

Evaluation title	Regional Evaluation of WFP’s Contribution to Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean 2015-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Thematic	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory (93%)	
<p>The Regional Evaluation of WFP’s Contribution to Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean 2015-2022 constitutes a highly satisfactory report that users can rely on with a high degree of confidence. The report effectively summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale, and methodology, as well as information on relevant contextual developments before and during the evaluation period. Drawing upon a range of data sources and methods of data collection, including stakeholder consultations that also reached beneficiaries, the report presents clear and well-evidenced findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The evaluation effectively mainstreamed gender and broader inclusion considerations. It presents a set of relevant conclusions that synthesize findings across evaluation questions and discuss their strategic implications and puts forward relevant lessons. The report makes seven relevant, targeted recommendations that logically derive from the findings and conclusions. It uses clear, understandable language free of jargon and makes good use of visual aids to summarize key findings. Readability of the report could have been further strengthened by reducing its length, for example by omitting selected details, including in the recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary constitutes a clear, accurate and useful synthesis of the evaluation. It briefly captures key evaluation and contextual features, clearly summarizes the main evaluation findings and supporting evidence, presents a summary of the evaluation conclusions and lessons learned, and includes the evaluation recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a concise yet detailed overview of key contextual features relevant to the evaluation. It also presents relevant information on the subject, including an overview of the evolution of WFP's work on shock-responsive social protection systems and an overarching theory of change for this area of work. The report could have benefited from explicitly referencing relevant regional and national policies or strategies on social protection, and relevant normative instruments on gender equality and human rights. The description of the evaluation subject could have been strengthened by mentioning the main partners that WFP engages with across the targeted countries. The report might also have benefited from commenting on gender, equity, and inclusion dimensions of the subject of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly states the evaluation objectives and rationale, as well as the evaluation scope and the intended evaluation users and uses. The evaluation mainstreamed gender equality and human rights considerations into the two dual objectives of accountability and learning.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's theory-based mixed methods and utilization-focused approach, which employed elements of Outcome Mapping, as well as the methods of data collection and analysis are clearly described in the report and Annexes. They were appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in an unbiased way and allowed for effective data collection, including through consultations with a variety of stakeholders. Gender equality and broader equity and inclusion dimensions are addressed through a dedicated sub-question, and the report comments on the extent to which relevant monitoring data (including on gender equality) was available. The evaluation made meaningful use of the intervention's constructed theory of change and WFP's country capacity strengthening framework to guide data collection and analysis.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation clearly addresses all the questions and sub-questions in a. Supporting evidence is presented transparently, providing sources for all presented data and quotes, and using a neutral tone. The report discusses WFP contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way, considering contextual factors, including the COVID pandemic. The findings reflect the voices of different stakeholder groups from both inside and outside of WFP. The report might have benefited from stating more explicitly where, how, and to what extent WFP's work on shock-responsive social protection systems addressed recommendations from relevant previous evaluations.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions effectively synthesize evaluation findings across evaluation questions and reflect on the strategic implications of these findings for the future of shock-responsive social protection work in WFP LAC and beyond. The conclusions reflect both strengths and weaknesses of the reviewed area of work, do not introduce any new information, and include reflections on GEWE and broader inclusion dimensions.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation makes seven relevant, realistic, and generally actionable recommendations that are prioritized, include a timeframe for action, and identify responsible actors. The recommendations logically and clearly derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions and include suggestions for how to improve the integration of GEWE and inclusion considerations in future work around shock-responsive social protection systems. The recommendations section exceeds the word limit and could have been shortened by omitting detail especially from the sub-recommendations. They could further have been strengthened by assigning them with a more nuanced timeframe for action and reviewing their status as either strategic or operational.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report follows the WFP template for evaluation reports and includes all the required annexes and lists. It is written in clear, precise and professional language. It also makes good use of visual aids such as tables, figures, and textboxes to highlight key findings. The report provides sources for all data and quotes and uses cross-references when needed. Readability could have been strengthened by reducing overall report length, e.g., by using bullet points instead of narrative paragraphs and by omitting some detail. The report might also have benefited from: using more internal cross-references; using bold font more consistently and sparsely to emphasize observations; and presenting Annexes in the order that they are referenced in the main report.</p>		

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: 9 points
<p>GEWE considerations are well integrated into the report. GEWE was effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation framework and the evaluation matrix includes dedicated questions and indicators on GEWE. The report includes an assessment of the availability of information on GEWE and broader inclusion indicators. The evaluation methodology, data collection methods, tools, and approach to data analysis were gender responsive. This involved using a mixed-methods approach, conducting consultations with a diverse range of stakeholders, and considering ethical standards throughout the evaluation. The evaluation's background section includes an intersectional analysis of gender, equity, and inclusion issues, and evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations reflect GEWE and broader inclusion considerations.</p>	

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>