

Evaluation title	WFP's Use of Technology in Constrained Environments	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Strategic Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 95%	
<p>The Strategic Evaluation "WFP's Use of Technology in Constrained Environments" constitutes a highly satisfactory report that provides credible findings that decision makers can use with a high degree of confidence. It concisely summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale and methodology, and presents information on relevant external and internal contextual developments during the evaluation period. The report presents clearly formulated findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions and supports these findings with transparently shown evidence deriving from a range of primary and secondary sources. The evaluation successfully dealt with the complex and cross-cutting nature of the evaluation subject, and effectively used its conceptual framework to guide data collection, analysis and reporting. It systematically mainstreamed gender equality and wider equity (GEWE) and inclusion dimensions, and laudably went beyond questions of numeric equality by exploring the gender-transformative potential of the use of technology in constrained environments. The report formulates conclusions that synthesize key findings across the evaluation questions and indicate key areas for improvement, and it makes seven recommendations with realistic, targeted and actionable sub-recommendations. It makes good use of visual highlights, using bold font for key findings and textboxes to present good practice examples. However, the report is very long, and its readability would have benefited from keeping within the word limit prescribed by WFP.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary concisely and accurately captures key evaluation features and relevant context information and integrates some graphics from the main report. It adequately summarizes the assessment related to all evaluation questions and effectively presents an overview of the evaluation conclusions. The summary also includes all recommendations exactly as they appear in the main report. However, it could have benefited from also integrating selected figures in the findings section and from explicitly naming the evaluation users.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and concise description of the evaluation context and the subject of the evaluation. It provides definitions for important terms and summarizes key features of the global discourse on the use of technology in constrained environments, and developments within WFP, including relevant policy and strategy documents. The evaluation provides a comprehensive overview of the WFP portfolio in relation to the use of technology and discusses implications of the evaluation subject for gender equality, equity and inclusion.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report explains the evaluation rationale and provides a concise and adequate overview of the evaluation's accountability and learning related objectives, and the evaluation scope, in terms of time period covered and subject matter addressed. Human rights and gender equality considerations were mainstreamed in the evaluation's objectives.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The mixed-methods, non-experimental evaluation design and chosen data collection methods and sampling approach were appropriate for the evaluation purpose and for answering the evaluation questions. The evaluation effectively mitigated the complex and cross-cutting nature of the evaluation subject and effectively used its conceptual framework to guide data collection and analysis. GEWE, inclusion and equity dimensions were effectively mainstreamed, using relevant evaluation criteria, such as 'protection', as well as dedicated evaluation questions and sub-questions. Laudably, the evaluation explored not only issues of numeric equality but also questions around the gender transformative potential inherent in the use of technology. The methodology was based on an evaluability assessment conducted during</p>		

the inception phase, and the evaluation was carried out in alignment with UNEG ethical code of conduct principles. Nevertheless, the main report could have explicitly mentioned the evaluation criteria applied.

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 using a neutral tone. The report reflects the voices of diverse stakeholder groups from both inside and outside of WFP, and frequently presents data disaggregated by sex and geography.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions synthesize and connect findings across the evaluation questions, presenting both strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject, thereby indicating strategic implications of the evaluation findings. The conclusions explicitly reflect on gender equality, as well as on broader inclusion and equity dimensions related to the use of technology in constrained environments. However, the conclusions could have been further strengthened had they marked strategic implications of summarized findings more clearly as forward-looking reflections, using formulations - as are used in the findings section - such as "this indicates the need to...".</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation formulates seven recommendations with 25 sub-recommendations, all of which are actionable and realistic. One recommendation with four related sub-recommendations focuses on issues of gender equality and women's empowerment and broader inclusion. The sub-recommendations are prioritized, include a clear and realistic timeframe for action, and identify responsible actors. The evaluation, however, would have benefited from identifying one responsible actor at the level of the overarching recommendation, not only at the level of sub-recommendations, especially in cases where different WFP units are assigned responsibility for specific sub-recommendations. Similarly, the report could have indicated timelines for implementation not only for sub-recommendations but also at the overarching recommendation level.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is written in clear and understandable language and is well organized. Data is cross-referenced, key findings for each evaluation question are visually highlighted for easy access, and the report makes effective use of visual aids such as graphs. The only significant weakness is that the main report is overly long, which reduces its readability.</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>GEWE considerations are well integrated into the report. GEWE is both addressed through dedicated relevant criteria ('protection' and 'duty of care') and mainstreamed into the other evaluation criteria. The evaluation matrix includes dedicated questions and sub-questions on GEWE and broader equity and inclusion issues. The chosen mixed-methods approach allows the evaluation to draw upon a variety of data sources and processes, thereby facilitating inclusion, accuracy and credibility. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations clearly reflect a gender analysis that goes beyond exploring numerical equality towards exploring the potential of technology to contribute to gender transformative changes. Findings triangulate the voices of different stakeholders, both men and women. One of seven recommendations and its four related sub-recommendations focus on GEWE, equity and inclusion issues.</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.