Evaluation title	Final evaluation of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) project in Senegal January 2020 - October 2024
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Partly Satisfactory: 59%

The findings presented in the report of the "Final evaluation of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) project in Senegal January 2020 - October 2024" can be relied upon and used for decision-making noting some shortcomings in the information provided. The report provides useful information on the context of the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative (R4) project in Senegal, including a reflection on relevant gender equality and inclusion issues. The evaluation findings provide useful disaggregated data on subscribers, beneficiaries, policyholders, and compensation by gender. In addition, the evaluation identifies unintended effects of the project. However, findings are not always supported by robust and triangulated evidence and sources are not consistently and clearly cited. In addition, some sub-questions are addressed relatively briefly or not at all. The description of the methodology does not appear to have been updated after the inception phase, making it difficult to ascertain if all key elements of the methodology were employed during the evaluation; furthermore, no evaluability assessment is included in the report. In general, there are clear links between findings, conclusions and recommendations. However, the recommendations do not always reflect resource constraints for their implementation. Finally, there are significant issues with respect to report accessibility and clarity.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	**Rating**	Partly Satisfactory

The summary concisely presents the key features of the evaluation, including the objectives, context and overview of the GCF R4 project in Senegal. The main evaluation findings and recommendations are included; however, findings could have been presented more clearly and concisely, and recommendations would have benefited from prioritization, information on timeframe, and a clearer presentation of the linkages to the findings and conclusions. The summary's usefulness as a standalone document is limited by a few factors, including lack of visuals and lessons learned, a too brief description of the methodology, and evaluation users and stakeholders not clearly identified.

CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	**Rating**	Satisfactory

The report provides a clear description of the external context for the R4 project including a reflection on gender equality dimensions in Senegal. An overview of the R4 project is provided, including a logical framework and reconstructed theory of change, as well as a breakdown of activities and beneficiaries. However, past evaluations and reviews are not discussed and a budget breakdown by activities is not provided. There is no clear rationale offered for the geographic targeting of the project and more could have been done to specify how gender and inclusion dynamics were mainstreamed within the project design.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	**Rating**	Satisfactory

The evaluation objectives and purpose are clearly identified as is the geographical scope and timeframe of the evaluation. However, the main users and stakeholders of the evaluation could have been further elaborated.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	**Rating**	Partly Satisfactory

The evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach, including both primary and secondary sources. However, it is not clear if the methodology was implemented as planned as the relevant annex was not updated to account for actual implementation during the evaluation, making it difficult to ascertain whether all key elements of the methodology were employed. The methodology section is missing several elements, including: i) how gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) considerations were integrated; ii) the results of the evaluability assessment and its implications on the evaluation design. Evaluation questions and sub-questions are outlined with the evaluation matrix and indicators and data collection and analysis methods are identified for each sub-question and are generally appropriate. However, some sub-questions are broad and appear to encompass multiple components which limits their utility and, there are some gaps in relation to missing or vague indicators and methods.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	**Rating**	Partly Satisfactory

While in a few instances evaluation findings use sufficient data triangulation to provide an analytical depth that serves the learning and accountability purposes of the evaluation, in many other instances it is not clear how/if multiple sources of evidence were used to substantiate the findings. The credibility of the findings would be greatly improved with a better practice of presenting evidence, as there are few instances in which primary and secondary sources are

clearly identified and cited, although these appear to be incorporated into the analysis. The findings per evaluation question are not clearly structured in relation to each sub-question, leaving room for potential inconsistencies and making it difficult to ascertain how findings aligned with the sub-questions of the evaluation. WFP's contributions to the R4 project are at times difficult to ascertain within evaluation findings as often WFP and "the project" appear to be collapsed into the same category. Disaggregated data is presented on a number of occasions and unintended effects are explicitly identified.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory

The conclusions follow logically from the findings and are presented without major gaps. GEWE and inclusion considerations are addressed in multiple conclusions. However, some conclusions are too expansive which limits their utility for strategic decision making. In addition, in some instances, conclusions could have been more concise to avoid repetition and improve their analytical rigour.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory

In general, recommendations logically and clearly derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They include a timeframe for action and identify responsible actors, with suggestions for how to improve the most important areas of the R4 project and better mainstream GEWE. However, resource constraints have not been clearly considered for some recommendations, limiting the ability to assess whether the recommendations are feasible and actionable in the context of Senegal and for the operations of WFP more generally. In addition, in some instances recommendations are very broad, limiting their utility for actionable response.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Partly Satisfactory

Although appropriate figures are referenced in the text, and visuals are well designed, there are significant accessibility and clarity concerns with respect to the report. These include misnumbering of sub-sections, a lack of footnotes and references in the main report to the annexes. Acronyms could also have been used more sparingly, and language could have been simplified in some instances.

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	Approaches requirements: 5 points

Gender equality is mainstreamed in the evaluation though a specific criterion and evaluation question and sub-questions on gender in relation to relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness. Nevertheless, there is no assessment of available project data in relation to GEWE and the methodology does not fully address how GEWE was integrated. While disaggregated data is used to support the findings, more could have been done throughout the findings to establish when evidence is being drawn from different sub groups, including persons with disabilities. The report includes one recommendation on strengthening the integration of gender and inclusion issues to maximise the project's impact.

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: 3 points

The terms of reference for this evaluation states that the evaluation should also determine the extent to which people with disabilities have been included and considered in project design and implementation. However, from available information, it does not appear that the evaluation team had experience with disability inclusion. In addition, the report does not indicate that stakeholder mapping and data collection methods were undertaken specifically involving persons with disabilities and their representative organizations; although findings related to coverage and targeting and integrating specific needs of people with disabilities are discussed. Two conclusions and one recommendation also present relevant information on disability inclusion issues.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	*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.*
	Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
Satisfactory	*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.*
	Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Partly Satisfactory	*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.*
	Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Unsatisfactory	*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.*
	Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.