

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Country Strategic Plan for Kenya 2018-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>The Evaluation of Country Strategic Plan for Kenya 2018-2023 is of good overall quality and users can use with confidence for decision-making. The evidence base for the evaluation is clearly presented and includes identification of information gaps. Evaluation findings are based on multiple sources of credible and timely evidence that have been appropriately triangulated and can be reliably used to support decision-making. Conclusions and recommendations generally flow logically from findings while recommendations are prioritized and targeted for implementation within identified timeframes. The evaluation report and annexes are clearly structured and well written, with appropriate use of visual illustrations, and generally meeting WFP evaluation reporting requirements. Human rights, gender equality, equity and inclusion are incorporated in evaluation questions in the evaluation matrix and in the description of the methodology in annex, although it is unclear how and to what extent the methodology ensured that gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and the voices of diverse social role groups were represented during data collection. Moreover, the evaluation report would have greatly benefitted from more comprehensive and systematic attention to GEWE in evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation did not sufficiently build on conclusions and recommendations on GEWE, equity and inclusion from the mid-term Country Strategic Plan (CSP) review, while analysis on GEWE does not flow logically from findings through to conclusions and recommendations in the report. Recommendations would have been strengthened had they addressed two important areas highlighted in findings: internal logic of the CSP and indicators, as well as prioritizing programme investment choices in keeping with available funding and associated financial risks.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a clear and comprehensive overview of the evaluation purpose, scope, and users, as well as a description of the CSP in Kenya and its context. Evaluation findings are structured against all key evaluation questions, while key conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the findings. The presentation of the evaluation methodology could have been expanded with more emphasis on how GEWE, inclusion and the voices of different social groups were included, as well as more detail on data sources and data analysis.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report and annexes generally provide a clear overview of WFP's strategic shift to a CSP in Kenya including objectives, outcomes, activities, transfer modalities, intervention logic and assumptions. The report provides a rationale for the evolution in CSP design and implementation due to external factors and availability of funding. Planned to actual delivery is described in terms of beneficiaries, budget disbursement and transfer modality. The report's description of the CSP would have benefitted from an explanation of GEWE and broader inclusion dimensions/strategies.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The purpose of the evaluation is presented in the introduction to the report, while objectives and key evaluation questions are presented in the evaluation matrix, which is found in Annex 6. Evaluation questions 1.1 and 2.2 in the evaluation matrix address human rights, gender equality, and inclusion considerations. The Methodology section of the main report would have benefitted from a clearer presentation of evaluation objectives and key evaluation questions.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology is briefly described in the main report and further detailed in Annex 3. Annex 6 includes an evaluation matrix, which meets WFP requirements. The report also includes a comprehensive assessment of CSP monitoring data (and gaps), systems, and frameworks. However, the Methodology section could have included further details, such as a</p>		

description of the extent to which the methodology ensured that GEWE and the voices of diverse social role groups were represented in the data collection methods. Evaluation matrix sub-questions and evaluation findings do not reflect the type of analysis on gender mainstreaming that is presented in Annex 3.

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

Findings address both strengths and challenges of CSP performance in a balanced way, and make use of multiple sources of evidence, and respond to evaluation questions and sub-questions. Where data is missing or unavailable, it is discussed in the findings. There is very limited disaggregation of data by sex, age, refugee status, disability, geographic location in the majority of findings under Effectiveness (EQ 2) related to output delivery and outcome achievement. The treatment of GEWE, equity and inclusion is limited in findings on CSP relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency, with little discussion of how gender is mainstreamed, or how different beneficiaries and vulnerable groups might be experiencing or benefitting from WFP inputs differently. The discussion of unanticipated effects is sporadic rather than explicit in findings.

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

Conclusions are balanced, reflecting positive and negative aspects of CSP performance and summarizing key factors affecting CSP implementation. Conclusions connect key messages in findings across evaluation criteria to assess CSP performance at a more strategic level. Conclusions flow logically from findings and cover the major points raised with regard to CSP performance with an appropriate level of detail. Conclusions also address GEWE, equity and inclusion considerations. There are some elements raised in the conclusions, which are not present in the findings.

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

Recommendations flow logically from key findings and conclusions and the number of recommendations meets WFP requirements. Recommendations are clearly targeted to key stakeholders within the Country Office, are categorized as strategic or operational and prioritized with proposed timeframes for implementation. The report includes a recommendation focused on gender equality, equity and inclusion. It is unclear how recommendations address decision-making with regard to the prioritization of investments in the next CSP given the ongoing funding constraints and associated risks. The recommendation related to gender equality does not flow logically from the evidence provided in the findings and conclusions.

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

The report is well written, clearly structured and easy for the reader to navigate. It meets WFP criteria for length. Evidence is appropriately sourced, and information provided in annexes is cross-referenced. Key findings related to CSP performance associated with each evaluation question are highlighted in bold, although the report would have been strengthened with highlighted identification of best practices. Required annexes are appended in Volume II and referenced in the main report. However, not all annexes are referenced sequentially in the report.

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: 7 points
--	------------------------------

While not reflected in a specific evaluation objective, equity, gender equality, inclusion and protection considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation framework, including one evaluation question and sub-questions related to relevance and effectiveness. GEWE considerations and the disaggregation of data by sex could have been more broadly mainstreamed in the evaluation matrix beyond EQ 2.2. There are few details on how gender equality is addressed in the methodology and the evaluation findings do not reflect the type of analysis on gender mainstreaming that is proposed in the methodology annex. There is very limited disaggregation of data by sex in the majority of findings under related to CSP effectiveness. The discussion of unanticipated effects does not include a reference to GEWE. Recommendations address GEWE. The report recommends to "strengthen implementation of the commitment to gender transformation and inclusion through better analysis, design and resourcing." While this is a worthy aim, it does not flow logically from the evidence provided in the findings and conclusions, which do not raise any particular issues or needs with regard to Country Office gender mainstreaming, staffing and resourcing.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<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>
Satisfactory	<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>
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>