups</p>		

involved across gender and broader inclusion dimensions. Furthermore, the report identifies multiple unanticipated effects of the project, both negative and positive.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The report presents conclusions that are correctly pitched at a higher analytical level and go beyond a mere summary of findings. They are substantiated by and logically flow from the findings, without any major gaps, omissions, or new information not already included in the findings. Moreover, the report presents five lessons learned that contribute to wider organizational learning for WFP and guide future action. On the other hand, conclusions should not incorporate a recommendation, and a some of the lessons identified do not provide significant opportunities for learning.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents recommendations and sub-recommendations that are actionable and coherent. They are forward-looking, clearly aimed at fulfilling the evaluation's purpose of fostering learning and accountability. The recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation's findings and conclusions, with explicit linkages demonstrated in the mapping annex. The recommendations appear realistic and actionable, identifying responsible actors and offering a clear path forward. They are prioritized and include clear timeframes for their implementation.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report presents all of the mandatory elements including a table of contents with a logical outline of sections and, for the most part, accurate page numbers. Overall, the evaluation tells a consistent story with clear linkages between sections and annexes. Information is cross-referenced, ensuring coherence throughout the document. The report uses language that is generally clear and professional. However, the main report and executive summary exceed the maximum word count requirement and should have been further streamlined. Also, the report would have benefited from a final edit to correct the misalignment of page and paragraph numbers, as well as some passages with different font and size text.		

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	
While GEWE is not explicitly mentioned within the stated purpose and objectives of the evaluation, the evaluation scope explicitly states that gender was considered. While not reflected in a standalone criterion, it was mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria through a dedicated sub-question. The evaluation's mixed-methods design, along with its chosen data sources and analysis methods, are relevant and generally enable the evaluation questions to be answered in an impartial way which is appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations. Finally, recommendations include elements addressing GEWE, equity, and broader inclusion which are directly linked to findings and conclusions.		

Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard		
UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Misses requirements: 2 points	
Sub-question 4.3 mentions disabled persons: 4.3 To what extent have these intended and unintended effects of the project contributed to gender equality, women's empowerment, equity and inclusion in the broader sense (disability, etc.)? Furthermore, under Finding 1.3, it is stated that "The PSE support measures supported by the project, which consist of awareness sessions for beneficiaries on essential social practices (mostly focused on health and nutrition, but also on aspects related to children's education and care and services for the elderly or disabled)."		

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels		
Highly Satisfactory	<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>	

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
Satisfactory	<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>
Partly Satisfactory	<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>
Unsatisfactory	<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>