

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of the WFP South-South and triangular cooperation policy (2015-2019)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized – Policy evaluation	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory 85%	
<p>The evaluation report of the WFP South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) policy is credible and can be used for decision making with confidence. Based on a sound methodological approach, the evaluation yields pertinent findings that enable WFP to improve its policy management with regards to SSTC. The four main conclusions synthesize well the evolution of the SSTC Policy, the institutionalization process and need for WFP to improve its positioning within UN country teams. The six recommendations are useful, pragmatic, targeted and actionable. The SSTC policy being "gender blind" and the fact that there is a lack of comprehensive data on WFP-supported SSTC initiative beyond activity level are two key factors that have hindered due consideration of GEWE-related aspects and wider equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The summary meets all expected requirements: it is a reliable and complete synthesis of the evaluation report, is complete in covering the evaluation subject, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The introduction is well crafted and provides a clear overview of the purpose of the evaluation, the process followed, its intended users and its main limitations. The findings cover each evaluation question and provide clearly substantive evidence answering each of them. Conclusions rest on findings and are expressed simply and clearly. Recommendations in the SER reflect faithfully the ones in the evaluation report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The internal and external contexts are well described. The scope of the SSTC policy evaluation is well presented and the retrospective theory of change included in the report is a laudable attempt to make explicit the underlying logic model of the SSTC policy. However, SSTC policy focus on the most vulnerable could have been better described and explained.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The dual overall objectives of learning and accountability of the evaluation are clearly stated. The rationale and potential use are well explained. Human Rights, Gender equality and inclusiveness are mainstreamed in the evaluation matrix and data collection tools.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation methodology was well adapted to the evaluand, duly considering limitations in corporate data on WFP-supported SSTC initiatives and related to the COVID-19 pandemic. OECD-DAC evaluation criteria are referred to explicitly in the evaluation report, with changes from the TOR to Inception Report explained very clearly. The mixed method approach for data collection relied on literature review, remote field missions, in depth desk reviews of country offices documents, key informant interviews and comparative analysis with other UN organisations. The ethical considerations are clearly presented in the evaluation report and are adequately dealt with. The evaluation matrix is structured according to the three main evaluation questions, with relevant and useful sub-questions. Nonetheless, a link could have been made between the evaluation questions and the set of OECD DAC criteria adopted.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>Findings are presented in a neutral fashion and are supported by sufficient evidence, revealing both strengths and limitations of the evaluation subject. The findings provide excellent observations, learning and evidence on the nature and quality of the policy, on the results of the policy and why the policy produced the observed results. While the findings are useful to address the state of implementation of the policy and evidence on collaboration modalities, they fall short on informing systematically on the results helping the ultimate beneficiaries, including effects on human rights, gender equality and inclusiveness. The unanticipated effects are not systematically identified and analysed.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The conclusions are consistent with the findings and are well substantiated, providing useful insights related to the strategic management of a policy. They could have brought forth additional information on how the policy effects reach the ultimate beneficiaries, including equality and inclusiveness considerations.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly satisfactory
The recommendations are well crafted and have a strategic perspective aimed at fostering the improvement of the SSTC policy management by WFP. They are clear, to the point, strategic and are aligned with the purpose of the evaluation. Importantly, they reflect well WFP's external and internal contexts and are logically interrelated. Recommendations are well focused and actionable, with a designated responsible unit and support actors, and are time bound and prioritized.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation report is professionally written in a clear and simple language, with acronyms spelled out systematically any time they are used for the first time. It is well documented, and evidence based. The use of visual aids helps understanding of the subject matter and text boxes are used astutely. Sources are consistently indicated, and cross references are made throughout the document. However, the evaluation report and its annexes could have been slightly shorter.		

<b>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</b>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Approaches requirements: 5 points
The SSTC policy was "gender blind". The evaluation does not have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue nor spells out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality. On the other hand, the evaluation matrix had a sub-question asking the extent to which the SSTC Policy and later guidance tools highlighted gender, disability, and broader equity considerations and another on the extent to which cross-cutting dimensions such as gender were considered in the design of South-South cooperation programmes. No unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender are described in the report. Given the fact that there was no comprehensive data on WFP supported SSTC initiatives beyond the activity level and next to no secondary data on gender and other equity or inclusion related issues, the evaluation team partly mitigated the limitations by drawing upon primary data collected in 12 focus countries in the course of the data collection phase.	

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>