Evaluation title	Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience	Evaluation report number	OEV/2017/003
Type	Strategic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Global	PHQA date	January 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 63%		Meets requirements: 8 points	

The strategic evaluation of 'WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience' meets requirements. It is well-written, balanced and evidence-based. The report overview outlines the evolution of the resilience concept, strategy development, programming and measurement frameworks globally, and summarises WFP support for resilience, with some examples of how the strategy has been adapted for different policy areas, programmes and cross-cutting issues. Findings respond to evaluation questions, and describe broader policy and unintended results, and factors that have enabled and constrained WFP capabilities to support resilience. Consideration of gender equality is solidly integrated within the methodology. Recommendations reflect critical areas identified in the analysis, although some are ambitious within the proposed timeframe, given the funding context for resilience work and WFP's ongoing journey to build its expertise, experience and reputation. Additional discussion of key contextual factors, such as an analysis of emerging best practice, uptake of resilience agendas by government, resourcing, and institutional capacity would have enhanced the report. There is also scope for more detailed analysis in some areas, as well as a greater emphasis on emerging good practice at country level.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches

The report summary summarises the key information, albeit with some omissions of emerging good practice and a very brief introductory section. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations are included for the most part, as is a high-level overview of data sources, data collection and analysis methods, and major limitations. However, the summary is longer than WFP requirements and does not indicate the intended audience for the evaluation. Accessibility is compromised with the use of some complex sentences and inclusion of figures that are not explained.

CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets

The overview outlines the evolution of the concept of resilience, strategy development, programming and measurement frameworks globally and summarises the core strategies, policies and programmes framing WFP support for enhanced resilience. Relevant studies, policy and programme documents are referenced. Some examples of how the strategy has been adapted for different policy areas, programmes and cross-cutting issues are presented. Nevertheless, whilst a high-level overview of the relevant WFP Strategic Plans, Policies, and Programmes are provided, no details or assessments are given of the expected results and theories of change associated with supporting resilience work. Although there are broad references to selected examples (e.g. 'resilience measurement, evaluation and learning guidance'), details of resource, guidance or systems specific to supporting WFP implementation of support to resilience could have also been provided.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Approaches

The evaluation purpose and objectives are presented, and the focus on learning and accountability is briefly discussed. The information on context is relevant to the evaluation subject and draws on current and reliable sources; it considers the global policy context, international discourse and some description of the internal response to this, within the relevant time period. However, some key contextual factors are not discussed, including an analysis of emerging best practice, working in partnership, uptake of resilience agendas by government, resourcing and institutional capacity. In addition, whilst the context provided is relevant, there was no explicit discussion of the how issues raised might have influenced findings.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets

The evaluation report incorporates a detailed methodological narrative, with references to supporting annexes. Evaluation questions and sub-questions are well defined, relevant to the subject of the evaluation and appear feasible. The methods applied are appropriate and feasible and limitations of the methodology are outlined, including indications where this has affected findings. Application of triangulation principles is illustrated within the evaluation matrix, and there is evidence that is has been applied. However, ethical standards are not explicitly discussed in the report, although there is some evidence that some standards have been applied. Methodological risks are also not discussed in the report.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets

Findings are triangulated from different sources and presented in a balanced way, presenting both positive and negative aspects. A number of unintended effects are identified, including tensions resulting from seeking to address structural causes of resilience challenges, and how commitments to donor reporting on resilience is stimulating institutional changes to monitoring capabilities. Enabling and constraining factors are identified and discussed, including the strong capacity of some regional bureaus (versus a lack of capacity in country offices). Whilst the report presents a large number of relevant findings, there is scope for more detailed analysis in some areas (for example in relation to working in partnership, internal capacity, and information), as well as greater emphasis on emerging good practice at country level. In addition, whilst a few examples of data gaps were identified (including pending results of resilience monitoring pilots), other gaps identified in the limitations (such as access to particular donors) were not highlighted as a gap in any particular area of findings.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets

Conclusions draw explicitly on the evidence from the findings and present a summary of the evidence, with some effort to provide a strategic overview. Conclusions appear balanced, reflecting both positive and negative findings. Whilst conclusions clearly draw on and reflect many key findings, other key aspects, such as disparities in institutional capacity at different levels of the organisation, are not highlighted. In addition, some of the concluding statements appear to overlook the complexity of the challenge; for example, the challenges around effective partnering to deliver resilience outcomes are described as 'administrative difficulties'.

CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Meets

The evaluation addresses issues of gender and to a lesser extent equity in a number of ways. One evaluation question focuses explicitly on the availability and use of data, with a clear emphasis on data to support gender programming and understand gender-related outcomes. Gender, from the perspective of vulnerability and resilience, was also integrated into one of the three broad assessment questions. Although not explicit, a number of findings, conclusions and recommendations also consider equity issues. Ethical considerations are not discussed in detail, although there is some evidence that ethical considerations were considered. In addition, whilst equity and human rights dimensions have clearly informed the evaluation, they could have been more explicitly identified across the report.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets

Recommendations reflect critical areas identified in the evaluation, such as organisational capability to anticipate and respond to resilience needs in different contexts, engage in effective partnerships, and operationalise resilience at country level. Recommendations are targeted, with responsible actors clearly identified. Timeframes for action are provided, although a number of them seem ambitious within the timeframe. Some sub-recommendations would have benefited from greater specificity and guidance on the recommended action to be taken.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds

The report is logically structured and sequenced, and the tone of the report appears appropriately balanced and objective. Key messages are summarised as sub-findings highlighted in bold, within each of the eight analysis sections. Sources are generally cited for all data and quotes. Whilst the report is well written, the findings include a number of long complex sentences, and dense use of technical language in certain areas, which affects accessibility. Greater explanation of the graphs and figures used would have also made the report more accessible.

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	2
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