

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Corporate Partnership Strategy Policy Evaluation	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	OEV/2016/010
<b>Type</b>	Policy	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Centralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Global	<b>PHQA date</b>	August 2017
<b>Quality rating – overall category</b>		<b>EPI – overall report category</b>	
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%		Approaches requirements: 4–7 points	
<p>The Evaluation of the WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (CPS) contributes to its objectives of accountability and learning about the quality of the policy, the initial results of the policy, and the reasons for why changes have or have not occurred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The executive summary lists the main methods applied and states the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations but the purpose and objectives of the evaluation are not framed clearly in the executive summary.</li> <li>• The evaluation report is supported by a separate document (Volume 2) which includes a detailed and comprehensive methodology section that defines the evaluation criteria in relation to the context and includes the evaluation matrix. The evaluation matrix clearly sets out the evaluation questions but does not align the questions and sub-questions explicitly to the evaluation criteria. The evaluation draws upon previous evaluations and discusses the extent that recommendations from the 2012 Food Aid to Food Assistance Evaluation have been addressed.</li> <li>• While the methodology presented is detailed, the effects of the limitations on results are not clearly outlined and the efforts to mitigate are limited; the rationale for the sample is clear but its representativeness is not detailed.</li> <li>• The report benefits from clear and transparently generated findings which make explicit use of evidence from a range of sources. Findings are balanced and well substantiated by evidence, and present both positive aspects of the quality of the report and its results as well as areas for improvement. The findings do not clearly address or signpost unintended effects of the CPS or fully assess use of resources.</li> <li>• The conclusions draw upon insight presented in the findings; however, they do not fully respond to the ‘so what’ question or bring the evidence together by evaluation question or criterion.</li> <li>• The evaluation analyses how Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (GEEW) objectives and equity principles were included in the intervention design and refers generally to GEEW mainstreaming principles. There is a clear assessment of the CPS’ alignment to both WFP policy and UN wide policy. The evaluation tools employed for the evaluation reflect an appropriate attention to gender and equity issues. However, the findings do not fully analyse gender results. The analysis of gender issues focuses on the design of the CPS and does not fully explore gender results achieved. Gender and equity dimensions are partially integrated into the conclusions but are not brought out in the recommendations.</li> <li>• Recommendations are explicitly mapped against evaluation findings and conclusions in a highly accessible table. The recommendations are specific, actionable, and well rationalized but the prioritisation and timeframe for action is not entirely precise for recommendations 1-3.</li> <li>• Overall, the report is well-written and uses language and terminology accurately. The report is over length however, and some key information does not feature in the report and is included in the annexes instead. Better use could be made of visual aids, which are used only sparingly in the report. The report is logically structured overall, and key findings and conclusions are clearly signposted which aids the accessibility of the messaging.</li> </ul>			

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Meets requirements: 60–74%	11–12 points = Exceeds requirements
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	8–10 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–7 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
<p>The Executive Summary (ES) is succinct and readable and presents key aspects of the methodology and description of the CPS. The key findings, conclusions and recommendations are summarised well. The ES falls well within WFP limits on length. However, the purpose of the evaluation is not clearly stated. Information about the scope of the evaluation is provided but the period being evaluated and the scope of the evaluation is not explicitly and clearly stated. There is no indication of the evaluation's users. The methods applied are not described in full. All in all, the ES does not have all of the required elements to be fit-for-purpose as a stand alone document to inform decision making.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds
<p>The overview provides information about the main objectives and activities set out in the CPS. The analytical basis of the policy is described and the logic model/theory of change underpinning the policy is included in the overview with detail in the annex. The overview draws on relevant and up to date literature about partnerships. However, the resourcing for the policy is not described in the overview. Description of the evolution of WFP's work on partnerships is set out but changes to the current policy are not described explicitly. The main partners implicated in the CPS are not described in detail. The evaluation type is not explicitly set out, and there is only a general timeframe indicated.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The context section provides a clear definition of the terms, and semantic debate around "partnerships". WFP's work around partnerships and the evolution therein provides useful background information for understanding the context for the evaluation. The rationale, objectives, period and users of the evaluation are all clearly defined. Nonetheless, the terminology section is longer than necessary for the purposes of the evaluation. The context does not present data or statistics that address the importance of partnerships vis-à-vis progress toward Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 2 (ending hunger and achieving food security), and in general, the overview presents a broader narrative, rather than specific data and statistics. The main purpose of the evaluation is not explicitly stated but is instead integrated into the statement of objectives. The type of evaluation is only implicitly addressed. The linkage between the wider purpose of the evaluation and the linkage between learning and accountability is not clearly articulated.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
<p>An extensive methodological annex provides detail about the full methodology that was applied to the evaluation. This includes detailed description of the evaluation criteria in relation to the context which is explicitly aligned to the evaluation questions in the description. The evaluation questions are well defined and correspond to the purpose of the evaluation. Data collection methods and analysis approaches are described in detail. Previous evaluations are utilised as an information source. Some efforts to mitigate gaps in data are outlined in the report. However, sampling is not comprehensively addressed, and the issue of data availability is not fully discussed. The evaluation matrix does not include evaluation criteria. Whilst the evaluation matrix articulates what indicators will be used to assess the evaluation questions and sub-questions, these indicators are not clearly benchmarked and the threshold for achievement is not evident for all of the indicators. Mitigation measures are limited.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
<p>Findings are well substantiated by a reliable evidence base which draws upon a range of sources including corporate documentation, good practice literature, site visits, and key informant interviews. Both achievements and challenges are described. The findings present a clear analysis of the quality of the partnership strategy and a discussion of how the policy has been communicated and used. However, the narrative does not explicitly articulate unintended effects beyond effects achieved. The report does not provide a detailed discussion about the use of resources for the policy. Although weaknesses in certain evidence sources are covered, overall gaps in the evidence base or the sample are not fully articulated .</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The conclusions are well-balanced, reflecting both positive and negative findings that align to the issues presented in the findings. The conclusions effectively summarize the evidence and follow the logic and</p>		

order of the analysis presented in the findings. However, the conclusions do not explicitly respond to the evaluation questions or evaluation criteria, which somewhat interrupts the logical flow of the report. The conclusions do not include evidence about how the CPS compares with partner strategies from other organisations. Although they draw upon the findings, the conclusions do not draw, to the extent possible, explicitly on the evidence sources included in the findings. Accounts from WFP staff are noted but the other sources are not fully represented.

<b>CRITERION 7: GENDER</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Approaches</b>
----------------------------	-----------------	-------------------

The evaluation report clearly assesses the CPS' alignment to WFP and system-wide norms on gender and equity. The evaluation methodology employed data collection instruments that ensured that the gender and social roles of the respondents were appropriate. The stakeholder list, bibliography, evidence matrix, and interview guide and survey demonstrate attention to GEEW issues. Nevertheless, GEEW dimensions are not explicitly integrated in the evaluation criteria. Indicators assessing gender dimensions focus on qualitative aspects. Reference to the gender policy which includes both qualitative and quantitative indicators is stated but the quantitative aspects of how this will be measured is not set out explicitly. The assessment of evaluation results does not consistently consider GEEW beyond articulation of the quality of the CPS. The recommendations do not reflect a gender analysis and do not mention equity dimensions. The evaluation report does not provide lessons/challenges/recommendations for conducting gender-responsive evaluations.

<b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------------	----------------

Recommendations are clearly and explicitly derived from the findings and conclusions which are numbered and included in the recommendations annex. Recommendations are underwritten by a clear articulation of the rationale for the recommendations. The recommendations are framed in consideration of important contextual issues. The recommendations set out specific actions and set out the responsible actors. However, the timeframe and prioritisation of the recommendations are not entirely clear for recommendations 1-3, which are prioritised as very high, high and high (respectively) but the associated timeframe does not reflect this prioritisation exercise (by end of 2017 versus for immediate action). While the recommendations address many of the key issues presented in the findings, several of the issues presented in the findings (e.g. gender issues, linkages between partnership and capacity development) are not fully addressed by the recommendations. While the recommendations are generally framed to support the evaluation's purpose of supporting learning for the execution of the CPS going forward within the context of the current strategic plan (framed by the SDGs), the recommendations do not directly speak to this purpose.

<b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
---	-----------------	----------------

The report is well written and logically structured, and includes all of the main components required for an accessible report in line with WFP requirements. Terminology, acronyms, and the table of contents are used appropriately and accurately. Key findings are presented with the use of bold which aids the accessibility of the messaging. Key conclusions and recommendations are also clearly signposted. The report employs the use of 'boxes' to illustrate findings. Nevertheless, the evaluation includes only limited use of visual aids, which would have enhanced readability and aided the conveying of key information. The report exceeds requirements on length (<30%) and it is worth noting that this is the case despite a significant portion of key information being presented in the annexes rather than in the main body of the report.

<b>Criteria scoring scale legend – gender integration EPI</b>
3 points = Fully integrated
2 points = Satisfactorily integrated
1 point = Partially integrated
0 point = Not at all integrated

1. Scope and Indicators	2
2. Criteria and Questions	1
3. Methodology	2
4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
<b>Overall EPI score</b>	<b>6</b>