

Evaluation title	Evaluation of WFP Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Strategic Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 96%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic constitutes a highly satisfactory report that provides credible insights and forward-looking considerations that decision makers can use with a high degree of confidence. The report concisely describes the evaluation methodology that applied a 'retrospective developmental' approach, key contextual features, and the subject of the evaluation. It presents clearly formulated findings on all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions, which are supported by evidence deriving from a range of secondary and primary data sources. Findings in the main report are complemented by in-depth thematic evidence summary briefs in an annex. The evaluation makes excellent use of visual aids to present information. Gender equality considerations are effectively mainstreamed and go beyond questions of numeric equality by addressing the role of gender equality as a dimension of, and opportunity within, recovery. The report formulates conclusions that adequately summarize findings and indicate their strategic implication, as well as practical lessons on WFP operations. Reflecting its nature as a 'retrospective developmental' evaluation, the report does not make formal recommendations but outlines a set of items for WFP to consider as it moves into its next strategic plan. Minor weaknesses when assessing the report against the standard quality criteria for strategic evaluations include that the main report does not explicitly state the evaluation rationale, intended purpose, objectives, uses, and geographic or thematic scope. In a few places, the otherwise helpful visual aids tend to make the report overly 'busy', and the report is slightly longer than recommended, both of which negatively affect readability.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary accurately and concisely captures key information about the evaluation. It presents key evaluation features and relevant context information, and adequately summarizes key findings related to all evaluation questions. The summary effectively presents an overview of the evaluation conclusions and reflects the forward-looking issues for WFP consideration, as described in the main report. However, the summary does not explicitly identify the evaluation users and rationale, and does not reflect the lessons for WFP regional bureaus, country offices, and senior leadership at headquarters that were formulated in the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report effectively summarizes key dimensions and implications of the COVID-19 pandemic that are relevant for the evaluation. It clearly and concisely describes the subject of the evaluation, i.e., WFP's response to the pandemic and related challenges. This includes reflections on gender, equity and inclusion dimensions of the pandemic. The methodology annex provides a helpful overview of key findings from a past evaluation on which this evaluation was built and provides definitions for key terms and concepts related to the evaluation methodology. Some of the required information is not provided in the introductory (context) chapters but instead in the findings section or in annexes. However, in most cases, this makes sense given that part of the evaluation focused on exploring contextual factors that supported or hindered WFP's pandemic response.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation are addressed, albeit - in the main report - largely indirectly and via implication. While there was no specific evaluation objective on human rights and gender equality, these dimensions were mainstreamed in the evaluation's other objectives, and the intended users and timeframe covered by the evaluation are clearly identified. That said, the main report could have been further improved by explicitly stating, rather than implying, the evaluation rationale (why was the evaluation conducted at this point in time), intended purpose, objectives, uses, and the geographic and/or thematic evaluation scope.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory

The choice of a 'retrospective developmental evaluation' design, which combined developmental evaluation elements with a component assessing results, was appropriate given the dynamic and continuously evolving nature of WFP's response to the pandemic. The evaluation effectively used its analytical framework and drew upon a variety of relevant and reliable data sources. Methodology development and data analysis were informed by extensive stakeholder consultations, enhancing the relevance, credibility and usability of evaluation findings.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation addresses all of the posed evaluation questions and sub-questions in a clear and structured fashion. Evidence is presented transparently and clearly, providing sources for all presented data and quotes, and uses a neutral tone. The report discusses WFP contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way, taking into account contextual factors. The report reflects the voices of diverse stakeholder groups from both inside and outside of WFP. In a few cases, the report could have been more explicit about disaggregating data to illustrate differences or consistencies between the views expressed by different (sub-)groups of consulted stakeholders, e.g., by showing some results of consultations with WFP staff disaggregated by sex, such as in relation to questions pertaining to measures put in place to ensure staff wellbeing.</p>		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions synthesize evaluation findings at a higher, strategic level and include reflections on implications of the noted strengths and weaknesses of WFP's response to the COVID-19 pandemic for the organization's overall positioning and raison d'être, as well as in relation to internal dimensions, such as staff care. The conclusions include reflections on how GEWE and accountability to affected populations considerations were, or were not, integrated in WFP's pandemic response. The evaluation also formulates concrete and relevant lessons applicable at the level of WFP regional bureaus and country offices, and in relation to WFP leadership and senior management at headquarters.</p>		

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Given the developmental nature of the evaluation, the report does not formulate recommendations but, instead, outlines items for WFP to consider as it moves forward into its next strategic plan. The presented considerations logically derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions, are aligned with the evaluation objectives and purpose, and address GEWE and broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report aligned with the WFP template and is written in clear and understandable language. It makes effective use of visual aids, including figures, pictograms, textboxes, and tables to present information, and clearly summarizes key findings and messages. The evaluation provides sources for all data and quotes and uses cross-references to refer readers to relevant sections in the main report or in the annexes. In some cases, the otherwise helpful tools to visually highlight messages and structure the report, such as textboxes and bold font, add up to be slightly 'too much' and run the risk of distracting rather than helping the reader. The report is slightly longer than the recommended limit for WFP reports, and especially the conclusions section would have benefited from being slightly shorter.</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>Gender equality is effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis and across the evaluation criteria and objectives. The evaluation included an explicit question and sub-question on gender equality and broader equity and inclusion issues. Its approach and methodology were gender-responsive and based on deliberate considerations on how to effectively integrate GEWE dimensions in data collection and analysis. This is reflected in the mixed-methods approach chosen, and in the evaluation drawing upon a variety of data sources and processes. Ethical standards were consistently considered and all stakeholders treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The evaluation findings, conclusions and forward-looking issues for consideration reflect a gender analysis that goes beyond questions of numerical equality and addresses the role of gender equality as both a dimension of, as well as an opportunity within, recovery.</p>	

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.