

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Final Evaluation of the Joint UN SDG Funded Programme for Social Protection in Kenya 2020-2022	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 80%	
<p>The Final Evaluation of the Joint UN SDG Funded Programme for Social Protection in Kenya 2020-2022 is well written and provides credible findings that evaluation users can rely on for decision making. Descriptions of the context, subject of evaluation, the evaluation’s rationale, objectives, and methodology are comprehensive; however, the report would have benefitted from a clear statement on the scope of the evaluation, in terms of the time period covered, its geographic scope, or the specific activities and dimensions covered, its Findings are based on a mix of sources and are particularly strong in presenting interview data alongside information from secondary sources (such as documents and information from database). Overall, this illustrates a balanced and nuanced response to the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The exception to this, however, are the findings for a question related to the programme's efficiency, which would have benefitted from drawing upon financial data, to complement information gleaned from interviews and documents. Similarly, it is not clear why findings on programme performance do not draw upon any programme monitoring data. The evaluation conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction, and do not simply summarize the findings. They also present strategic issues emerging from the findings in a succinct manner that could potentially be useful for accountability and future decision-making. The evaluation’s recommendations are feasible, taking into consideration the implementation context and specify a timeframe for implementation. However, the recommendations would have benefitted from clearer identification of responsible actors and distinguishing between high and medium priority recommendations. The report demonstrates a relatively high level of integration of gender, equity, and inclusion considerations. Persons with disabilities are a key target population group, and the evaluation ensured that the evaluation questions, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations include a focus on disability inclusion.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary includes a clear, concise, and comprehensive summary of the evaluation findings, conclusions recommendations, and lessons learned. In particular, findings for nearly all sub-questions are included. This is particularly commendable for the question on effectiveness, for which there are many sub-questions. However, the summary would have benefitted from providing further details on the evaluation scope, rationale, and objectives. It would also have benefitted from further specifying the recommendations, i.e., prioritization, timeframe, targeting.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes a comprehensive overview of the key elements of the joint programme, in terms of its activities, thematic areas covered, implementation arrangements and main partners. The logic of the interventions through a Theory of Change visual, expected results, numbers of beneficiaries, planned activities and a budgetary overview are comprehensively presented, as well as a brief description of the effect of COVID-19 on the implementation of the programme. However, the report would have benefitted from briefly mentioning the analytical works that were conducted to inform the design of the programme.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report succinctly outlines the evaluation's objectives, of which two explicitly reflect gender, equity and inclusion considerations. The rationale of the evaluation is mentioned, as are the evaluation's main intended users. However, the report would have benefitted from a clear statement of the scope of the evaluation, in terms of the time period covered, its geographic scope, or the specific activities and dimensions covered by the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory

The report's methodology section is comprehensive and provides key information on all aspects of the methodological design, addressing the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention as appropriate. While the report does not mention it explicitly, its selection of data collection methods, including document review, semi-structured interviews, database confirmation, and its analysis of financial and quantitative data allows for triangulation of data sources. The evaluability assessment does not include an assessment of monitoring data on measuring progress on human rights and gender equality results, or broader equity and inclusion dimensions. More broadly, the report should have provided an assessment of monitoring data that would have informed how the choice of methodological approaches and data collection methods was made.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The findings include information that balances detail and synthesis in answering each question, with no inconsistency across findings. They draw upon several sources of data for substantiation, providing disaggregated data where possible. In particular, the report provides a comprehensive review of programme performance, disaggregated by target group, including people with disabilities, women, children, informal workers and workers involved in precarious employment, as well as an in-depth discussion of gender, equity and inclusion dimensions of the effectiveness of the programme, with a heightened focus on its effect on people with disabilities. The evaluation's findings, however, would have benefitted from discussing any positive or negative unanticipated effects. Findings for EQ2.1 would have benefitted from the inclusion of an analysis of performance reporting data. It is not clear why financial data was not presented or referenced in the findings related to programme efficiency.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
---------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The evaluation's conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction, presenting strategic issues emerging from the findings in a succinct manner that could potentially be useful for accountability and future decision-making. The conclusions are organized according by evaluation criteria, and logically flow from the findings. They are balanced, and reflect both positive and negative findings, and draw on evidence across all evaluation criteria. The conclusions cover gender equity and women's empowerment (GEWE) under Relevance, and wider equity and inclusions dimensions in the discussion of the Effectiveness of the joint programme. The lessons learned logically stem from the evaluation's findings and are formulated such that they have wider relevance and have the potential to contribute to WFP's organizational learning. However, the lessons learned would have benefitted from including more information that identifies conditions or situations for which they are valid.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The report presents 8 recommendations. With the exception of one, recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. Overall, they are feasible and take into consideration the implementation context. The recommendations also specify a clear timeframe. Two recommendations address GEWE issues and inclusion. However, the report would have benefitted from clearer identification of responsible actors, for example by labelling the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) as the lead entity, with the SDG Partnership Platform, and 'participating agencies' as contributing entities. Furthermore, the report would have benefitted from providing more detail on what is meant by 'participating agencies'. The recommendations would also have benefitted from having been distinguished between high and medium priority and grouped by type (operational vs. strategic).

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
-----------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The report is well written overall, using clear and professional language. It follows WFP template for ER and includes the requested lists and annexes. Relevant information is adequately signposted, and visual aids are utilized appropriately, with textboxes in findings serving to complement the narrative. Key finding statements serve to enhance the readability of the evaluation findings.

**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>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 7 points
--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------

GEWE is well integrated in the evaluation framework, with gender-disaggregated data collected and well reported. The evaluation's context section is a particular strength of the report in that there are dedicated sub-sections on GEWE in the Kenyan context. The evaluation's findings provide a comprehensive review of programme performance, disaggregated by target group, including people with disabilities, women, children, informal workers and workers involved in precarious employment. Furthermore, two recommendations address GEWE and inclusion issues. However, the evaluation's findings would have benefitted from the discussion of any positive or negative unanticipated effects, including on human rights and gender equality.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<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>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>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>