

Evaluation title	An evaluation of the effects and a cost benefit analysis of the GFD Cash Modality scale up (Cash Based Transfers for PRRO 200737) for refugees and host communities in Kenya	Evaluation report number	DE/KENYA/2017/004
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Kenya	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 63%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's General Food Distribution Cash Modality scale up for the refugees and host community in Kakuma and Dadaab Camp meets requirements. It starts with a good presentation of the evaluation subject and of the context and environment in which the intervention took place. It is based on a relatively robust methodology and provides a clear explanation of the key findings as well as of the successes and challenges of the intervention. Moreover, the evaluation accurately integrates Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women considerations both into its design and delivery. Nevertheless, the report would have benefited from a set of better targeted and more comprehensive recommendations.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
The summary provides a concise overview of the methodology and represents a comprehensive overview of the evaluation's key findings and recommendations. However, a few key elements are missing in the summary, including resources raised against the budget, an overview of the evaluation subject and an explanation of how the limitations affected the findings. Furthermore, the conclusions in the summary are not consistent with the conclusions in the main report.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
The overview of the evaluation subject is coherent and relatively comprehensive. It includes a clear and insightful assessment of the logical framework and a thorough assessment of the analytical basis. The evidence presented is also clearly identified and referenced. The section would have been improved if all figures were explained and if any changes to the original design of the subject as well as the rationale behind it were specified.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Meets
The report defines appropriate and realistic objectives. Contextual information around external environmental and political factors affecting food production and movement of refugees is provided, even though it is not always specific or relevant to the evaluation subject, or its implications for the evaluation findings are not always explained. The section also explains why the geographical scope of the evaluation has been revised (i.e. exclusion of Dabaab) vis-à-vis the original design. Clarifying the evaluation purpose, including the balance between its learning and accountability objectives, would have made the report more coherent.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The evaluation is based on a robust methodology. It employs a range of appropriate methods to collect data from several sources and address the evaluation questions. It thoughtfully considers the identified limitations and mitigation strategies to ensure they are addressed as comprehensively and meaningfully as possible. It would have been helpful to explain how the evaluation criteria were defined and applied in this evaluation, and to explain the standards and benchmarks that were used to assess the subject's performance.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The report provides a comprehensive and balanced overview of relevant evidence against all evaluation questions and each of the evaluation criteria. Enablers and constraints for the achievement or non-achievement of results in the implementation of CBT are clearly identified and ascribed. Gaps in evidence are identified in the limitations section (i.e. unavailability of data showing the number of actual CBT beneficiaries in each refugee camp). The cost-benefit of CBT for refugees, traders and host community households, as well as the cost-efficiency of the CBT modality, are well presented. However, the findings section does not consider wider effects such as influencing policies and legislation nor does it identify any unintended effects of CBT. Consequently, WFP's contribution to results are not made fully explicit.		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
<p>The conclusions flow logically from the findings and the information presented against each of the evaluation questions is consolidated according to the evaluation criteria. The conclusions also emphasise both achievements and challenges encountered during the intervention. However, the rating scale (i.e. high, medium or low) used to summarise the performance of the intervention against the evaluation criteria is not explained and it is not clear what judgements and considerations were applied when deciding on ratings. The value of lessons learned for wider organisational learning in WFP could also have been made more explicit.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Meets
<p>A strong awareness of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions is evident in all aspects of the evaluation. GEEW considerations are included in all evaluation questions and consistently embedded in the findings. Moreover, the report includes one recommendation specifically focused on strengthening gender mainstreaming and analysis in programming. However, data was not always sufficiently disaggregated and triangulated to measure the gender dimensions of indicators and there is no indication that data collection tools and implementation guidelines consistently enabled the collection of data from women and men in ways that avoided gender biases. Furthermore, equity dimensions such as ethnicity and language were not clearly defined and consistently applied throughout the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches
<p>The recommendations do not clearly address the evaluation purpose and do not follow up consistently on all findings and conclusions. While contextual factors/limitations that may impede their implementation are acknowledged, it is not clear who in the WFP Country Office and the Refugee Operations sub-office is responsible for leading and reporting on their implementation. Moreover, the section focuses mainly on addressing identified challenges associated with the delivery and monitoring of CBT, but no recommendation focusses on the continuation or strengthening of the positive results of CBT. Nevertheless, each recommendation has an implementation plan which outlines steps that need to be taken, as well as the priority, timeline and responsibility for implementing each step.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
<p>The report presents a balanced and objective assessment of the subject, using clear and professional language. Maps, figures and graphs (either in the report or in the annexes) are effectively used to illustrate or summarise information. However, key messages and findings can sometimes get lost or be obscured by long paragraphs.</p>		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	8

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
Meets requirements: 60–74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements