

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of WFP's Emergency Preparedness Policy	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - Policy	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP's Emergency Preparedness Policy constitutes a satisfactory report that decision makers can use with confidence. The report clearly describes the evaluation purpose, objectives, questions and context, and key features of the mixed-methods evaluation methodology. Gender equality and broader inclusion considerations were mainstreamed into the evaluation. Drawing upon a variety of primary and secondary data sources, the report articulates clear findings for all evaluation questions and sub-questions. It puts forward a set of conclusions and five recommendations that logically derive from the presented findings. The report could have been further improved by describing how the quality of available monitoring data, including data on gender equality and human rights, informed the methodological design. The findings could have also explored whether the policy and its implementation had any unanticipated effects, including on gender equality and human rights. Additionally, the findings could have reflected the views of non-WFP stakeholders more consistently. Finally, all conclusions should have articulated forward-looking implications and the recommendations should have been more specific to enable concrete actions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The summary report provides an accurate and useful overview of key evaluation features, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. It includes several relevant figures from the main report, and is logically organized, with the main findings supporting key conclusions. It includes all the recommendations as they appear in the main report. The summary could have benefited from naming the intended evaluation users and, when describing the evaluation subject, from clearly stating whether there was a policy owner within WFP.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report effectively contextualizes emergency preparedness within WFP's strategic evolution since 2004, presenting clear policy objectives and theory of change, while incorporating gender equality and inclusion considerations. The analysis could have been further enhanced by clarifying policy ownership and implementation responsibilities within WFP, and by referencing studies that might have shaped the development of the policy.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report clearly and concisely describes the evaluation rationale, objectives and scope. It provides relevant information summarized in a table that allows readers to grasp key characteristics at a glance. Gender equality and women's empowerment considerations were mainstreamed into the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation's participatory, mixed-methods approach was appropriate for answering the evaluation questions and is clearly described in the main report and annexes and. The evaluation used the policy's reconstructed theory of change as the guiding framework for data collection and analysis. Data collection drew upon a range of primary and secondary data sources and processes, including a review of relevant organizations for comparisons. The report describes the evaluation's approach to addressing gender equality considerations and explains how it considered relevant ethical standards. Methodological limitations and related mitigation strategies are clearly described. The report could have been further strengthened by describing how an assessment of the quality and validity of available monitoring data, and specifically data related to gender equality and human rights issues, informed the methodological design.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report presents clear findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions. It provides sources for most data, describes gaps in the evidence base, and reflects strengths and weaknesses of the policy and its implementation. Findings reflect the views of several groups of actors and refer to several previous evaluations. The section could have been further strengthened by primarily by avoiding contradictions between some of the findings and stating the underlying sources</p>		

for all observations. The report could have also reflected the views of non-WFP actors more effectively. The report could have also commented on unintended effects of the policy and its implementation and better analyzed discrepancies between planned and actual results.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report articulates a set of conclusions that summarize key insights across evaluation questions, outline several strategic implications that derive and logically flow from the findings. Several of the conclusions reflect gender equality and broader inclusion dimensions. They could have been strengthened, however, by more clearly articulating implications of the noted gaps or weaknesses. Finally, there is a specific conclusion that is not fully supported by the findings.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The report makes five main recommendations that logically flow from, and address, the main gaps and weaknesses presented in the findings and conclusions. The recommendations are realistic and contextually feasible, with clear timelines and a responsible actor assigned. They are prioritized, grouped, and sequenced, and include reflections on how to improve WFP's work in relation to gender equality and broader inclusion issues, including on disability. Some of the sub-recommendations could have been strengthened by using more specific language and more consistent prioritization.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report is generally written in clear and professional language, free from grammar and other mistakes. It provides sources for data and quotes, effectively uses visual aids to convey key information, uses bold font and shaded textboxes to visually highlight key messages, and includes all the requested annexes. It might have benefited from undergoing a final edit to catch a few minor errors. In some cases, the report could have explained some technical terms and concepts. Main findings could have been clearer, reducing their length, focusing on less insights and moving descriptive detail to supporting paragraphs. The report exceeds the recommended word limit, and its readability could have benefited from reducing its length, including by using more cross-references and omitting some descriptive detail. It would have been helpful had the main report included references to all included annexes.

### **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: 7 points
--	------------------------------

The evaluation approach and mixed-methods methodology, which drew upon a variety of data sources and processes, were gender-responsive and based on deliberate considerations on how to integrate GEWE dimensions in data collection and analysis. The evaluation matrix included dedicated questions on GEWE. Evaluation findings and conclusions, and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The report could have benefited from commenting on the availability of monitoring data on GEWE, providing a more developed intersectional analysis of compounded vulnerabilities, and commenting on whether the evaluated policy had unintended effects in relation to GEWE.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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.