

Evaluation title	Strategic Evaluation of Funding WFP's Work	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Strategic Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The Strategic Evaluation of Funding WFP's Work is a high-quality evaluation report that can be used with confidence to inform decision-making. The context section presents key developments in the global humanitarian/development funding landscape as well as internal reforms at WFP, which helps the reader better contextualize the findings. The evaluation is based on a robust methodology, and findings are well substantiated by evidence and present an informative discussion on WFP funding and gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE). Recommendations stem logically from the findings and conclusions and are targeted, actionable, and realistic. Nevertheless, a few elements could have been further enhanced, notably, conclusions could have focused more on the implications of the findings for the future of WFP funding, and equity and broader inclusion dimensions beyond GEWE could have been more explicitly considered. Moreover, though well written, the evaluation report is overly long, which limits its readability and accessibility.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report provides a good overview of the most important elements of the evaluation report, namely the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and can be used as a stand-alone document to inform decision making. It provides sufficient detail to understand each finding without needing to reference the main body of the report and makes good use of visuals. Recommendations are also clearly presented exactly as in the main body of the report. The main weakness noted in the summary reflects that of the report itself, i.e., the conclusions do not sufficiently highlight the implications of the findings for the future of funding WFP, and introduce information not presented in the summary of the findings.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context section provides an excellent overview of key developments in humanitarian/development funding and ongoing reforms (UN Development System (UNDS), Global Bargain) to improve the quality and efficient use of resources. Likewise, the context section clearly describes internal reforms at WFP, namely the Integrated Road Map and its implications on financial management. Overall, the report clearly describes the strategic directions and organizational architecture for financial management within WFP. The discussion of context also describes how funding is earmarked for, and contributes to, addressing the needs of vulnerable groups such as women, people with disabilities, etc.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope are clearly outlined. The report also clearly identifies the main users at HQ, regional bureau and country office levels and how they are expected to use the evaluation in general terms.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section of the report and methodology annex clearly present the data collection methods, data sources, data analysis methods, sampling frame, and limitations and mitigation strategies, although the evaluation design could have been more clearly articulated or justified. The report also provides a good overview of the methodology used for the comparative study, including the rationale for the selection of comparators and a benchmarking framework. However, the report does not explain how the evaluation team adjusted their analysis approach in light of the fact that they stopped using the conceptual framework during the data analysis phase (since they did not find it to be useful). In addition, no reference is made to evaluation ethics.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents robust findings that are well substantiated by evidence, triangulated by primary and secondary data sources. Findings are transparently and impartially generated and discuss strengths and weaknesses equally. To enhance clarity, the findings are neatly structured around the main evaluation questions, with labels explicitly referencing evaluation sub-questions and key findings clearly presented in concise summary statements. Findings could have been further strengthened by clearer and more explicit triangulation of the voices of different social role groups, rather than, for example referring to respondents generally as "interviewees", and by explicitly identifying unanticipated effects, particularly in relation to human rights and gender equality.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS/LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions logically derive from the findings and provide an insightful analysis that discusses some potential implications for the future of WFP funding. However, conclusions are not always clearly distinguished from key findings and could have provided more in-depth analysis of the implications of specific findings related to challenges around securing long-term development financing at scale.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation findings, indicate the conclusions with which they are aligned, and contribute towards the fulfilment of the evaluation objectives. They are realistic and feasible, taking into account contextual factors within WFP (e.g., development of the WFP Strategic Plan, the IRM) and outside of WFP (e.g., UNDS and the UNSDCF processes). In addition, they are actionable, target a specific audience, and include a clear timeframe for action. No notable weaknesses were found in the evaluation recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report uses clear language and avoids excessive use of jargon. Visual aids are employed effectively to help clarify or provide supporting evidence to findings, and the report presents a variety of relevant good practice examples. Accompanying annexes provide relevant background information and additional details that further enrich the findings presented in the main report. However, the report is excessively long, which affects its readability. While its length is, to some extent, due to the complexity of the issues addressed, some elements could have been presented in a more concise manner.</p>		

Integration of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations based on UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI)		
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	8 points = Meets requirements	
<p>The evaluation report satisfactorily integrates GEWE considerations. It includes a background section that summarizes relevant context information on UN and WFP commitments to cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, persons with disabilities, and accountability to affected populations. Contextual information on funding for GEWE, both in terms of ODA trends as well as within WFP, is also presented. While the evaluation did not include a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question related to gender equality and women's empowerment, it is clear from the report that WFP's funding is partly directed towards gender equality and human rights considerations which are implicitly included in the evaluation objectives. Nevertheless, GEWE could have been more explicitly integrated into the evaluation objectives.</p> <p>A mixed methods approach was used that was appropriate for addressing GEWE considerations in the context of WFP funding, specifying the data collection methods used to address gender issues (analysis of gender-related policies and guidance materials, as well as interviews with key WFP staff). However, key informant interviews were not identified by sex, making it impossible to know how many women and men were consulted.</p> <p>GEWE is considered in the findings, e.g., WFP financing related to GEWE, including information on gender-responsive financing, as well as the conclusions and one recommendation. Broader equity and inclusion issues beyond gender, however, are not considered.</p>		

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels		
Highly Satisfactory: 90–100%	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.</i>	

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
Satisfactory: 60—89%	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Partly Satisfactory: 45–59%	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Unsatisfactory: ≤44%	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>