

Evaluation title	Evaluation of WFP's Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Policy Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 96%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP's Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition is a high-quality report; 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. It presents a good overview of the context and overview of the evolution of resilience building for food security and nutrition in WFP programming. The evaluation uses a mixed-methods approach that includes mainstreaming of gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) considerations. Findings are clearly outlined, highlighting both strengths and weaknesses of the resilience policy, and all evaluation questions and sub-questions are answered consistently. Findings present triangulation of varied sets of data collected from different sources and the report explicitly identifies data sources used to support them. Recommendations clearly draw on the evaluation findings and conclusions, are realistic and pay attention to contextual factors that may have an impact on their implementation. However, the report could have been somewhat enhanced by bringing forward cross-cutting issues, such as equity and wider inclusion more prominently in the report, and by presenting an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the policy.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary is a comprehensive and informative stand-alone document. It provides a clear summary of key information drawn from the main report, supported by a few visual aids that complement the narrative. Key evaluation findings are well structured by theme, such as policy quality, policy implementation, senior management support, and corporate responsibilities and accountabilities, among others.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a good overview of the context and subject, as well as the evolution of resilience both within WFP as well as outside the organization. As resilience policy does not have a theory of change (ToC), the evaluation team retrospectively constructed a ToC as an evaluative tool to help to identify the policy's likely spheres of control, influence and interest, to define and refine the scope and focus of the evaluation and indicators of progress. It also explains key concepts that are instrumental for the reader to understand the policy and lists several findings and recommendations from previous evaluations that informed the current evaluation. However, the report should have discussed the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality and described how the policy addressed the conditions of different social groups. Finally, the overview could have described in further detail some of the most relevant activities related to the resilience policy and resources allocated to it.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report describes the main evaluation objectives of accountability and learning, explicitly including as part of the learning objective an assessment of the policy from a gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and inclusion perspective. The scope of the evaluation is also clearly described in programming and chronological terms. Conversely, the evaluation report could have benefited from explicitly addressing the rationale/purpose of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a good description of the methodological design and data collection methods that allowed evaluation questions to be adequately answered. It also includes a discussion of the availability and quality of data for the purpose of this evaluation. The report introduces the evaluation questions in a discussion along with their corresponding OECD-DAC criteria, just as outlined in the ToC. The evaluation matrix, included in an annex, presents the evaluation questions associated with their corresponding evaluation criteria; sub-questions; lines of enquiry; main sources of data and data collection tools; and data analysis methods to be used under each evaluation sub-question. A contribution analysis was</p>		

applied to the country and desk studies, using the evaluation ToC as a starting point, with comparative case study analysis. GEWE considerations were mainstreamed through evaluation sub-questions and the methodology explains the ways in which the evaluation used a gender lens throughout the evaluation process. The report dedicates a sub-section of the methodology to identify a number of methodological limitations, such as challenges in directly linking policy to programming, and limited availability of respondents, with mitigation strategies outlined for each limitation.

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

Findings are clearly presented and thoroughly respond to the three evaluation questions, as well as to all sub-questions. Findings highlight both strengths and weaknesses of the resilience policy, presenting a complete assessment of the degree to which the policy contributed to the achievement of results. Findings are evidence-based, including triangulation of varied sets of data collected from different sources, reporting on gender, equity, and wider inclusion dimensions as well. Furthermore, the evaluation is strong at presenting a discussion around potential unintended effects with regards to human rights and gender equality. While the report presents a discussion around potential unintended effects with regards to human rights and gender equality, these are framed as 'risks' rather than effects.

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

The report presents conclusions that highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the policy and provide a higher-level reflection on the implications of the evaluation findings for the future of the resilience policy that can be useful for accountability and strategic decision making. Conclusions discuss information that spans across the evaluation questions without any major gaps or omissions. Furthermore, conclusions consistently state to which recommendation each conclusion is logically related. Gender is included as part of the analysis presented in the evaluation conclusions. However, cross-cutting issues such as equity and wider inclusion should have been more prominently addressed in the conclusions.

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

Recommendations are few in number, clearly draw on the evaluation findings and conclusions, are realistic, and pay attention to contextual factors that may have an impact on their implementation, addressing GEWE issues as well. Recommendations are clearly presented, are actionable and provide sufficient detail as to how to go about their implementation, with target actors identified and a list of other contributing entities that could partake in their implementation. The level of prioritization (high or medium) and a clear deadline for the implementation of each recommendation are indicated.

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

The report includes all of the required lists. The language used is professional and grammatically correct and the information included is factual, unbiased, and presented in a clear fashion. In addition, the report presents summarized key messages across findings, conclusions and recommendations, which enhances the readability of the report. However, the report length and length of the annexes exceed WFP maximum word count requirements.

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 report addresses the question of whether enough information was collected on specific results indicators to measure progress on human rights, gender equality and broader equity. Furthermore, it also assessed the Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition from a GEWE and inclusion perspective, with GEWE was mainstreamed through evaluation sub-questions and gender and other diversity considerations incorporated throughout the evaluation design. The report highlights that the policy is explicit about the need to integrate GEWE and social inclusion objectives, including people living with disabilities. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach appropriate to evaluating GEWE and applying wider inclusion considerations. Findings and recommendations address GEWE issues and priorities and provide guidelines for action to improve on this area. However, the methodology section could have benefited from further explaining the way in which the evaluation ensured that the voices of all groups, i.e., men, women, boys and girls, and in particular the most vulnerable, were heard, for instance, through gender- and age-disaggregated focus groups. Furthermore, the context section includes no intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the policy.

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.