

Evaluation title	Thematic Evaluation of Cooperating Partnerships in the Eastern Africa Region 2016 - 2020	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Thematic	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 90%	
<p>The Thematic Evaluation of Cooperating Partnerships in the Eastern Africa Region 2016 – 2020 is a highly satisfactory report that 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 executive summary is clear and concise, including all essential elements. The report provides a good overview of the context and subject of the evaluation. The evaluation objectives of accountability and learning, with an emphasis on learning, as well as five specific objectives including one focused on gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) are clearly stated. The methodology outlined the two-tiered evaluation design that encompasses in-depth reviews of three countries and desk review ‘plus’ in the remaining six. Stakeholders were disaggregated by gender and stakeholder categories. Data limitations and mitigation efforts were made explicit. Findings are presented in a transparent and impartial manner, providing sources for most presented data and quotes, and using a neutral tone. Findings links to the relevant evaluation question and complement each other with no inconsistencies. The report presents five conclusions that are organized by themes with a mapping of findings – conclusions – recommendations in an annex. Six recommendations with sub-recommendations are well-crafted, grouped and prioritized with responsible actors clearly identified. The context/background could have been strengthened with an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the intervention. Findings could have better synthesized the views of key stakeholders.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary is clear and concise, including all essential elements, so as to be a standalone document for decision making. Key findings are well covered under each of the evaluation questions. The conclusions are concisely summarized, highlighting strategic implications of the findings. While recommendations are summarised, there is not explicit links to the findings.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context is presented in a clear and useful manner, presenting the overall East Africa context and countries’ specific details, as relevant. The evaluation subject is well described, presenting the logic of the intervention in a comprehensive manner. Detailed country information is presented is useful matrix, including governance typologies (fractured, weak or unified structures), needs based plan (NBP) amounts and number of cooperating partners by type. The report includes an overview of the analytical work that informed the design of the subject, noting the limitations and refers to a useful lessons learned exercise undertaken in 2018-2019. The report outlines the strategies and frameworks that have informed the evolution of WFP’s work in partnerships, including the 2016 Grand Bargain and the 2030 Agenda, as well as operational and strategic shifts in WFP’s approach to partnership during the period under evaluation. Gender inequality is mentioned as a significant factor in the gap in access to food. However, with regards to human rights and gender equality, the context/background does not include an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning, with an emphasis on learning, as well as five specific objectives including one focused on GEWE. Primary intended internal and external stakeholders and users of the evaluation are clearly identified and the rationale for the evaluation is explained. A reconstructed Theory of</p>		

Change, based on available documentation, was developed during the inception phase, and updated during the evaluation, including underlying assumptions, to illustrate pathways of change.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

The methodology outlined a two-tiered evaluation design that encompasses in-depth reviews of three countries and desk review 'plus' in the remaining six. The evaluation proposed to address three main evaluation questions. The country selection criteria and sampling were clearly outlined in the report and in an annex, as was a detailed methodology. The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact were applied. Questions or indicators related to coherence were included for two sub-questions and the evaluation explored the extent to which COs improved efficiency of contracting through increased use of fit-for-purpose FLAs. The evaluation drew primarily from qualitative data, employing (i) database mining, (ii) document and literature review; (iii) stakeholder interviews, and (iv) an online survey of WFP's cooperating partners in the nine focus countries, which was appropriate for answering all of the evaluation questions in a triangulated fashion. Stakeholders were disaggregated by gender and stakeholder categories. Data limitations and mitigation efforts were made explicit.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

Findings are presented in a transparent and impartial manner, providing sources for most presented data and quotes, and using a neutral tone. Each of the 21 findings links to the relevant evaluation question and complement each other with no inconsistencies. Strengths and weaknesses are presented in a balanced way and where evidence is inconclusive, it is clearly stated. Strong attention was given to important GEWE issues within the evaluation's scope throughout the findings. One finding specifically addressed unintended results of the shift in partnership practices on gender, equity and human rights dimensions. The findings also referred to guides and procedures that embodied previous recommendations. Findings would have been strengthened by synthesize the views of key stakeholders.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	----------------------------

The report presents five conclusions that are organized by themes illustrating the main elements of the new partnership approach. A mapping of findings – conclusions – recommendations is provided in an annex. The conclusion address core strategic considerations useful for institutional improvement, flowing logically from the findings and draw from learnings, do not contain any major gaps or omissions, and do not present any new information not already included in the findings. Conclusion 5 specifically addresses clearly GEWE-related and wider equity and inclusion dimensions.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

Six recommendations with sub-recommendations are grouped into either strategic or operational and prioritised, with responsible actors clearly identified. Recommendations are well-crafted, logical and pragmatic, taking into account contextual factors and WFP constraints, are internally consistent and aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives. While explicit references to previous recommendations are not highlighted, the report makes reference to guides and procedures that embodied previous recommendations. The recommendations exceed the word length.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	----------------------------

The report uses clear and easily understood, precise and professional language, without jargon or excessively complex sentences. In general, signposting is effectively used, such as footnotes to tie findings back to the evaluation questions. Sources are provided, and textboxes and visual aids such as tables summarize key information throughout the report. Annexes are listed in the order that they are referenced in the main report, follow WFP template, and do not exceed the word limit.

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	
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets requirements: 8 points

The evaluation incorporates gender equality and human rights considerations, with GEWE mainstreamed throughout. The overview presents gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the subject of the evaluation noting increased prioritization of women's and GEWE-mandated organizations and focus on GEWE minimum capacity standards for all partnerships. There is a specific objective that looks at gender transformation. Gender equality and equity-related questions and indicators were included in the evaluation matrix and data collection tools. Data was disaggregated by gender and CP type and an annex provides an overview of gender-related requirements in partnership management tools looking across three parameters from gender blind to gender transformation. The evaluation conformed to WFP and UNEG ethical standards and norms throughout the evaluation cycle. Two findings address gender-sensitive approaches in programming. One recommendation proposes a more intentional approach for gender transformative programming including 6 sub-recommendations on the how-to. The evaluation incorporates gender, equity and inclusion considerations appropriately, considering that it is an evaluation of an administrative mechanism, focuses on institutional transformation, and as such, does not take into account the perspectives of beneficiaries.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.