

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Mid-Term Evaluation of WFP's Private Sector Partnerships and Fundraising Strategy 2020-2025	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 91%	
<p>The mid-term evaluation of WFP's Private Sector Partnerships and Fundraising Strategy 2020-2025 is a highly satisfactory report that provides a comprehensive, credible, and useful assessment of progress and gaps to date. The design, methodology, analysis, findings, and conclusions are well-substantiated and flow logically to form a set of pragmatic recommendations for action on strategic and operational improvements. At the same time, the evaluation would have benefitted from more attention to, and clarity about the non-financial benefits of the private sector, and a more rigorous application of gender-analysis. No lessons are presented which was an expectation identified in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary offers a concise, well-structured summary and logical overview of the purpose, methodology and findings of the evaluation. The use of charts and graphs help to emphasize key contextual points in relation to the narrative. The recommendations would have benefited from a clearer connection to the findings and/or how they relate to the pillars of the PSPF Strategy.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The introduction includes a clear overview of the subject of the evaluation and usefully presents a Theory of Change to explain the general design and intended outcomes of the PSPF Strategy. The context would benefit from more detail on the non-financial value of the private sector to balance out the primary focus on necessary financial inputs. From the outset the evaluation should explain this important distinction between the financial value versus the non-financial assets (e.g. technical, network, know-how, innovations) of the private sector as key concepts which are raised throughout the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The rationale, objectives and scope of the formative evaluation are clearly indicated. The introduction would benefit from explaining the non-financial value of the private sector and how gender equality considerations are included in the objectives of the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology for the evaluation is thorough and well-explained with additional details in Annex 5 and Annex 6, as well as a more fulsome description in the Inception Report. The methodology would have benefitted from greater clarity on how and why the non-financial aspects of the private sector were studied and assessed, which might have allowed for a greater scope for gender analysis. While several sub-questions in the evaluation matrix address gender issues, the evaluation might have been strengthened with further examination of gender equality in some of the other relevant sub-questions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The findings are well structured and substantiated to assess all three evaluation questions and sub-questions in an unbiased, factual and informative analysis. Several summary tables are particularly useful. Given the emphasis on financial considerations, it might be useful to summarize the key observations on the assessment of non-financial and gender-equality issues in a clearer manner.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions are grouped strategically and thematically, responding to the evaluation objectives and analysis of findings. However, given the evaluation purpose to learn, adding a short section on Lessons have been a useful and important addition to complete the evaluation assessment.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The five recommendations flow from the evaluation's purpose, analysis, findings and conclusions with a clear and practical set of actions with timelines, responsibility and priorities. The full set of recommendations would benefit from considering gender implications and corresponding actions at the strategic or operational level. The recommendations would also benefit from a clear connection to the findings and/or the three evaluation questions and/or how they relate to the pillars of the PSPF Strategy (i.e. impact, income, innovation), or both.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The Evaluation Report is written professionally and follows a clear logic, with useful references and indications of inter-connected themes. The report would benefit from checking acronyms (Executive Summary) and revising jargon or unclear references (e.g. Grand Bargain, or ED priorities). Adding highlight or underline to key points will help the reader take note as the report builds towards and substantiate its conclusions and recommendations.</p>		

<b>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>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory: 6 points</b>
<p>The evaluation scope and questions focus primarily on the global corporate context of WFP funding and the private sector, and the macro analysis does not delve into disaggregation by sector or gender and other vulnerable cohorts. Additionally, the report shows a limited consideration of GEWE in the evaluation questions, and several of the sub-questions could have gone further to consider gender and broader inclusion issues. The evaluation, however, applies a mixed-method approach and includes some GEWE considerations, which would have been more substantive with greater focus on non-financial dimensions of the private sector contribution to WFPs agenda. Finally, the findings discuss gender, and these might have gone further to elaborate in lessons, particularly tied to the non-financial and strategic dimensions of private sector contribution to WFPs mission.</p>	

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