Evaluation title	Evaluation of WFP Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts	Evaluation report number	OEV/2016/014
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
Approaches requirements: 58%	Approaches requirements: 5 points

The evaluation of WFP Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts approaches requirements. Evaluation criteria and key questions are relevant to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, but more clarity around the basis for assessment, more explicit linkages to the evidence and use of triangulation would have added greater weight to the findings. Nevertheless, an overview of the current international debate situates the evaluation and its findings in the current policy context and conclusions effectively summarise the evidence. Gender equality and equity dimensions could have been considered more explicitly and systematically throughout the report. Finally, although recommendations are highly relevant, they would have benefited from prioritisation and further guidance on how to action them.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches

While the summary is succinct and readable, there are some key gaps which limit its accessibility to its intended users. These include a more complete discussion of the evaluation purpose and objectives, the inclusion of the evaluation questions and the intended users of the evaluation, discussion of the wider scope (beyond the time period). Further details could also be provided on the evaluation subject, most notably resources. Conclusions are very brief, and some key conclusions have not been incorporated. On the positive side, most of the key findings are effectively summarised, with few exceptions, and the recommendations are reflected in full.

CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially

This section does not provide a complete overview of the evaluation subject. Little to no discussion is included on several key elements, including the extent of policy implementation, a stakeholder analysis reflecting on stakeholders' understanding of the policy aims, and the resource profiling over time. While the context provides the analytical basis for the evaluation and the overview is based on relevant and well-evidenced resources, a more complete overview would have increased readers understanding of the evaluation subject.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Meets

The report contains a comprehensive analysis of the evaluation context, including an overview of the current international debate which is likely to influence and/or inform the findings. The contextual information is up to date in terms of the trend data and indicators used, and is based on reliable sources. In order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, further elaboration could have been provided on the key users, the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, in terms of learning and accountability, and how the objectives of this evaluation and its policy orientation link to the wider purpose.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets

The evaluation criteria and questions are relevant, and their alignment is explained. The evaluation methods are referenced in the report and limitations and risks are also explained. Findings from previous evaluations are extensively used within the evaluation analysis. An overview of data analysis and weighting of evidence is provided in the methodology, and specific analysis methods identified in the overview of methods. However, data sources, data collection and analysis methods are not incorporated in the evaluation matrix and there is no explanation as to how the evaluation criteria will be applied and why additional criteria (compared to the ones presented in the terms of reference) were selected.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets

Findings are explicitly aligned with the three over-arching evaluation questions, and for the most part address all evaluation questions and sub-questions. There is also a brief assessment of alignment with other policies and there is frequent reference to findings from other evaluations. Data gaps are also identified. While findings provide an assessment of contribution (or lack of) to results, there could have been more explicit linkages to data sources and more effective use of triangulation, including explicitly differentiating between different stakeholders and staff types. There is also limited analysis of resource use.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets

Conclusions effectively summarise the evidence and for the most part, logically flow from the findings despite the inclusion of some new evidence. They are also largely balanced, presenting both positive and negative findings. However, more explicit

linkages to the analysis may have strengthened some statements and recognition of the fact that the policies have been institutionalised to some extent, *in spite of* institutional failures to formally disseminate them, may have been useful.

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Partially

Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions are not explicitly and systematically integrated into the evaluation methodology and it is unclear to what extent the interview guides and other data collection methods were adapted to a gender-responsive approach. Gender analysis is also not evident in the conclusions and recommendations. There is some evidence that gender has been considered, in terms of stakeholder and beneficiary representation. Similarly, while there is some consideration of equity dimensions within the context of the humanitarian principles in the overview of the evaluation subject, equity dimensions are not explicitly integrated into the indicators, conclusions or recommendations, beyond brief discussions of coverage of humanitarian food security needs in the conclusions and the need to increase the coherence [of the policies] to cross-cutting issues' such as gender, protection and accountability and improve needs assessments in the recommendations.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches

Overall, recommendations are clearly derived from the analysis and conclusions, address the most critical areas identified by the analysis, and are targeted to specific units within WFP. However, recommendations could have been made more actionable. As structured, many recommendations are high-level and would have benefited from more clarity and prioritisation to enable their sequencing. The distinct sub-recommendations under each recommendation are in themselves substantial pieces of work. Key messages, such developing a corporate view on key trade-offs and tensions, improving operational guidance and alignment with cross-cutting issues, could have been made clearer, and proposals for how this could be achieved in a sensitive and timely way, drawing on wider peer learning, could have been provided.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets

The report uses clear and easily-understood language that makes it accessible to intended audiences. The language for the most part is precise and professional although with some scope for greater clarity / precision in the discussion of findings. Whilst the over-arching organisation of the report is logical, the purpose of using headings in the findings section at the beginning of the relevant section is sometimes unclear, whether these represent key findings/ judgements or efforts to organise the evidence under summary headings. Other actions that would increase accessibility / clarity include shortening the report to meet the 50-page WFP requirements on length, linking findings more explicitly to evidence / data sources, as well as the data within charts.

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	1
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI score	**5**

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports
	UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
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