

Evaluation title	Evaluación formativa del piloto de la Política de Compras Locales y Regionales de Alimentos en América Latina y el Caribe (abril 2021 a diciembre 2023)	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 94%	
The <i>Evaluación formativa del piloto de la Política de Compras Locales y Regionales de Alimentos en América Latina y el Caribe (abril 2021 a diciembre 2023)</i> can be used with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report presents information in a very clear fashion providing a thorough overview of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and a good description of the methodological design, including limitations and mitigation strategies. Findings are a particular strength as they successfully tell a story that is both clear and informative, based on triangulated evidence from multiple sources. Findings directly respond to the main evaluation questions and address all sub-questions with an appropriate balance of detail and synthesis. However, the report could have been strengthened by presenting any unintended positive or negative results of the pilot programme. Conclusions are generally pitched at a higher analytical level and capture the most salient takeaways to inform strategic decision-making. Recommendations are forward-looking and provide WFP with actionable steps and a strategic roadmap for the next phase of the LRFPP's implementation.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
The executive summary effectively presents key messages in a concise manner. It provides information on key evaluation features such as the evaluation objectives, scope, and methodology, and provides a brief overview of the context and subject of the evaluation. Conclusions and key messages in the executive summary are supported by the findings. Recommendations are concise and provide information on their prioritization, targeting, and timeframe.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation report includes a thorough analysis of key contextual aspects relevant to the LRFPP. The information provides a balanced synthesis of details and sufficient information to understand the implications for the LRFPP pilot. A clear picture of the pilot project is presented along with its objectives and the underlying logic. The report identifies several marginalized groups relevant to the evaluation subject and the evaluation methodological design considered the inclusion of all these groups, with the exception of persons with disabilities (see UN-DIS criteria below). The description of the LRFPP would have benefited from a clear description of planned versus actual transfers.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report clearly explains the purpose and timing of the evaluation, along with its objectives and scope. The evaluation is a formative assessment with the specific objective of determining the degree to which the tools used have contributed to improved access of small-scale farmers and their organizations to both public and private markets.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation employed a mixed-methods approach informed by an evaluability assessment, with a primary focus on qualitative data, which is appropriate for a formative evaluation. The sampling frame included a diverse range of key stakeholders, including WFP staff, government officials, private sector partners, and small-scale farmers, providing multiple perspectives. The use of interviews and focus groups allowed for in-depth exploration of the evaluation questions. The methodology is also transparent about its limitations and mitigation strategies. The evaluation adhered to key ethical principles, including informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity, among others.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
Findings directly respond to the main evaluation questions with clear analytical statements underpinned by robust evidence from multiple sources, including WFP documents, external studies, and key informant interviews and focus groups. They provide a consistent balance of detail and synthesis and are based on triangulated evidence from various stakeholder groups. Additionally, when identifying causal linkages, the report takes into account the broader context		

and the contributions of other actors. Findings could have been strengthened by identifying and presenting an analysis of any unexpected positive or negative effects of the pilot.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
Conclusions are generally pitched at a higher analytical level and capture the most salient takeaways to inform strategic decision-making. They connect the dots across findings, and reflect gender and wider equity and inclusion dimensions.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
Recommendations are forward-looking and provide WFP with actionable steps and a strategic roadmap for the next phase of the LRFPP's implementation based on findings and conclusions. They are prioritized, with clear timeframes. There are no notable weaknesses in the recommendations.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report is concise and uses clear, professional language, with sources and supporting evidence clearly presented through footnotes and annexes. The flow is logical, and cross-references are used effectively to refer the reader to further information on a number of issues.		

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
GEWE considerations are consistently integrated throughout the report beginning with the evaluation scope and methodology. The report details how a GEWE approach was integrated into the methodology, including data collection and analysis, to ensure that the evaluation systematically examined the pilot's impact on women and other vulnerable groups. For example, the report notes a specific effort to include women in focus groups with farmer organizations, but it also transparently discusses the challenges faced in this regard. Specific recommendations addressing GEWE and broader equity and inclusion issues are provided which are linked explicitly to the findings and conclusions. Unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality are not discussed.	

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
Disability considerations are not well integrated in the evaluation report, perhaps because the evaluation terms of reference did not pay sufficient attention to this issue. Consequently, evaluation questions did not cover different aspects of disability inclusion, the methodology did not involve persons with disabilities, nor do the findings, conclusions, and recommendations reflect disability inclusion.	

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.

	<p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</p>
--	---