

Evaluation title	Evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy	Evaluation report number	OEV/2016/015
Type	Policy Evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Global	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Exceeds requirements: 78%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy presents clearly the quality, results, and underlying factors contributing to or hindering the intended impact of the Protection Policy. The analysis is clear, well-sourced and comprehensive. Conclusions present a balanced assessment of both positive and negative findings, summarising evidence and responding to the evaluation questions. Whilst gender and equity dimensions are well-covered, the report could have been strengthened by providing more detailed information on the methodology. It is well-written, accessible, and is suitably targeted to its intended users.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
<p>The executive summary provides the rationale for the evaluation, explaining the timing and its convergence with the evaluation of WFP Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Context. The evaluation questions, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations are also clearly summarised. However, the wider purpose and objectives of the evaluation are not defined in the summary, and the users of the evaluation are not referenced.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds
<p>The overview links the Humanitarian Protection Policy to the WFP Corporate Results Framework, draws on a strong body of evidence and outlines the implementation plan undertaken to implement the Policy. A comprehensive stakeholder map has been undertaken. It could have been further improved by including additional explanations on the rationale for the 2014 update to the Humanitarian Protection Policy.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The purpose, scope, and rationale for timing are clearly provided. The context presents relevant information on wider humanitarian and protection issues and relates WFP actions to the wider UN, IASC, and global context. This information is highly relevant to understanding why protection has become a central concern. The report draws on international discourse on the nexus between human rights and other normative frameworks and presents good practices in protection. However, the main users of the evaluation are not explicitly indicated, and the report does not explain the intended balance of learning and accountability.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
<p>The evaluation matrix is clear, facilitating a systematic assessment of the evaluation questions against the evaluation criteria despite the latter not being explicitly defined in relation to the evaluation context. The sampling rationale behind country selection is well justified and triangulation principles have been applied. However, while data limitations are set out, it is unclear how they affected the quality of findings or how they were mitigated. Furthermore, previous evaluations are not featured as evidence sources and there is limited mention of ethical considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The report is clearly framed in terms of the quality of the Protection Policy and how this affected the results achieved, detailing internal and external enabling or constraining factors. Findings are transparently generated based on evidence from policy documents, relevant studies, and interviews. Findings are appropriately referenced throughout. Findings are explicitly responding to the evaluation questions. The narrative provides some solid discussion of unintended effects produced by the intervention. The section could have been strengthened further by explaining the reasons for gaps in evidence and by drawing on recommendations from previous evaluations.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The conclusions are comprehensive, responding to the three main evaluation questions, and provide a balanced assessment of both positive and negative findings. They also correspond with the structure of the findings section even though their logic</p>		

could have been enhanced by bringing together the discussion on the internal and external factors. The section could have been further strengthened by presenting lessons as key organisational learning points for WFP.

CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY

Category Exceeds

The evaluation explores the link between the Protection Policy and the Gender Policy and its implications on results. The analysis includes the voices of women and interprets outcomes for beneficiaries with different levels of vulnerability. Recommendations address equity issues through the lens of accountability. However, the evaluation matrix does not fully capture or integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEEW) or equity dimensions: only two evaluation questions explicitly address GEEW dimensions and no indicators explicitly address equity issues.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS

Category Meets

The recommendations follow logically from the analysis, findings and conclusions. They are also targeted and time-bound. However, they do not appear to have fully considered the resource implications or appetite to develop a new Protection Policy. The section could have been strengthened by clustering or prioritising the recommendations.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

Category Exceeds

The report is clear and well written, based upon evidence, and unbiased - presenting both positive and negative findings, despite the absence of visual aids and the slight excess in length.

Gender EPI

1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	8

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%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements