

Evaluation title	Strategic Evaluation of WFP's work on Nutrition and HIV/AIDS	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Strategic	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The Strategic Evaluation of WFP's work on Nutrition and HIV/AIDS constitutes a satisfactory report that can be used with confidence for decision making. It clearly summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale, and methodology, and provides information on relevant contextual developments during the reviewed period. Findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions are supported by evidence deriving from various primary and secondary data sources. The evaluation deliberately explores questions around gender equality and inclusion. The findings section could have been strengthened by expanding the discussion of the HIV/AIDS Policy's effectiveness, despite the noted limitations in available monitoring data. The report could also have benefited from explaining more clearly why WFP chose to address HIV/AIDS and Nutrition in one combined evaluation, from reflecting existing or potential linkages between HIV and Nutrition in the findings and conclusions sections, and from linking such reflections back to the reconstructed theories of change for both areas. The report makes six targeted recommendations. Some of these could have been strengthened by formulating more specific and actionable suggestions, and by tailoring GEWE-related sub-recommendations to the thematic areas reviewed. The report generally uses clear and professional language and makes good use of visual aids such as tables and graphs to summarize information.</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, as well as information on the evaluation subject. It summarizes evaluation findings on all evaluation questions and includes all the evaluation conclusions and recommendations as they appear in the main report. The summary might have benefited from including some additional information on the evaluation subject, such as WFP financial investments into HIV/AIDS and Nutrition respectively, or information on where responsibility and leadership for both areas lie within WFP, including a few additional figures to convey this information. It also might have benefited from using the conclusions more deliberately to reflect on commonalities, differences, as well as on existing or potential future synergies and linkages between HIV and Nutrition.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation effectively summarizes key developments in WFP's external contexts during the evaluation period and explores implications for the relevance and positioning of the evaluation subject. It provides a comprehensive overview of how WFP's work in the areas of HIV/AIDS and Nutrition evolved during the reviewed period and includes reflections on relevant gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE), equity and inclusion considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report explains the evaluation rationale and provides a concise overview of the evaluation's accountability and learning-related objectives, the evaluation's global scope, and time period covered. Human rights and gender equality considerations were mainstreamed in the evaluation's objectives. The report could have explained more clearly why WFP chose to address HIV and Nutrition in one combined Strategic Evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The theory-based evaluation approach and the chosen data collection methods were appropriate for the evaluation purpose and answering the evaluation questions. The evaluation used the reconstructed Theories of Change and WFP criteria for Policy Quality to guide data collection and analysis. GEWE and broader inclusion issues were effectively mainstreamed using dedicated evaluation questions, sub-questions, and indicators. The report would have benefited</p>		

from: (i) commenting on how the evaluability assessment conducted during the inception phase informed the choice of methodology; and (ii) being more explicit about the specific effects that the noted limitations had on the evaluation.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The evaluation addresses the posed evaluation questions and sub-questions in a clear and structured fashion. Evidence is presented transparently and clearly, providing sources for all data and quotes, and using a neutral tone. The report discusses WFP contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way, considering contextual factors and likely contributions of other actors. The report reflects the voices of diverse stakeholder groups from both inside and outside of WFP. In answering a question on the effectiveness of the HIV/AIDS policy, the report might have benefited from not only discussing limitations of available data for the specific indicators outlined in the original policy, but also clearly stating what types or areas of WFP achievements and contributions to results are emerging from the evidence generated by the evaluation. In some cases, the report could have been more explicit about disaggregating presented data to illustrate differences or consistencies between the views expressed by different consulted stakeholder groups.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The conclusions synthesize several evaluation findings, presenting both strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subjects, and note operational and strategic implications of evaluation findings for the future. They do not contain evident gaps or omissions, do not introduce new information, and entail some reflections on GEWE, equity and inclusion. However, the report could have benefited from using the conclusions more deliberately to reflect on commonalities, differences, and existing or potential future synergies and linkages between the HIV/AIDS and Nutrition policies. This would have been important given the noted reduction in WFP's organizational focus on and declining resources for HIV programming and the need to maximize gains deriving from integrating HIV across WFP programming. The conclusions could also have benefited from additional reflections on GEWE and broader equity/inclusion issues.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The evaluation formulates six targeted recommendations, most of which are realistic. Two recommendations include sub-points that relate to GEWE and inclusion issues. The recommendations logically flow from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are prioritized, include a clear and realistic timeframe for action, and identify responsible actors. However, several of the main recommendations and related sub-points could have been strengthened in terms of their clarity and specificity and, in one case, in terms of considering the extent to which they are realistic in the current WFP context. The report could have tailored GEWE-related considerations more strongly to the specific thematic areas reviewed.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report is written in clear and professional language and includes all required annexes. It makes use of visual aids, including graphics, tables, and bold font to highlight key elements and messages. However, readability of the report could have been further strengthened by: (i) using internal cross-references more frequently to avoid repetitions; (ii) using more textboxes to highlight good practice examples; and (iii) accompanying all presented figures with legends and/or narrative explanations.

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
--	------------------------------

GEWE considerations are well integrated into the report. The evaluation matrix includes a stand-alone question, and several sub-questions and indicators on gender. The evaluation's mixed-methods approach, sampling and data collection tools are adequate for generating appropriate data for the analysis. Ethical standards were consistently considered and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The evaluation findings and conclusions reflect a gender analysis, and two of the six recommendations include sub-points that address GEWE considerations, although these could have benefited from further tailoring them to the evaluation subject. In some cases, the report could have commented more explicitly on differences or consistencies in the views expressed by different consulted

(sub-)groups. The report could also have been strengthened by explicitly commenting on whether sufficient information had been collected on indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results.

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.