

<b>Evaluation title</b>	<b>Final evaluation of the USDA-supported Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) project in Kenya FY 2017-2020</b>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	<b>Decentralized Evaluation - Activity</b>	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory: 87%</b>	
<p>The final evaluation of the USDA-supported Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) project in Kenya is a well written report that can be used with confidence for decision making. A relevant methodological design featuring mixed data collection and analysis methods ensured effective triangulation of data. Findings are robust, balanced, and fully address all evaluation criteria and questions. Conclusions flow logically from the findings and provide a higher-level strategic perspective on the LRP, and recommendations are realistic, actionable, and clearly identify implementing actors. The GEWE dimension is mainstreamed throughout the evaluation findings, although not to the same extent in the conclusions and recommendations. Equity and wider inclusion dimensions could also have been addressed more fully in the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The executive summary provides a complete overview of the most salient features of the LRP evaluation, including details on the specific objectives, scope, methodology, as well as stakeholders, and the intended evaluation users. The five key findings are presented around the evaluation criteria and respond comprehensively to the most important evaluation questions. All nine recommendations are presented in brief and they establish clear links to the findings presented in the executive summary. The section would have benefited from the inclusion of better synthesized conclusions, which in the summary are too general and do not convey the same strategic value as those included in the main report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report presents a complete overview of the country context, citing authoritative sources and providing a very accurate description of the main socioeconomic characteristics of the Kenyan counties targeted by the intervention as well as of relevant national government policies and actions in such areas as agriculture, nutrition, and gender equality. The LRP itself is also well described, including its coverage, design, main objectives, activities, logical framework and main implementing partners. Moreover, pertinent details are included on the type of assistance provided, e.g., food commodities, capacity building, and the modalities of planned vs. actual transfers in terms of cash, in kind or vouchers disaggregated by year.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report provides a good description of the objectives, main users and the intended use of the evaluation. Moreover, the evaluation scope is described in significant detail, covering thematic, geographic, and temporal elements, as well as target groups. The evaluation report should however have explicitly described the overall purpose of the evaluation and the reason for conducting the evaluation at this point in time.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation methodology is generally well described, including the evaluation design, data sources, data collection, data analysis, and methodological limitations. The mixed-methods approach provided good triangulation and validation across diverse sources of information, including secondary and primary data from various data collection methods such as key informant interviews and focus group discussions. However, the evaluation matrix should have included specific evaluation sub-questions and more details on how the voices of the most vulnerable groups - including women - were captured. Mitigation strategies should also have been provided for the evaluation limitations and risks identified.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Findings are organized around the evaluation criteria and are substantiated by robust evidence which is adequately sourced and triangulated. They provide a balanced overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention based on the perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders and beneficiaries and clearly point out when evidence was inconclusive. Findings are presented in a way that does not compromise the confidentiality of respondents; language is neutral and does not suggest a bias. Contributions of WFP activities to results - or lack thereof - as well as internal and external factors affecting the achievement of intended results are clearly outlined.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents conclusions that are clearly linked to the evidence presented in the previous sections of the report, and do not introduce any information that was not discussed in the findings. Conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analysis, providing a strategic perspective on the results of the evaluation. However, the lessons learned identified are too specific to the LRP initiative, lacking broader relevance in different contexts, and thus limiting their utility for organizational learning.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents recommendations that are realistic, take into consideration WFP internal constraints and demonstrate a good understanding of the other implementing partners and users of the evaluation. Recommendations are clearly linked to the findings and conclusions and identify the specific actors that should be responsible for their implementation. However, they miss critical information on their level of priority and timeframe for implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report generally observes WFP requirements in terms of clarity, using precise and professional language without jargon or excessively complex sentences. The report provides sources for all data presented and quotes are cited in a way that does not compromise the anonymity of sources in sensitive cases. Moreover, authors make in general good use of visual aids such as graphs, charts, tables and maps to complement the information presented. However, the accessibility of the report would have been improved by highlighting key messages more effectively.</p>		

<b>Integration of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard</b>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 8 points
<p>GEWE considerations are effectively mainstreamed in the report. The report includes a context section that discusses and analyses the specific social groups affected by the intervention as well as the relevant normative and policy elements. Questions assessing the extent to which GEWE was integrated into the LRP project were included in the evaluation framework, although the report does not clearly outline how the evaluation set out to capture the voices of the most vulnerable groups. Moreover, the report presents unintended gender-related outcomes of the initiative and one recommendation refers to GEWE issues, although little information is provided on the specific actions that should be carried out to improve results in this area.</p>	

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>

<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i><u>Definition at overall report level:</u> Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.</i>
	<i><u>Definition at criterion level:</u> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i><u>Definition at overall report level:</u> Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.</i>
	<i><u>Definition at criterion level:</u> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>