

Evaluation title	Capacity to Respond to Emergencies	Evaluation report number	OEV/2018/010
Type	Strategic Evaluation	Centralized/ Decentralized	Centralized
Global/region or country	Global	PHQA date	February 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Exceeds requirements: 78%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>“WFP’s Capacity to Respond to Emergencies” strategic evaluation exceeds requirements. The context is comprehensively discussed and provides a detailed explanation of the evolution of internal and external policy frameworks. The report describes very well the evaluation subject, including the logic model, as well as the evaluation purpose and scope. The methodology is strong regarding the presentation of the evaluation questions and matrix, although the report could have justified in greater detail the choice of the selected evaluation. The findings provide useful and robust insights into WFP’s contribution at different levels to emergency responses and relevant lessons are drawn from previous evaluations and reviews. Recommendations are very well presented; they address the findings and conclusions and are actionable, targeted and timebound. The report would have benefited from the inclusion of equity aspects in its methodology and analysis and from a more concise and accessible executive summary.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
The executive summary captures well the key elements of the evaluation, namely the key findings, conclusions and recommendations, although a slightly shorter version would have made the section more accessible and concise. On the other hand, important information concerning the rationale, objectives, questions and users are missing, and the presentation of the methodology does not cover the rationale and the limitations to the methods proposed. The description of the subject is too brief and misses key trends and policy developments.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds
The report provides a comprehensive, well referenced and relevant overview of relevant policies, internal frameworks and of WFP's capacity to respond to emergencies over the period under evaluation. The logic model presents a clear picture of the links between capacity and emergency responses. A comprehensive and up to date set of sources are used and quoted throughout the section, along with a very well summarised overview of the resources and WFP guidance. The stakeholder analysis would have benefited from a more extensive examination of the different interests of internal and external actors to the evaluation.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The context is described in rich detail, using relevant sources and covering global trends as well as WFP policies. The objectives and purpose are all well described. The greatest strength is the succinct yet highly informative presentation of the evolving policy framework in the sector and the key factors which may have influenced WFP interventions. Greater discussion of the SGD trends and their relevance to the sector would have been helpful. The wider purpose and objectives are presented, although the intended balance between accountability and learning could have been explained in more detail.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology is very clear in terms of setting out the evaluation questions and sub-questions and is supported by a detailed evaluation matrix. The section explains very well how relevant documentation, case studies and interviewees were sampled and analysed. Findings from previous evaluations and reviews are systematically collated and used as key sources of information. The report would have benefited from a more comprehensive explanation of how data gaps were handled and limitations and risks to the methodology were addressed as well as from the explanation of the analytical approach followed.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
The report stands out for the way in which it analyses WFP's contribution to results and provides strong insights on the role of corporate, regional and country level factors influencing capacity to respond to emergencies. Evidence is well triangulated from a large base of documents, interviews and data to provide a sound assessment against the key evaluation questions. The report appears free from bias and substantiates its findings with systematic links to evidence. The link between findings and evaluation questions is not explicit, and findings could have been organized in a different way to help the reader understanding whether every question or sub-question has been answered.		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The conclusions draw well together the findings with each of the six main conclusions including lists of points that reflect the complexity and range of the findings chapter. The tone is balanced, and the section provides a summary of positive achievements along with areas that require attention. The main report would have benefited from the presentation of linkages among conclusions, evaluation questions and criteria.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
<p>The evaluation included a diverse range of views from stakeholders and obtained a broadly balanced gender ratio of interviewees. Tools such as gender markers are analysed and the recommendations address GEEW issues, such as strengthening gender responsiveness. However, gender and equity aspects are not stated in the objectives of the evaluation nor mentioned in the selected evaluation criteria and questions. Equity aspects are not addressed by the methodology and are not discussed explicitly neither in the findings nor in the conclusions and recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The recommendations are a strong feature of this evaluation. They are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objectives and build logically on the findings and conclusions, addressing almost all critical areas identified by those sections of the report. They are comprehensive, identify the responsible actors and provide a reasonable timeframe for their implementation. Although they are ambitious and wide in scope and require a high level of corporate change and senior management involvement, they are carefully detailed and request the improvement of systems, processes and frameworks that should be within the capability of the organisation.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>This is a well written and insightful report. It is well edited and free from errors, with content presented in neutral tone and language used is professional and accessible for the audience. References are given where needed and useful summary boxes are provided. The tone is extremely well-balanced presenting strengths and weaknesses in an impartial manner. Visual aids, maps and graphs are used well and referenced, although they are mostly in one Annex, with the main report including only one Table and six Figures and being somewhat dense. Some of these could have been placed in the main report to improve readability.</p>		

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 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