

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Joint Resilience Programme in South-Central Somalia from 2018 to 2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 81%	
The report of the "Evaluation of Joint Resilience Programme (JRP) in South-Central Somalia from 2018 to 2022" is a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on for decision-making. A key strength of the report is the inclusion of diverse viewpoints in the analysis, drawing together different social groups involved in the JRP. This was feasible because the methodology enabled effective data collection from a variety of stakeholders, particularly concerning the inclusion of vulnerable groups. The findings provide explanations of WFP's contribution to outcome-level results, differentiating these from UNICEF when possible. There is a robust assessment of the JRP performance relative to International Humanitarian Principles. The report's recommendations demonstrate a path forward for action and leave room for adaptation depending on the context in Somalia. In terms of weaknesses, indicators in the evaluation matrix were improperly formulated and there were inconsistencies in the connections among matrix elements. There is not a discussion of how the available monitoring data allowed for measures of progress in human rights and gender, and the methodology does not specify the sampling frame for focus group discussions. No unintended results of the JRP are clearly brought forward in the findings, and these do not cite secondary sources when evidence is being presented. Additionally, the conclusions could have been made more concise. Finally, the accessibility of the report is limited as the document exceeds the word limit and is missing important elements such as a list of acronyms.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
The summary concisely communicates findings and recommendations. While the scope of the evaluation could have been clearer, the objectives, methodology, context and overview of the JRP are well discussed. Adding visuals to support the narrative could have improved its utility as a standalone document.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report provides a clear description of the external context for the JRP, including a detailed reflection on gender equality dimensions. There is also a discussion of important contextual changes which influenced the JRP's implementation (e.g., conflict and climate change) and the phases of the JRP itself. However, the overview of the JRP as the subject of the evaluation does not include a breakdown of outputs, beneficiaries, and resources.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
The objectives, purpose, intended users, stakeholders of the evaluation are clearly outlined. However, there is no clear statement of the JRP implementation period under evaluation and there is no discussion of the evaluation's target groups.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The mixed methods approach was appropriate for answering all evaluation questions. There was effective data collection from stakeholders relevant to the JRP. Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) were considered in the design of the data collection tools. Limitations are identified, and mitigation measures are presented, and an evaluability assessment is provided. However, there is no discussion of how the quality and availability of the monitoring data on human rights and gender informed the methodological design. Indicators in the evaluation matrix were improperly formulated and the sampling frame for the focus group discussions (FGDs) could have been further elaborated upon. While ethical standards are included, these do not state the four UNEG guiding principles.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory

The evaluation addresses all evaluation questions and sub-questions. Supporting evidence is presented transparently and clearly using a neutral tone. WFP contributions are discussed considering contextual factors (e.g., drought) when necessary. The report reflects the voices of different stakeholder groups relevant to the JRP and provides insights concerning the international humanitarian principles. Secondary sources are not clearly identified and cited, and primary data are not always referenced in the footnotes. No unintended results were clearly brought forward and findings from previous evaluations are only briefly mentioned.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The conclusions clearly flow logically from the findings and do not introduce new evidence. Attention is given to GEWE-related dimensions. However, the conclusions lack sufficient synthesis and it is not always clear how each individually might contribute to the learning and accountability objectives of this evaluation.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
There are six recommendations that include a timeframe for action and identify responsible actors. They present good balance between specificity and generality, allowing for adjustments to the context of Somalia. However, operational and resource constraints in the national and local context of the JRP were not clearly considered.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
In general, the report is well written and uses professional and accessible language, is logically structured and includes several well-designed visual aids that are particularly useful for presenting the household survey data. However, the report length is beyond the maximum word limit requirement, does not effectively signpost information, is missing a list of acronyms, and does not provide sources for all data.		

#### **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>	Approaches requirements: 6 points
For the most part, the report integrated gender equality and women's empowerment into the scope of analysis by mainstreaming GEWE into the evaluation design, although this was not explicitly stated in the presentation of the evaluation's purpose. This included integrating the examination of GEWE into the evaluation matrix across certain sub-questions. Ethical standards were considered and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The evaluation's mixed-method approach was gender-responsive and based on deliberate considerations on how to effectively integrate GEWE. This included the use of a variety of data sources from different sociodemographic groups relevant to the JRP in Somalia. The context section provides information on external context for GEWE and other important social-demographic considerations. The findings section reflects the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups, and the recommendations address GEWE dimensions. However, no JRP unanticipated effects are reported related to GEWE. Additionally, there is no gender breakdown of data from the KIIs or the FGDs in the main report or the annexes.	

#### **Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard**

<b>UN-DIS individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 5 points
The TOR for this evaluation considered disability and the evaluation team included two experts with relevant disability inclusion experience. Evaluation question 5.1 considers if there are any differences in behaviour or demand across gender, age group or disability dimensions in relation to efficiency. The evaluation matrix includes disaggregation by disability along with other categories as well. The findings include different considerations for disability, including accessibility for persons with disabilities in both health centres and schools as well as advocacy and sensitization efforts to promote enrolment of children with disabilities. Disability considerations are mentioned in conclusion 14 and recommendation 2, as well as sub-recommendation 5.2. However, there is no discussion of how data collection methods included persons with disabilities and their representative organizations.	

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.