

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación final Proyecto de “Resiliencia Climática de los hogares rurales del Corredor Seco en Nicaragua (Nueva Segovia, Madriz y Estelí)” Agosto 2020 – Marzo 2025	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 93%	
<p>The <i>Evaluación final Proyecto de “Resiliencia Climática de los hogares rurales del Corredor Seco en Nicaragua (Nueva Segovia, Madriz y Estelí)”</i> is a high-quality report that can be used with confidence for decision-making. It presents information clearly and coherently, providing a thorough overview of the country context tailored to the climate-resilience focus of the project under review, with an appropriate balance of synthesis and detail. The report provides a concise overview of the project’s relevant features, followed by a clear articulation of the dual purpose of accountability and learning. The methodological design, data collection methods, data sources, and analysis methods are generally relevant and designed to answer the evaluation questions impartially, relying on mixed sources and techniques. The findings present clear analytical statements that triangulate evidence across multiple sources. The findings effectively presenting both the project's successes and areas for improvement in a constructive manner with a view to improving the project's and WFP's work in the country. The conclusions are well substantiated by the findings and offer higher-level analytical insights that can contribute to strategic decision-making. The lessons learned similarly provide concrete contributions towards organizational learning. The recommendations are actionable and provide a clear path forward for WFP including strengthening multi-level action, prioritizing women's empowerment, strengthening information management, etc. However, the executive summary could have been further improved by presenting all sub-recommendations and including the level of prioritization and implementation timeframe. In addition, findings are quite numerous and could have been streamlined by merging closely related findings to create a more concise and manageable set.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary effectively summarizes the evaluation’s main findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. It presents succinctly the evaluation rationale and objectives, its scope, and its key stakeholders and intended users. The conclusions highlight the core messages emerging from the main findings, are well substantiated, and effectively strengthen the executive summary as a standalone document. The recommendations are generally supported by the summarized findings and conclusions, maintaining internal consistency for a standalone document. However, the executive summary could have been further improved by presenting all sub-recommendations and including the level of prioritization and implementation timeframe.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context section appropriately addresses relevant aspects related to the evaluation subject, including disasters and humanitarian protection, and clearly highlights the region's vulnerability to climate shocks. The report also identifies specific disadvantaged groups, with a primary focus on small producers and women in the Dry Corridor. In addition, it offers a concise overview of the essential aspects of the evaluation subject and explicitly references the reconstructed theory of change, including planned outputs and outcomes.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly explains the rationale of the evaluation and its dual purpose - accountability and learning. The temporal and geographic scope are clearly defined. The objectives include assessing performance and achievement of result and examination of gender gap reduction in addition to extraction of lessons learned for future actions concerning the resilience of small producers and their organizations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation questions are appropriate to meet the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The methodological design, data collection methods, data sources, and analysis methods were generally appropriate and conducive to answering the evaluation questions impartially. The evaluation applied mixed methods and systematically triangulated</p>		

data across multiple sources and techniques. The evaluation matrix effectively outlines the logical connections between the methodological elements in a coherent and structured fashion.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The findings present clear analytical statements that triangulate evidence from multiple primary and secondary sources, effectively telling the story of the climate resilience project results and presenting both successes and areas for improvement. The report also presents unintended results – both positive and negative – including those related to gender equality. However, the presentation of 48 separate findings potentially dilutes key messages for decision-makers. Some findings, such as those covering policy alignment, water impact, or sustainability fragility, could have been merged to enhance conciseness and readability.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The conclusions are pitched at a higher analytical level and effectively inform strategic decision-making. They are well substantiated and flow logically from the findings. The report also presents six lessons learned drawn from project implementation that are relevant, clearly formulated and contribute to wider organizational learning. The lessons are relevant with potential for application across wider contexts. However, the conclusions do not sufficiently capture the notable absence of a gender approach in the design of the project, which represents a gap that could have been more explicitly highlighted.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents five main recommendations that are clearly and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions, offering a coherent path forward for WFP. The prioritization of the recommendations is clearly articulated and appropriately specific. Recommendations also address gender equality and women’s empowerment as well as broader equity and inclusion considerations.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The report narrative follows a logical progression, moving coherently from the context and subject overview through the evaluation methodology and findings to the conclusions and recommendations. The report consistently uses visual aids to convey key information and clearly highlights findings and conclusions for ease of reading and quick comprehension. The report uses footnotes appropriately for citations and contextual information. However, the report could have been enhanced by reducing the number of acronyms and findings, both of which negatively affect readability.		

<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>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements
The methodology uses data collection and analysis methods that are highly appropriate for evaluating GEWE. The report identifies specific disadvantaged groups - such as small producers and women in the Dry Corridor – and explicitly recognizes gender as a key intersecting factor contributing to marginalization. The mixed methods approach is gender sensitive, and the findings triangulate data from a diverse set of data sources, including women beneficiaries. Conclusion 8 explicitly reflects GEWE-related aspects and wider equity and inclusion dimensions and maps directly to Recommendation 3 which calls for intensifying efforts in women's empowerment through greater participation in decision-making within the home, cooperatives, and communities.	

<b>Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard</b>	
<b>UN-DIS individual evaluation score</b>	Misses requirements
Overall, the consideration of disability inclusion within the evaluation is limited and uneven. While disability inclusion is explicitly addressed disability under evaluation sub-question 6.1, disability inclusion considerations are limited within the evaluation terms of reference and stakeholder mapping, and data collection did not systematically involve persons with disabilities or their representative organizations. Although the findings acknowledge the lack of consideration of	

persons with disabilities in project design, this evidence was not carried through to the conclusions or recommendations.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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.