

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of WFP's Environmental Policy	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - Policy	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 89%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP's Environmental Policy is overall a high-quality document that can effectively inform decision-making. The background section of the report presents an analysis of international debates, good practices, external events and trends for understanding WFP's environmental policy. The overview of the policy provides a complete and detailed description of its stated goals, objectives, and underlying logic. While the report demonstrates efforts to integrate Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations, it falls short of explicitly specifying the approach used to evaluate these aspects and lacks detailed descriptions of how gender issues were addressed in data collection and analysis. The findings are transparently generated and present a balanced overview of strengths and weaknesses. The report explicitly references evidence without compromising informant anonymity. Conclusions are balanced and discuss implications from a strategic perspective. They are substantiated by and logically flow from the findings, and do not introduce new information. The recommendations are realistic, feasible and can be implemented within the existing constraints as they acknowledge the financial, operational, and contextual challenges faced by WFP and its partners. They provide a clear direction of intended change, but at the same time leave leeway for implementers and users to fine-tune their implementation approach.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary includes concise information on key evaluation features such as its rationale, objectives, and scope. The findings are presented and structured around the evaluation conclusions but do not clearly signpost the evaluation questions and issues addressed. Conclusions are summarized in a clear and concise manner and follow logically from the key findings. The summary includes all the recommendations from the main report, while it omits the "rationale" section under each recommendation and sub-recommendation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents an analysis of international debates, good practices, and external events/trends that provide valuable context for understanding the development and implementation of WFP's environmental policy. An analysis is included of internal events within WFP that have implications for the environmental policy. The report provides information linking the policy to broader gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE), equity, and inclusion objectives. While the analysis of intersecting vulnerabilities of social groups affected by the policy is not included, the report mentions relevant normative instruments and policies related to human rights and gender equality. The overview of the subject provides a complete and detailed description of the stated goals, objectives, and the underlying logic of the policy.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The objectives and scope of the evaluation are clearly defined. While there is no specific objective solely for human rights and gender equality, these considerations are integrated into the evaluation scope. The report also identifies internal and external key users and stakeholders.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation used a relevant theory-based approach to assess the complex policy implementation with multiple pathways and interactions. The methodological design was informed by an assessment of monitoring data, including on human rights, gender equality and broader inclusion indicators. While the evaluation framework does not include a standalone criterion specifically for GEWE, this is mainstreamed through evaluation sub-questions. The report explicitly acknowledges limitations of the methodology and their potential effects on the evidence base and findings. The evaluation conformed to the UNEG 2020 ethical guidelines. The methodology could have been strengthened by providing further details about the approach used to evaluating GEWE (e.g., gender analysis framework, specific guidelines); describing how</p>		

data collection tools and methods ensured gender sensitivity and providing details on sex-disaggregated data and analysis of gender-specific outcomes. The report should have also specified how the data collection methods took into consideration vulnerable groups, describing how their perspectives were included.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The findings are transparently generated and present a balanced overview of the policy strengths and weaknesses. The report explicitly references evidence without compromising informant anonymity. The evaluation findings discuss the occurrence of both positive and negative unanticipated effects. They also identify recommendations from previous evaluations and discuss how these were taken into consideration. However, some sub-questions could have been responded in greater detail. Finally, the findings in the evaluation report should have better triangulated different voices of different social groups or disaggregated data on gender, equity, and wider inclusion dimensions.

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

The conclusions are balanced and discuss implications from a strategic perspective, connecting findings across different questions. They are substantiated by and logically flow from findings, and do not introduce new information. A specific conclusion discusses the extent to which GEWE, equity, and inclusion dimensions were considered in the environment policy.

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

There is an evident link among the findings, conclusions and the recommendations. The latter are realistic, feasible and can be designed in consideration of the financial, operational, and contextual challenges faced by WFP and its partners. The recommendations are prioritized and presented with a clear timeframe for action. The section includes sub-recommendations addressing some GEWE issues and priorities for action to improve the intervention and future initiatives. However, the evaluation could have been strengthened by providing further details and priorities for action to improve GEWE within the policy framework and across WFP future initiatives.

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

Clear, precise, and professional language is used, which is free of jargon and grammatical errors. The sentences are concise and easy to understand, ensuring clarity and professionalism. Sources are provided for all data and quotes and the report includes a comprehensive bibliography and detailed annexes. Key messages and good practices are consistently summarized and highlighted in the text using boxes and other means. The annexes are listed in the order that they are referenced in the main report and follow the WFP template. On the other hand, the text in all tables and graphs presented should have been revised for clarity and formatting.

**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>	Approaches requirements: 5 points
--	-----------------------------------

The limitations of the monitoring framework informed the choice of a theory-based evaluation approach to better capture the complexity of the policy's implementation and its impact on different social groups. While there is no specific objective solely for human rights and gender equality, these considerations were integrated into the evaluation scope. The report states that the evaluation's design, conduct, analysis, and reporting ensured that results and processes were assessed through a GEWE lens, further broadened to encompass gender, equality, disability, and social inclusion (GEDSI) issues. However, the evaluation matrix did not include evaluation questions to ensure GEWE-related data would be collected. While the report demonstrates efforts to integrate GEWE considerations, it falls short of explicitly specifying the approach used to evaluate these aspects and lacks detailed descriptions of how gender issues were addressed in data collection and analysis. Moreover, the report does not provide specifics on how the perspectives of vulnerable groups were included. The findings do not adequately demonstrate that there was triangulation between different voices or disaggregation of data reporting on gender, equity, and wider inclusion, although at least one sub-recommendation addresses some GEWE issues and priorities for action.

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.