**Quality Checklist for Decentralized Evaluation Report**

**[title of the Decentralized evaluation]**

**Version January 2024**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall** | | | |
| **General** | | **Comments/status** | |
| **Length**   * Report does not exceed 30,000 words, excluding executive summary; and annexes do not exceed 40,000 words. An additional 15 percent length is allowed for deliverables written in French or Spanish   **Accessibility**   * The report is written in a clear and accessible manner * The structure of the findings allow readers to understand evaluation findings * Key messages are summarized and highlighted * The report presents a good balance between descriptive and analytical information * Terminology is used correctly * The report is free from grammar, spelling or punctuation errors * Visuals, diagrams, charts and tables are used in a clear and accessible way * The language used in the report is simple and clear, without jargon and excessively complex sentences and acronyms are used only where essential * Relevant information that can be found in other parts of the report is adequately signposted   **Credibility**   * The tone of the report is constructive, balanced and politically sensitive * The report is objective and presents successes and failures, positive and negative sides in a balanced way * The language is precise and professional, with language that is appropriate for an official document, without room for interpretation * The report raises critical issues when necessary and does not avoid or hide problems * The report’s findings and conclusions are fully evidence-based. * The evaluation does not draw conclusions unless evidence clearly points to them | |  | |
| **Editing** | |  | |
| * WFP format and templates are applied * Acronyms are spelt out the first time they are used * Paragraphs and pages are numbered electronically * Sources are provided for all data and quotes * A table of contents is included and lists tables, graphs, figures and annexes * Tables and diagrams are used as relevant and are numbered * Annexes are numbered and cross-referenced in the main document | |  | |
| **Cover page** | |  | |
| * The cover page uses the WFP DEQAS report template/layout (this can be adjusted for joint evaluations) * The title of the decentralized evaluation is identical to that in the ToR (unless agreed otherwise) * The date and status of the report (draft/final) is indicated on the cover page | |  | |
| **Executive summary** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| The executive summary provides a complete and balanced synthesis of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations and contains:   * An introduction, which details the main features of the evaluation including evaluation type, period being evaluated and commissioning office * Purpose and objectives, main users/intended audience, context * The subject of the evaluation, including geographical coverage, beneficiaries and resources raised against budget * Main features of the methodology (including rationale, sources, data collection and analysis methods used, major limitations) * Key findings on all the evaluation questions * Overall summarized conclusions and recommendations, with clear links to findings presented * [Optional] If any lessons learned identified, key elements of learning derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions are clearly summarized. | * The executive summary is coherent, self-explanatory and self-contained. It can be used as a standalone aid to decision-making * The key findings form the largest part of the summary * All recommendations are presented in brief * Length does not exceed 2,500 words for CO-led DEs; and 3,000 words for RB-led and HQ-led DEs. | |  |
| 1. **Introduction** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| **1.1 Evaluation features** | | | |
| This section provides a succinct overview of the evaluation features, providing clarity on why and how the evaluation was carried out and includes:   * The purpose / rationale for the evaluation, including why the evaluation is taking place at this point in time * Specific objectives (e.g. accountability and/or learning). If more weight is given to a specific objective, it should be explicitly justified in the report * The scope of the evaluation, including any exclusions and reasons for them * Main stakeholders and users in the evaluationand how they will use the evaluation findings * A short presentation of the evaluation team, timing and duration of fieldwork | * Expected content is included and sets the scene for the evaluation * Information is succinct and focused * The content is sufficient to explain to readers how the evaluation was undertaken and to generate trust in the impartiality and credibility of the evaluation * Relevant annexes are cross-referenced | |  |
| **1.2 Context** | | | |
| This section provides a succinct overview of the surrounding context directly relevant to the evaluation including:   * Poverty, food and nutrition security * Contextual aspects relevant to, and necessary to inform an understanding of the subject of the evaluation: geography, demography, including refugees and internally displaced persons where applicable; disasters and humanitarian protection where applicable * Government strategy, institutional capacities, policies and priorities, including normative instruments related to human rights, gender equality and equity and wider inclusion considerations * National indicators (education, health, nutrition, agriculture, gender inequality index) relevant to the evaluation subject, disaggregated by sex. * Key data and trends related to SDG 2/SDG 17 in the context (region, country subnational/local level) * Humanitarian issues, including migration patterns and host community/social tensions * Gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the context, including an intersectional analysis of specific social groups * Key external events which led to significant changes in WFP’s work * Features of international assistance in the area * Other WFP work in the area * Related work of other key humanitarian/ development actors | * Information is sufficient to understand the implications of the context for the evaluation subject * Relevant indicators have been identified and latest trend data used * Information draws from and is consistent with the inception report, updated where appropriate * Information is explicitly geared to the evaluation subject, rather than being generically presented * There is a good balance between amount of details and synthesis * Authoritative or reliable sources are used | |  |
| **1.3. Subject being evaluated** | | | |
| This section provides a succinct overview of the evaluation subject, including factual information such as:   * Type of evaluation (activity, thematic area, transfer modality, pilot project) and subject * Geographic scope of the evaluation subject * Relevant dates: approval date; start date; end date * Presentation of the logic of the intervention/theory of change/logical framework and its key assumptions, including intended results (planned outputs, outcomes and where appropriate, cross-cutting). If no ToC, the evaluation team should have recronstructed it at inception stage * Planned and actual outputs and activities * Beneficiary numbers (planned and actual) disaggregated by sex/age/activity * Amount of planned and actual transfers (tonnage/cash/vouchers), disaggregated by year and by activity (if multiple activities). For DEs that focus on an activity, transfer modality or pilot project, the modalities of intervention are presented and discussed (e.g. capacity strengthening, service delivery, etc.). * Main partners (government; NGOs; bilateral; multilateral, private sector) * Resources (over time, resources allocated to each activity, percentage funded of total requirements) and key donors. If subject funded from pooled funds or is a component of an activity, show resource allocated to the subject of the evaluation * Analytical basis of the subject (needs assessment, past evaluations/reviews, gender/social inclusion studies that informed the design of the subject). Any amendments to initial design and rationale. Includes a summary of findings from previous related evaluations * Other relevant preceding/ concurrent activities/ interventions * Maps/graphs for illustration | * Expected content is included and information is relevant and important to understand the subject of the evaluation: * What it is * When it was designed * What are the key inputs (USD value) * What are the planned and actual outputs? (beneficiaries, metric tons, cash & voucher, USD) * What is the target/scope? * What are the planned and actual outcomes? * Who is involved in its implementation? * Highlights relevant evidence from past needs assessments, evaluations and reviews that are relevant to the evaluation * Gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the subject of the evaluation are explained * Differences between original design and implementation are explained if appropriate * The section is descriptive, not analytical: It does not pre-empt the analysis of the findings section * The section provides a starting point for further quantitative and qualitative analysis to be reported in the findings section | |  |
| **1.4. Evaluation methodology, limitations and ethical considerations** | | | |
| * Methodology used for the evaluation is summarized * Evaluation criteria applied to the evaluation are listed and justified (and if possible, interpreted for the subject), are consistent with the purpose/scope and explained in relation to context. If a particular criterion is not applied, justification is provided * The main evaluation questions are set out in relation to each evaluation criterion * An evaluation matrix is included, enabling systematic assessment against the evaluation questions * Gender, equity and wider inclusion considerations are mainstreamed across the evaluation questions where relevant * Specific data collection and analytical methods, data sources and sampling used (area and population, rationale for selection, representation) are provided, including how they addressed the diversity of stakeholders * Assessment of the strength of the intervention’s monitoring processes and data in relation to gender, equity and wider inclusion considerations are provided * Approaches to triangulation are included, with a description on how validity and reliability was addressed * Limitations of methods or data availability encountered, and mitigation strategies applied/implications for the findings are explained * Gender, equity and wider inclusion considerations for the data collection methods are explained * How the evaluation has considered and managed ethics, and what safeguards were in put in place during the evaluation are detailed. If the ToR/IR identified or anticipated any ethical issues, they are also explicitly addressed at this point * If relevant, how the analysis has been conducted against international humanitarian principles is explained here * Full details on the methodology and the evaluation matrix included in Annexes are given | * Information allows reader to understand how the evaluation was conducted * Methodological approach is comprehensive and presents a systematic approach that generates trust in the credibility of the evaluation * Methodological approach is coherent, logical and in line with the ToR and inception report * The evaluation matrix included (in annex), identifying context-specific sub-questions aligned with the main evaluation questions, as well as indicators, data sources, data collection methods and analysis methods for each sub-question and that allows for analysis of equity dimensions * Specific methods and sampling applied are relevant to the methodological approach and are feasible/appropriate * Analytical methods are described and generate confidence in the evidence base (how data have been analysed including description of validity and reliability of the evidence, triangulation) * Limitations and their effects on the evidence base are included, including how they were addressed * The methodology description explains how any risks arose to the methodology and ethical safeguards, and provides appropriate mitigation measures * Evaluation deliverables do not include any personal identifiable information * Full methodology is provided in Annexes and cross-referenced in the main report (updated from inception report in relation to its actual implementation). * Methods demonstrate consideration of gender equality and women’s empowerment, equity and wider inclusion | |  |
| 1. **Evaluation findings** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| * Findings are structured around the standard evaluation questions and corresponding subquestions as presented in the inception report * All evaluation questions and subquestions are addressed, and any gap as compared to the scope agreed in the IR should be justified * Limitations or gaps in evidence are presented * Indication is given of where evidence is inconclusive * Findings assess WFP's contributions to results (or lack of) while taking into consideration the implementation context and other effects produced. * Positive or negative unanticipated effects are described. | * Findings explicitly address all the evaluation questions, with no gaps or omissions (unless explained and justified) * Findings are transparently generated on the basis of triangulated evidence. Evidence has been checked for accuracy, consistency and reliability; it is identified and referenced (sources provided for data/quotes). No findings is based on unsubstantiated opinions * Findings take into consideration the perspectives from different stakeholder groups, and carefully consider gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions, including through the analysis of data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc. * Findings are presented in a culturally sensitive manner that respects the confidentiality, protection of source and dignity of those interviewed * Any limitation or gaps in the evidence base are clearly explained, and any places where the evidence is inconclusive are also explained * Findings are balanced, present both successes and failures and positive and negative sides * Findings are adequate to substantiate the conclusions and recommendations made by the evaluation team * Findings consider how recommendations from previous evaluations have been addressed or not addressed * Findings assess performance against international humanitarian principles (if applicable) * Visual aids are used in a clear an accessible way to illustrate the argument * The findings balance detail and synthesis | |  |
| 1. **Conclusions and recommendations** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| **3.1 Conclusions** | | | |
| * The conclusions provide a balanced assessment of both positive and negative evaluation findings. They may be organized by evaluation question, evaluation criteria or by theme * The conclusions bring the findings up to a higher level, connecting findings across different evaluation criteria and responding to the “so what” question (rather than simply summarizing the evidence) * The conclusions consider gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEWE), equity and wider inclusion dimensions | * Conclusions are substantiated by and follow logically from the findings, with clear and explicit linkage to them * Conclusions are succinct and present a conclusive picture * No new evidence is introduced that has not been presented in the findings * Conclusions are impartial and free of bias * Conclusions reflect both strengths and areas for improvements * Conclusions include recognition of different stakeholder groups, gender and equity aspects | |  |
| **3.2 Lessons (*optional*)** | | | |
| * This section of the report is optional in case the evaluation team has identified lessons worth noting but that do not lend themselves to concrete recommendations * Lessons contribute to wider organizational learning for WFP and partners * They can be positive or negative | * Lessons clearly build on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation * Lessons contribute to wider organizational learning in WFP and guide future action * Lessons have the potential for wider application and use beyond the context of the evaluation (this implies clearly identifying the conditions/ situation(s) for which they are valid) | |  |
| **3.3 Recommendations** | | | |
| * Short paragraphs describe up to 10 recommendations, which are all relevant to the subject of the evaluation * Recommendations are presented as per the table provided in the evaluation report template | * Are relevant and well aligned to the evaluation purpose and objectives * Address critical areas identified by findings with no gaps * Clearly and logically derive from findings and conclusions * Are internally consistent and take account of interdependencies * Are objective and constructive * Are sufficiently specific to be actionable and provide a clear direction of intended change, while at the same time leaving room for implementers and users to fine-tune their implementation approach * Focus on what action WFP can take (or other commissioners in the case of joint evaluations) * Orient towards actions that clearly deliver benefits in proportion to their costs * Address GEWE issues and priorities for action to improve GEWE and reflect, where appropriate, equity and inclusion dimensions * Are clearly targeted (should make clear/specify who should implement them) * Are prioritized (ten recommendations maximum and within those, distinguish between those that are high or medium priority) * Are concise (should not exceed 1,500 words) * Use active language * Are grouped /sequenced based on criteria (e.g. strategic/ operational) * Propose a clear timeframe for action * Have been subject to a do-no-harm and risk analysis | |  |
| **Annexes** | | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | | **Comments/status** |
| Annexes support and expand on text in the main report and do not include all working documents.  Mandatory annexes include:   * Summary ToR * Evaluation timeline * Methodology * Evaluation matrix * Data collection tools * Fieldwork agenda * Findings – conclusions - recommendations mapping * Key informants overview * Bibliography * Acronyms | * Annexes do not exceed 40,000 words * Mandatory annexes are all included * Additional technical annexes are relevant and necessary to supplement the main text * All annexes are listed, numbered and referenced where appropriate in the main report * Sources of quotations of interviews, focus group discussions and events should not allow for personal identification. The annex "Key informants’ overview” should not include any personal identifiable information and should include ONLY affiliation and/or indications on municipalities. | |  |