

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of the Corporate Emergency Response in Myanmar (2018-2022)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized – Corporate Emergency Evaluation (CEE)	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 90%	
<p>The Evaluation of the Corporate Emergency Response in Myanmar (2018-2022) is overall a high-quality document that can be used with confidence by decision makers. The report highlights important aspects of the national context such as the socio-political, economic, food security and nutrition situation, and provides a thorough description of the Corporate Emergency Response and WFP's strategic direction in the country. The CEE methodology is clearly outlined but does not include an assessment of the quality of the monitoring data collected during the implementation of the Response. Gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) considerations are not reflected in a standalone criterion in the evaluation framework, but they are mainstreamed through two dedicated sub-questions. The report provides a wide range of data sources and methods, tools and processes including triangulation and validation to ensure that the voices of men, women, boys and girls were heard. Findings are supported by sufficient primary and secondary data drawn from a wide range of sources. Also, they discuss strengths and areas for improvement of the Response in a balanced way. However, the report does not examine positive or negative unintended results of the response. The conclusions present a higher-level interpretation of the evaluation findings. Finally, the evaluation presents recommendations that are both realistic and feasible as they consider the implementation context as well as potential limitations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary of the summary report presents key findings, conclusions, and recommendations in a succinct and concise fashion. The summary explains the main evaluation features such as its rationale and objectives. The executive summary also clearly presents the four conclusions and four recommendations of the evaluation. The SER includes graphics and charts that add value to the narrative.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report highlights aspects of the national context and presents an overview of the humanitarian response and WFP in Myanmar. Background information provides valuable insights about the broader context in Myanmar and a relevant and thorough description of the response itself, allowing for a deeper understanding of WFP's strategic direction on the humanitarian front. Strategic outcomes, activities and budget revision shifts under the CSP 2018-2023 are clearly presented. However, further details regarding the linkages between the Response and equity and wider inclusion dimensions are missing. In addition, the report would have benefited from including findings from previous evaluations related to aspects of the Corporate Emergency Response.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The twofold objective of the corporate emergency evaluation is clearly described, i.e., to provide accountability for results to WFP stakeholders, and provide evaluation evidence and learning on WFP performance to inform country-level strategic decisions. The scope of the evaluation is clearly outlined, and two sub-questions focus on gender and other vulnerable groups. The report explains that the CEE will feed into the development of the new interim country strategic plan (ICSP). . On the other hand, the evaluation could have been strengthened by including a specific evaluation objective dedicated to human rights and gender equality or by integrating these dimensions explicitly in other evaluation objectives.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report identifies the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and key themes for evaluating humanitarian action in complex emergencies. Although GEWE considerations are not reflected in a standalone criterion in the evaluation framework, they are mainstreamed through dedicated evaluation sub-questions. Also, the methodology employed an approach appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations, clearly stating how gender issues were addressed.. On the other hand,</p>		

the report could have been strengthened by including an assessment of the quality of the monitoring data collected during the implementation of the Response, and by discussing if sufficient data on human rights, gender equality and broader equity and inclusion dimensions were collected during the implementation period.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
Findings consistently respond to all evaluation questions and the 12 sub-questions. They draw on significant primary and secondary data drawn from a wide range of sources. The report demonstrates balance when discussing the strengths and areas for improvement of the Response, remaining transparent wherever evidence was not conclusive and applying triangulation consistently and where possible. . However, the report does not refer in a consistent manner to either positive or negative unintended results of the implementation of the Response.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents a higher-level interpretation of the evaluation findings in four main cross-cutting conclusions which provide a balanced assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Response. Conclusions demonstrate logical links to specific findings reflected in the “Mapping of findings conclusions and recommendations” table and do not introduce new information. Finally, conclusions address GEWE-related aspects on targeting and accountability to affected populations.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The report presents four main recommendations along with 12 sub-recommendations which exclusively draw on the information presented in the findings and conclusions. Recommendations are aligned with the evaluation twofold objective of learning and accountability. The evaluation presents recommendations that are both realistic and feasible as they consider the implementation context as well as potential limitations, and actors responsible for their implementation are consistently identified. However, the evaluation report should have reflected GEWE issues explicitly in the recommendations.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation report uses language that is professional, free of jargon, neutral and grammatically correct. Furthermore, the report contains information that is presented in an unbiased fashion, and it is generally accessible to a diverse audience. The report includes all the mandatory annexes as per WFP’s requirements which are included in a second volume.		

**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>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 8 points
--	------------------------------

The evaluation does not discuss whether sufficient monitoring data related to GEWE was collected during the implementation period. The context discusses how gender-specific vulnerabilities intersect with other vulnerabilities. For instance, the it explains that the military takeover led to massive shutdowns in government services, education and health, all sectors where women account for a large share of the workforce. Furthermore, even though GEWE considerations are not reflected in a standalone criterion in the evaluation framework, they are mainstreamed through dedicated sub-questions. The evaluators ensured fair recruitment of participants, including women. Therefore, the evaluation team ensured that gender roles were respected and provided space for women to share their views in a safe and enabling environment. The report provides a wide range of data sources and methods, tools and processes including triangulation and validation to ensure that the voices of men, women, boys, and girls were heard. Finally, no specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues are included 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>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

<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>