

Evaluation title	WFP’s Corporate Emergency Response in Ukraine: Corporate Emergency Evaluation	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CEE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 86%	
The report presents quality and credible findings that can be relied with confidence for decision making. The conclusions are a key strength, as they directly relate to and support the learning and accountability objectives of the evaluation and offer insights into Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) and other inclusion dimensions of the emergency response. The evaluation’s mixed-method approach enabled all the evaluation questions to be answered, with data collected from a variety of relevant stakeholders. The report’s findings offer a nuanced picture of WFP contribution to results while also considering weaknesses of WFP activities in a neutral manner. A range of relevant and informative secondary sources are mobilized to support data triangulation. The summary report can be used as a standalone document to inform decision-making as it is both concise and comprehensive in presenting the evaluation’s main components and findings. In terms of weaknesses, there is no discussion of an evaluability assessment that informed the methodological design. At the same time, no unintended results of the response related to human rights and gender equality are identified. Primary data is not clearly cited which then limits an understanding of how effective the report is at drawing together different stakeholders across sociodemographic groups within its evidence base. The recommendations would have been made more actionable by considering resource constraints in some instances.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report summary effectively communicates the evaluation’s findings and recommendations. It also includes an adequate context description and overview of the subject, evaluation rationale, objectives, users, methodology. However, the geographic scope of the evaluation was not clearly defined.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
There is a clear description of the external context for the WFP’s emergency response in Ukraine. The evolution of the war is clearly detailed and is complemented with a timeline for the evolution of the emergency response. More could have been added to describe internal WFP policy context relevant to the emergency response while the gender and equity dimensions of the response could also have been further elaborated upon.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
The objectives, purpose, intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation are clearly outlined. However, the report does not include a discussion on how gender considerations were included in the evaluation purpose or scope, and there is no specific objective related to gender, equity, and inclusion.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The evaluation’s mixed methods approach is clearly outlined and allowed for all evaluation questions to be answered with data collected from a variety of stakeholders relevant to the emergency response in Ukraine. Evaluation activities were carried out in alignment with relevant ethical standards and took gender and inclusion issues into account. The report, however, does not contain a discussion how an assessment of the quality and availability of monitoring data informed the methodological choices. The sampling frames could have been further elaborated upon, and limitations to the methodology could have been more explicitly described.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory

All evaluation questions and sub-questions are answered and supported by transparent evidence in a neutral manner. The findings offer sufficient analytical depth and take into account important contextual factors related to the ongoing war in Ukraine, both domestically and internationally. Relevant insights from previous evaluations and needs assessments are incorporated, together with effective triangulation of the voices of different stakeholder groups. The findings considered gender, equity, and inclusion dimensions of the emergency response. However, primary data is not always clearly referenced in the findings and no unanticipated results related to human rights and gender equality are identified.

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

The seven conclusions are presented without gaps, with specific attention given to GEWE-related conclusions. They are drawn from across the findings for the evaluation questions and support the main learning and accountability objectives.

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

The five recommendations made by the evaluation include a timeframe for action and identify responsible actors. They are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. Recommendations allow evaluation users to tune their implementation to the context as needed. However, resource constraints could have been more clearly considered in their formulation.

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

The report is written with clear, understandable and professional language and with good use of tables to depict data. There are good cross-references in the main report and in the annexes. The necessary annexes as well as a table of contents and required lists are included. There is good flow of the narrative throughout. However, the main report is well over the maximum word limit requirement.

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 evaluation approach and methodology were gender-responsive and discussed how the methodological design sought to effectively integrate GEWE. This is reflected in the mixed-methods approach and the use of a variety of data sources, including with some presentation of disaggregated data by sex and other sociodemographic factors. Ethical standards were considered, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. GEWE was mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis and across the evaluation criteria and questions. The evaluation matrix includes sub-questions related to gender equality and broader inclusion and equity considerations. The evaluation's mixed-method approach drew upon a variety of sources and reflected the voices for diverse stakeholders. The report clearly explains how gender issues were addressed during data collection and analysis. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations all considered GEWE-related issues pertinent to the WFP emergency response in Ukraine. However, the report does not clearly comment on the availability of monitoring on GEWE-relevant indicators. The sampling frame for the focus group discussions was not explained and thus limited a full consideration of how this methodology was designed to ensure the inclusion of diverse stakeholders.

Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard

UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Meets requirements
---	--------------------

The TOR for this evaluation considered disability within the proposed evaluation questions and in the requirements for senior level consultant expertise. One evaluation question explicitly considered disability inclusion in the targeting of beneficiaries, including adapting programmes to specific needs. One finding presents some aspects of disability inclusion while one conclusion discusses setting up cash top-ups for pensions and disability grants. However, there is no discussion of how data collection methods included persons with disabilities and their representative organizations, and

it was not possible to assess the evaluation team's knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion from available documents.

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.