

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy Evaluation	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	OEV/2018/003
<b>Type</b>	Policy evaluation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Centralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Global	<b>PHQA date</b>	November 2019
<b>Overall category – Quality rating</b>		<b>Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating</b>	
<b>Meets requirements: 74%</b>		<b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>	
<p>The Evaluation of the Safety Nets Policy largely meets requirements. Overall, the evaluation is well-written, contains the key information and is highly accessible. The report includes several examples of good practices. The overview of the evaluation subject, evaluation context, purpose and scope and methodology sections are well detailed and comprehensive. Findings are nuanced, with positive findings consistently framed against their challenges and links to diverse evidence sources made. The recommendations are clear, specific, actionable, and targeted. However, there are a few aspects which could have further enhanced the report, including the presentation of the conclusions section by evaluation question or criteria rather than as a SWOT analysis and greater attention to gender and equity issues throughout the evaluation.</p>			

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
Overall, the summary contains an appropriate level of detail on the type, scope and period of the evaluation, as well as the methods applied. The description of the evaluation subject is complete, and the key conclusions and recommendations of the report are set out comprehensively. However, the summary does not explicitly refer to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, the commissioning office/unit within WFP or the users of the evaluation. The findings could have been synthesized more succinctly to fit within the expected length of the summary.		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The overview provides a detailed assessment of the evaluation subject, including the scope of the evaluation and a comprehensive assessment of the reconstructed theory of change. The stakeholder analysis undertaken for the report is thorough, maps out and considers a wide range of internal and external stakeholder groups and their varying levels of understanding and interest in the scope of the evaluation. Some additional analysis of WFP's work in this area and a more developed overview of the analytical basis for the Safety Nets Policy with reference to the wider evidence base could have further strengthened this section.		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The report provides a relevant and relatively comprehensive analysis of the evaluation's context, including a detailed history of WFP's policies on Safety Nets and Social Protection to clearly frame the policy context. There is also a valuable discussion of international practice and discourse surrounding social protection and social safety nets, and the challenges surrounding multiple definitions of social safety nets. A comprehensive, and useful description of the different users and stakeholders of the evaluation is also provided. More insight on how external events may have benefited the policy results, as well as more explicit definition of the scope in terms of activities and programme areas covered would have enhanced the quality of this section.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The evaluation report provides a detailed description of the evaluation's data collection and analysis methods, with a comprehensive methodological annex. The approach taken for constructing a theory of change and applying it to each core activity of WFP is also well described. The evaluation matrix allows for systematic analysis of all evaluation sub-questions and integrates good practice standards. A more detailed description of mitigation of risks in data collection and analysis would have further enriched the methodology section.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The report clearly explains WFP's contributions to results through the policy and indicates where evidence has enabled the evaluation team to derive findings and where the evidence is inconclusive. The narrative consistently links back to the theory of change that was developed for the evaluation in order to support the evaluation findings. The strengths and weaknesses of the policy's effectiveness are presented and previous evaluations are explicitly referenced in the text. Findings are derived from mixed methods, particularly document review, key informant interviews and case studies. However, this section could have been further strengthened through more explicit reference to the evidence, citing specific policies or drawing on quotes		

<p>from key informants, explicitly signposting the evaluation questions, as well as a discussion of any unintended consequences. Moreover, while the issues surrounding uptake and use of the policy and the challenges resulting from lack of clarity in the definitions are discussed, the link to results is not always clear.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
<p>The report presents a balanced conclusions section, framed as strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Conclusions are generally derived from the findings and refer to evidence from the findings without introducing new evidence. However, presenting the conclusions section as a SWOT analysis rather than by evaluation theme or question, requires the reader to piece together the evidence.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Approaches</b>
<p>While gender and disabilities are explicitly included in the overall objectives of the evaluation and the background section discusses links to the gender policy, the report does not provide a robust assessment of the gender and particularly the equity dimensions of the policy. The evaluation approach does not provide insight into unintended effects on human rights and gender equality, or indeed how the policy achieved results that may have differed by gender or group. There is limited explicit mention of human rights considerations and equity dimensions are virtually absent from the discussion, apart from mention of the policy's limited coverage of persons with disabilities. Nevertheless, gender has been mainstreamed into the evaluation criteria and included in two sub-questions, and there is some consideration of gender analysis in the indicators and measures of progress included in the evaluation matrix.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
<p>Recommendations are aligned with the evaluation's purpose and objectives and are well constructed with a clear rationale that exceeds standards. The recommendations are specific and actionable, with the responsible actors and timeframe clearly stated. There are very strong and explicit linkages to findings, which help to address all of the critical areas identified in the findings.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
<p>The report is well written and contains all the key information, as well as summaries of the key messages. The use of headings and signposting of findings as well as visual aids enhances the accessibility of the report. Sources are provided for all data and the report is highly accessible. Nonetheless, there are a few adjustments that could have further enhanced accessibility, including more explicit linkage of the conclusions to the findings and recommendations to ensure a logical flow, and reduced report length.</p>		

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

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