

Evaluation title	Somalia: An Evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2012-2017)	Evaluation report number	OEV/2017/013
Type	Country Portfolio Evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Somalia	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 61%		Approaches requirements: 6 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's Portfolio in Somalia between 2012 and 2017 is a balanced and well written report. It describes clearly the interventions and strategies of the portfolio, including programmatic shifts in response to gender, protection and in-country assessment 'policies'. Findings address almost all evaluation questions and the report provides interesting lessons that are relevant for the wider organizational learning. Even though an assessment of gender dimensions and humanitarian principles was included it could have been mainstreamed systematically throughout the report. Finally, while the recommendations were highly relevant, they could have been made more realistic and time-bound through the introduction of additional iterative steps.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
The report summary is excessively long while at the same time it provides only a high-level overview of the evaluation purpose, subject and context and minimal details of the methodology and lacks an explanation of the rationale and analysis methods. Main users of the evaluation are not listed in the section. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations, however, are appropriately summarised.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Approaches
The overview outlines the different WFP interventions between 2012-2017 but does not explicitly link them in relation to shifts in the external context. The intended results of the portfolio operations are not systematically described, and main partners are not discussed. There was no attempt to develop/reconstruct a logic model for the 'portfolio' in this section. On the positive side, despite the significant challenges related to data availability, the overview appears to be based on relevant and well-evidenced sources. Finally, the section includes an overview of national and UN policies and their shift over time as well as of WFP strategies and Policies that span the period.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The context section focuses on key areas of WFP intervention, and is based on reliable and up-to-date regional and national-level data. It provides a comprehensive overview of the policy context over the time covered by the evaluation, and states explicitly the purpose, scope, rationale, and main users of the evaluation. An analysis of the key external factors impacting the portfolio is provided and the challenges to deliver humanitarian aid are identified. The section would have benefitted from a greater level of detail on the education and agriculture sector in Somalia along with specific analyses on equity dimensions for internally displaced persons (IDPs), children, and people living with HIV/ AIDS.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Approaches
The evaluation matrix is partially incomplete and lacks substantive elements such as performance indicators, data collection and analysis methods. Sampling is not explicitly referenced and is only addressed in relation to diversity of stakeholders and gender and protection, not addressing other key aspect of the portfolio such as the activities and geographical distribution. Whilst the section indicates several limitations, it does not provide details on mitigation efforts. On the positive side, the evaluation criteria selected are relevant to the purpose and scope of the evaluation and evaluation questions are well-defined and aligned with the criteria.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
Findings address most evaluation questions, consider recommendations from several previous evaluations and are presented in a balanced way. The report provides an interesting assessment of strategic alignment across the different portfolio activities. The section identifies gaps in the evidence base, several unintended effects as well as several enabling (e.g. leadership) and constraining (insecurity, logistical delays, donor funding and conditionalities) factors, which make it very rich and interesting to read. Some assessment of WFP contribution to the national humanitarian and development contexts is provided, including the prevention of famine and the engagement on supporting national social security systems.		

Nevertheless, the credibility of findings could have been strengthened through triangulation of sources, stronger linkages to the evidence base, and an analysis of coverage vis-à-vis other actors' engagement.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
Conclusions flow logically from the findings and analysis and are presented in a balanced manner. They provide an effective summary of the evidence gathered for each evaluation question even though there is limited reference to evidence relating to coherence of education and resilience programming, or to organisational capabilities and performance on gender and protection. Lessons are, for the most part, correctly identified and are appropriate for wider organisational learning.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
Whilst the methodology was designed to give voice to women and different stakeholders, beneficiaries and stakeholders' voices were not clearly disaggregated during the data collection and analysis phases. Several equity dimensions are identified and incorporated into the evaluation, but these are not systematically analysed across all vulnerable groups. Nevertheless, GEEW dimensions were included in all evaluation questions and considered across findings, conclusions and recommendations, particularly in relation to targeting, participation, protection (gender-based violence) and decision-making.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches
Recommendations are of mixed quality, with some being broadly feasible, specific and actionable, and other being overly ambitious and very broad. Overall, the section could have benefitted from a different organization of recommendations: grouping them by priority would have enhanced the quality and utility of the section. On the positive side, they derive clearly from the analysis and conclusions and are relevant to the evaluation's purpose and objectives.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
The report uses a clear and easy to understand language, as well as an appropriately balanced and objective tone. It is logically structured and sequenced with clear linkages between sections. However, beyond the use of headings and sub-headings, key messages are not distinctly summarised or emphasised and some graphs are unclear. Finally, both the summary and the report exceed WFP requirements in length.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI score	6

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