

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| Evaluation title | WFP's relief food and cash assistance for conflict-affected people in Kachin and Northern Shan, Myanmar | |
| Evaluation category and type | Decentralized - Activity | |
| Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating | Satisfactory: 86% | |
| <p>The report of the evaluation of WFP's relief food and cash assistance for conflict-affected people in Kachin and Northern Shan, Myanmar satisfactorily presents the results of the evaluation of this programme and can be used with confidence in decision making. A key strength of the report is the robust methodology based on a strong mixed-methods approach which used a wide range of sources, including consultations with WFP staff, NGOs, UN agencies, government representatives, Financial Service Providers (FSPs), and beneficiaries, including internally displaced persons (IDPs). The report's findings consistently indicate sources of information, identifying the group and number of stakeholders' supporting statements which makes clear to the reader the range and quality of the evidence base. The findings effectively compare performance in different townships, highlighting what has worked well, what has not worked well, and why. The report's conclusions provide an insightful analysis of the IDP return process and the potential to support access to livelihood in the context of a protracted crisis. Moreover, gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) considerations are very well integrated throughout the report. However, the recommendations are not clearly targeted and prioritized, and should have better identified key primary users to support operationalization. More generally, the report is missing some key elements, including a description of the activity's line of sight, which would have enabled a better contextualization of the findings presented under the effectiveness criterion.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report summary is well drafted and can be used as a standalone document, providing a succinct overview of the evaluation features, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, a summary of the lessons learned included in the main report is lacking and should have been included.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Rating | Partly Satisfactory |
| <p>The context provides a good overview of the situation in Myanmar, including the protracted armed conflict in the regions of Kachin and Northern Shan. There is a good intersectional analysis of how vulnerable groups are affected by the conflict as well as a useful overview of humanitarian relief activities in Myanmar since 2011. Importantly however, key elements such as the programme's core activities, log frame/theory of change, overall budget and outcomes are lacking in the description of the subject of the evaluation. Moreover, the section does not provide information on a programme evaluation conducted in 2016 nor on other pertinent analytical work. and . While target beneficiaries are disaggregated by sex and there is a discussion of the support provided to pregnant and lactating women, the overview does not provide detail on the gender component of the activity under evaluation, which are however well described in the Terms of reference (i.e., promotion of women's participation in food management committee, the promotion of joint decision-making power of CBT, a partnership with UNFPA for the conduct of gender activities).</p> | | |
| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation's dual objectives of accountability and learning and its scope are clearly outlined. The report explains the evaluation rationale, stating that it was conducted at mid-point in the implementation of the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) to help WFP adjust programme design, if required. In addition, primary and secondary users of the evaluation are well defined. Although gender equality and human rights are not integrated into the evaluation objectives per se, they are adequately mainstreamed in the evaluation framework.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| <p>The evaluation employed a strong methodology grounded in a mixed-methods approach, drawing on multiple data sources, including vulnerable groups affected by the intervention. The evaluation matrix was a strong tool to guide the evaluators in answering the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The sampling frame is clearly described in the report, as are the limitations of the methods and corresponding mitigation strategies employed by the evaluation team. There is also a good description of the ethical standards to which the evaluation team adhered. However, the methodological approach adopted to assess programme effectiveness could have been presented more clearly.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The findings are robust, providing comprehensive answers to all evaluation questions and sub-questions. They are presented in a balanced way, offering insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the programme as well as nuanced perspectives of multiple groups of stakeholders, including vulnerable groups. Given the humanitarian nature of this intervention in Myanmar, the report provides a relevant analysis against the SPHERE standards and Core Humanitarian Principles. However, the analysis of WFP's contribution to results could have been further enhanced by embedding the programme's line of sight into a discussion of the key findings. Likewise, the findings section could have provided a more in-depth analysis of the status of implementation of the recommendations that emerged from the previous programme evaluation conducted in 2016.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The conclusions add insightful analysis for the future of WFP's work in Myanmar. They go beyond a summary of the findings to assess the implications of the findings for the support of the IDP return process, highlighting the potential to integrate this activity with other CSP activities to further support access to livelihood in the context of a protracted crisis. The lessons learned are correctly formulated and have the potential to contribute to common knowledge on relief activities beyond WFP's relief food and cash assistance for conflict-affected people activities in the country.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>Recommendations logically derive from the findings and conclusions and are aligned with the evaluation objectives. They are realistic and seem feasible considering the implementation context. Overall, they are well targeted and although sometimes they foresee more than one lead entity, thus blurring the lines of accountability for their implementation. Importantly, they address specifically GEWE, equity and protection concern among the affected population. The prioritization could have been clearer as all recommendations have the same priority and it is unclear which should be implemented first. A timeline for action should have also been provided.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>Overall, this report is well written and clearly structured, with good use of visual aids. It is very well sourced, transparently presenting the robust evidence upon which the evaluation findings are based. The report adequately cross-references information located in other sections. Although a box summarizing the main findings and conclusions is inserted at the end of each of the four main evaluation questions, readability would have been further enhanced with better use of bold throughout the text to highlight key messages.</p> | | |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Integration of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard | |
| UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score | Meets requirements: 9 points |
| <p>This evaluation fully integrated GEWE considerations, meeting all requirements in this regard. The report includes a gender analysis of the country context in Myanmar that presents sex-disaggregated data and discusses restrictive socio-cultural norms that limit women's participation in decision-making. While there was no specific evaluation objective to assess gender equality, GEWE is integrated across the evaluation criteria and through a specific evaluation question, and the methodological design ensured that sex-disaggregated data was collected. To the extent possible, the evaluation team included in FGDs participants with vulnerabilities, including physical disabilities, the elderly, and heads of female-headed households. Special safeguards for consulting women beneficiaries were used such as ensuring that they were interviewed by a woman. The findings present sex-disaggregated data from the household survey and the nuanced perspectives of women and men IDPs consulted through FGDs. There is an insightful gender analysis, including on the</p> | |

impact of the intervention on women's leadership in the community and in the household. Finally, the recommendations adequately integrate GEWE issues such as one recommendation on improving women's role in community decision-making Food Management Committees (FMCs) and Camp Management Committees (CMCs).

| Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels | |
|--|---|
| Highly Satisfactory | <i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations. |
| Satisfactory | <i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making. |
| | <i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. |
| Partly Satisfactory | <i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. |
| Unsatisfactory | <i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met. |