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.
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.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS

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.

CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY

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.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

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.

Gender EPI

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

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%
Meets requirements: 60—74%
Approaches requirements: 50–59%
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%

Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports
7–9 points = Meets requirements
4–6 points = Approaches requirements
0–3 points = Missing requirements