

Evaluation title	Evaluation of WFP's Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Policies	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Policy	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 86%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP's Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Policies is overall a quality report that evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making. It effectively describes both Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR/M) and Climate Change policies and their evolution within WFP over the last 50 years, presenting a reconstructed Theory of Change (ToC) that encompasses both policies and outlines all stated goals and objectives. The evaluation matrix lists all evaluation criteria, evaluation questions and sub-questions, lines of enquiry, data sources, and data collection tools. The methodological design and data collection used a mixed-methods approach drawing from several data sources as well as processes such as triangulation and validation to mitigate certain limitations, which are also clearly described. Findings clearly respond to the three evaluation questions and demonstrate balance between strengths and weaknesses of the policies, although there are some limitations in terms of depth of the assessment of the results at outcome level. However, the report could have been strengthened by presenting a discussion around positive and negative unintended effects. Conclusions provide a higher-level and forward-looking reflection on the information presented in the findings. Recommendations are aligned with the evaluation dual objective of learning and accountability; they are realistic and pay attention to contextual factors that may have an impact on their implementation. However, the report could have been strengthened by including recommendations further reflecting broader equity and inclusion dimensions beyond gender equality.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary observes all of WFP requirements, is comprehensive and provides sufficient information to adequately inform decision-making. It includes key features of the evaluation and of the policies under review, such as their purpose, context and evolution. Summarized versions of the eight conclusions presented in the main report are included in the SER, as are eight evaluation recommendations, which are presented in exactly the same table as the one included in the main report. The summary provides clear and complete information and can be used as a stand-alone document.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report presents a comprehensive context section and includes a good discussion of the DRR/M and Climate Change Policies and their evolution over time, which allows the reader to better understand the policies being evaluated. The report also includes an informative discussion around the strategic framework that has provided guidance to these WFP policies in the broader policy context. The reconstructed ToC is presented through an appealing and effective visual representation, which recognizes the related, yet separate, nature of the policies and illustrates their areas of overlap and differences. While the retrospectively constructed ToC is well described, the overview could have described in further detail some of the most relevant activities and resources allocated to both policies. The report could have also presented an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the policies.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the evaluation rationale, objectives of accountability and learning, as well as programming, geographic and chronological scope. The main stakeholders and users of the evaluation, both internal and external, are clearly listed. As part of the learning objective, the policies were assessed from a gender equality, women empowerment (GEWE) and inclusion perspective.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a discussion of the availability and quality of monitoring data for the purpose of this evaluation. The Evaluation Matrix lists all evaluation criteria which are OECD-DAC criteria; it outlines the evaluation questions and sub-</p>		

questions, qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach and outlines a number of data sources as well as processes such as triangulation and validation to mitigate certain limitations, which are also clearly described. On the other hand, the report could have been strengthened by including a discussion around the evaluation criteria and specific data analysis methods used during the assessment. Similarly, the methodology section could have benefited from providing a more detailed description of the way gender issues were addressed in concrete terms throughout the evaluation process, such as gender-sensitive data collection methods and tools.

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

Findings clearly respond to the three evaluation questions and all 16 sub-questions in a consistent and thorough fashion. Findings demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the policies evaluated. Findings are based on triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data collected from different sources and the report explicitly identifies data sources to underpin assertions made in the analysis. In general, findings address the degree to which both policies contributed to the achievement of results. Moreover, the evaluation discusses a number of findings and recommendations from previous evaluations and assessments. However, the report could have been strengthened by presenting a discussion around positive and negative unintended effects of the policies under review, including those related to human rights and gender equality. Findings could have benefited from making more extensive use of quotes from primary sources. Given the wide span of interventions covered and the lack of robust monitoring data, some understandable limitations were found with the depth of the assessment of the results at outcome level.

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

The report presents eight conclusions that demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the policies and provide a higher-level and forward-looking reflection on the information presented in the evaluation findings, which can effectively inform decision-making. Moreover, conclusions discuss information that spans across evaluation questions and each one of them speaks to one evaluation criterion or aspect of the evaluation, such as Effectiveness, Resources, and Partnerships. Conclusions effectively cover all evaluation criteria and questions with no major gaps observed.

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

Recommendations are clearly based on the information presented in the findings and conclusions sections. They are aligned with the evaluation objectives, are realistic, and pay attention to contextual factors that may have an impact on their implementation. The level of prioritization (high or medium) is indicated for each recommendation and a clear deadline is provided for the implementation of each recommendation. Recommendations address GEWE issues and priorities for action to improve on this aspect of programming. However, recommendations that further reflect broader equity and inclusion dimensions beyond gender equality could have been included.

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

The report includes all of the required lists for policy evaluation reports as per WFP guidelines. All acronyms are fully spelled out at first use. The report uses language that is professional and grammatically correct and presents information in a way that is clear, factual and unbiased. Finally, the report consistently presents summarized key messages across findings, conclusions and recommendations, in a reader-friendly format.

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

An important challenge to the evaluation was to determine to what extent gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) and equity dimensions could be evaluated, in the context of disaster risk and climate change where all gender and vulnerable categories should be both actors and beneficiaries. The ER explicitly includes as part of the learning objective an assessment of the policies from a gender equality, women empowerment (GEWE) and inclusion perspective. Even though they are not reflected in a standalone criterion in the evaluation framework, GEWE considerations were mainstreamed through evaluation sub-questions. However, while the mixed-methods approach was appropriate to assessing GEWE issues, the report could have benefited from providing a more detailed description of the way gender issues were addressed in practical terms throughout the evaluation process such as gender-sensitive data collection

methods and tools. The report refers to the recent WFP Gender Policy 2022, which mentions resilience and climate resilience as enablers of equitable access to and control over the means to achieve food and nutrition security and of enhancing the economic empowerment of women and girls. Conversely, for the most part, the report does not present sex-disaggregated data nor is there a discussion around positive and negative unintended effects, including those related to human rights and gender equality. Finally, recommendations address GEWE issues and priorities for action to improve on this aspect of programming.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels

Highly Satisfactory	<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>
Satisfactory	<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>
Partly Satisfactory	<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>
Unsatisfactory	<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>