

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of Promoting Self-reliance with Livelihood, Asset Creation and Resilience Interventions in Uganda 2020 - 2023	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Thematic	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The Evaluation of Promoting Self-reliance with Livelihood, Asset Creation and Resilience Interventions in Uganda 2020-2023 constitutes a satisfactory report that provides credible findings and recommendations which decision makers can use with confidence. It clearly summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale and methodology, and provides information on the evaluation subject context. Findings on main evaluation questions are supported by evidence and draw upon a variety of secondary and primary sources. The report puts forward a set of conclusions connected to the findings and presents seven prioritized and, largely, actionable recommendations. It is written in clear, professional language and is free from bias. It uses visual aids, such as tables and figures, to complement narrative parts. The report could have been enhanced by: (i) further strengthening the evaluation methodology by stating if and how the evaluation used the theory of change for WFP Uganda's work in the reviewed area, and by developing a more explicit framework for assessing WFP effectiveness in relation to self-reliance/resilience in Uganda given the absence of one; (ii) improving how conclusions and recommendations flow from the presented findings, and that all recommendations are specific, actionable, and realistic given WFP internal and external contexts; and (iii) refining the use and referencing of figures and tables.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary presents key evaluation features and relevant context information, and adequately summarizes evaluation findings in relation to the main evaluation questions. It presents an appropriate overview of conclusions and recommendations. However, it could have been significantly strengthened by omitting some descriptive detail and summarizing key findings in a more succinct manner. It would also have been helpful for the summary to state why the evaluation was conducted at this point in time.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a solid and informative overview of relevant features of the context and a helpful description of the subject. The context includes providing definitions of relevant concepts which help readers understand the subject of the evaluation. The section could have been further strengthened by including information on relevant education indicators, commenting on any changes in WFP's or other development actors' work due to external events, and providing a more explicit intersectional analysis of different social groups affected by the intervention. The description of the evaluation subject could have benefited from providing beneficiary numbers disaggregated by sex, elaborating on wider equity and inclusion dimensions of the evaluation subject beyond gender, and presenting the evolution of the intervention over time in response to contextual changes.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly states the evaluation objectives, purpose, and scope. Gender equality and human rights were mainstreamed under the evaluation's dual objectives of accountability and learning. The report could have been further strengthened by explicitly stating why the evaluation was conducted at this time.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed qualitative and quantitative data collection approach, including participation of intervention beneficiaries, was relevant and appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. The report comments on the availability of relevant monitoring data and identifies limitations and mitigation strategies. In absence of a 'self-reliance' framework, the evaluation would have benefited from describing more clearly how it assessed success and progress in this regard. It would have been helpful for the evaluation to state whether and how it used the reconstructed theory of</p>		

change to inform data collection and analysis. Finally, the assessment of effectiveness could have benefited from ensuring that evaluation questions clearly specified the results against which performance would be assessed.

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

The report addresses all the main evaluation questions, presenting evidence-based strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated interventions. The report discusses WFP contributions to results considering contextual factors and reflects the voices and views of different stakeholder groups. It could have been further strengthened by consistently synthesizing individual points of evidence into higher-level analytical findings. This would have been especially useful in the section on effectiveness which should have used a clearer framework for assessing WFP contributions to self-reliance and resilience due to the absence of a formally approved WFP guiding framework. In several cases, the report might also have benefited from omitting descriptive detail. Claims about WFP contributions to results would have benefited from a more nuanced use of evidence and/or by grounding the analysis in the retroactively designed theory of change.

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

The evaluation report presents a set of balanced conclusions that connect findings across evaluation questions and, in most cases, discuss their strategic implications. However, conclusions could have been strengthened by avoiding repetitions and ensuring that all key messages are fully supported by the presented findings. The 'lessons learned' and 'best practices' could have more fully demonstrated potential for contributing to wider organizational learning in WFP.

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

The recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, and are, for the most part, targeted, specific, and actionable. In a few cases, the report could have benefited from further clarifying the link between recommendations and related findings, ensuring that all recommendations are fully feasible/realistic and that only one main (responsible) actor is named for each recommendation. Additionally, the recommendations could have been strengthened by explicitly considering not only GEWE but also broader equity and inclusion issues.

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

The report is generally written in clear language that is accessible to readers familiar with development and humanitarian work. It appropriately references information that can be found in other parts of the report and uses many visual aids to convey information. It uses explicit 'key findings' statements to summarize main messages and includes all required Annexes. The report could have sometimes used simpler language for enhanced accessibility.

**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
--	------------------------------

Gender considerations are effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis and across the evaluation criteria. The evaluation matrix included questions and sub-questions that address GEWE issues. The evaluation approach and methodology were gender-responsive and ethical standards were consistently considered and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The report's context section provides an analysis of gender, equity and inclusion issues but could have been further strengthened in terms of explicitly conducting an intersectional analysis. The findings section draws upon the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups and mentions unintended effects of the evaluated programme that are relevant in relation to gender.

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