

|   |  |                     |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>   | Evaluation of the Policy on WFP's Role in Peacebuilding in Transition Settings |                     |
| <b>Evaluation category and type</b>   | Centralized – Policy Evaluation  |                     |
| <b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory (94%)  |                     |
| <p>The Evaluation of the Policy on WFP's Role in Peacebuilding in Transition Settings presents credible and useful findings that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report describes the broader context underlying the approval of the policy in 2013, provides information on the strategic directions and overarching objectives of the policy, as well as the measures and steps taken by WFP to implement the policy. The evaluation's aim, objectives, scope and users are clearly outlined. The evaluation approach and methodology are appropriate, drawing on different sources of information (including documents, interviews, surveys, focus group discussions, country cases, and sense-making workshops). Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) dimensions are considered in the evaluation framework. The evaluation findings are presented in a balanced manner, including reporting on both positive and negative unanticipated effects of the peacebuilding policy. The report clearly flags any gaps in terms of evidence. The evaluation presents balanced conclusions, reflecting the strengths and weaknesses of the policy. Recommendations are well targeted, have a clear timeframe for action, and address GEWE and broader equity and inclusion issues. However, some weaknesses noted include that the report does not include the definition of key elements of the policy; the conclusions do not discuss the extent to which GEWE dimensions were considered in the peacebuilding policy; and the report does not meet the WFP maximum length requirements.</p> |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The executive summary provides a succinct description of the main features of the evaluation and summarizes the key findings around the three evaluation questions. Conclusions and recommendations are equally well presented. However, the summary is silent about the overall rationale and objective of the evaluation. The summary could have been strengthened by including a brief description of the context of the peacebuilding policy, and by reflecting GEWE-related issues in the conclusions.</p>  |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The report provides a good overview of the broader context underlying the approval of the WFP Peacebuilding Policy in 2013 and relevant information on recent global developments, which have shaped WFP peacebuilding work since the approval of the policy. It also discusses how WFP committed more to conflict-sensitive programming following some internal events within WFP and how the policy considered the gender dimension and other diversity considerations. The overview includes descriptive information on the strategic directions and overarching objectives of WFP's Peacebuilding Policy, as well as the measures and steps taken by WFP to implement the policy. However, the overview does not provide the definition of key elements of the policy such as "Peacebuilding" and "Transition", and no comparison of WFP's definitions is made to those of other similar organizations. The overview could have been improved by clearly speaking to the specific social groups affected by the Peacebuilding Policy and the vulnerabilities of these groups, and by adding an analysis of relevant policies related to human rights and gender equality.</p>  |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The overall aim of the evaluation and its objectives of learning and accountability are clearly outlined in the report. The time period, the geographical scope, the primary and secondary users of the evaluation and specific dimensions of the policy covered by the evaluation are well defined, including how gender and diversity dimensions were considered in the evaluation framework. The report could have been strengthened by explicitly mainstreaming human rights dimensions.</p>   |  |                     |

|  |               |                            |
|--|---------------|----------------------------|
| <b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>The methodological design is presented, discussing the theory-based and mixed-methods approaches which guided the evaluation. The methodology used for this evaluation is sound, mixing different data collection and analysis methods and triangulating data from various sources of information, including documents, interviews, surveys, focus group discussions, country cases, and sense-making workshops. A comprehensive evaluation matrix is presented in the report's annexes, clearly outlining the evaluation criteria and associated questions, data indicators and sources, methods of data collection and analysis, as well as the degree of data availability and reliability. The sampling strategy is well described. Finally, the report elaborates on the methodological limitations and how the evaluation team addressed them. However, it could have been improved by explicitly informing whether sufficient data was collected on specific results indicators as to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p> |               |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>   | <b>Rating</b> | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>The findings are presented in an impartial manner, using evidence from various sources of data to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the WFP Peacebuilding Policy, in accordance with the three main evaluation questions. The report clearly indicates where there is a gap in terms of evidence and the evaluation team was unable to draw conclusions. The findings present the views of stakeholders throughout the report (WFP employees, conflict-affected people), without compromising interviewees' confidentiality. While the report discusses positive and negative unanticipated effects of the peacebuilding policy, it is silent about unintended results related to human rights and gender equality.</p>   |               |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>The evaluation conclusions are well balanced, reflecting the strengths and weaknesses of the peacebuilding policy, and are discussed around the three main evaluation questions, clearly linking to the conclusions to the findings. They are pitched at a high level and identify the implications of the findings for the future of the peacebuilding policy. No information that was not already presented and discussed in the findings is included in the conclusions, and no major omissions were identified. However, the conclusions could have been strengthened by adding a discussion on the extent to which GEWE and inclusion dimensions were considered in the peacebuilding policy.</p>  |               |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>The report formulates four main recommendations which, overall, contribute to the evaluation dual objective of learning and accountability and are derived from the findings and conclusions. The recommendations appear to be realistic and actionable, articulate minimum standards that should be met by all country operations, and provide indications of concrete steps/elements that should be done to ensure their implementation, with clear timeframes for action. They are also well targeted, identifying a responsible lead actor and support actors. However, the prioritization of recommendations could have been improved by indicating which recommendations are of high, medium or low priority. Similarly, recommendations could have been further grouped into strategic and operational recommendations.</p>  |               |                            |
| <b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
| <p>The structure of the report is consistent with the WFP template for policy evaluations. The report is accessible, does not contain jargon language, and associates all data and quotes with their sources to support the findings. The report uses visual aids in the form of tables, figures and graphs to highlight specific content. For each main evaluation question and/or themes, the report summarizes the key findings either in a text box or includes key statements summarizing the key findings and, in so doing, facilitates navigation for the reader through the findings. However, streamlining some parts of the report could have contributed to reducing its length. The report could have undergone a more thorough copy edit to correct any grammar, spelling, and punctuation mistakes noted.</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: 7 points

The evaluation included strategies to ensure that data was collected to evaluate GEWE aspects. Thematically, the evaluation assesses the extent to which the peacebuilding policy is consistent and complementary with the gender policy. The report describes specific measures undertaken to maintain ethical standards throughout the evaluation. While there is no specific objective reflecting human rights and gender equality, and no standalone criterion focused on GEWE considerations, there are indicators under some criteria in the evaluation matrix reflecting GEWE aspects which allowed measuring them. For example, the share of women and men affected by or at risk of conflict reporting negative or positive effects of WFP's presence (disaggregated by sex and age). Some sub-recommendations have aspects which address GEWE and broader equity and inclusion issues. However, unintended results relating to human rights and gender equality are not explicitly discussed in the report.

| Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels |   |
|--|---|
| <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>  |