

Evaluation title	Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Approaches to Targeting and Prioritization for Food and Nutrition Assistance	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Strategic Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The <i>Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Approaches to Targeting and Prioritization for Food and Nutrition Assistance</i> is a well-written report that delivers credible, well-substantiated findings that decision makers can rely on with confidence. The report presents a coherent narrative that maintains internal consistency throughout. A comprehensive overview of the context is provided, including an analysis of the humanitarian funding landscape and an explanation of the conceptual framework and normative framework for WFP targeting and prioritization. The report includes a clear and comprehensive description of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope and presents a robust mixed-methods design that triangulates evidence from diverse qualitative and quantitative sources. Findings are well-triangulated, balanced, and address all evaluation questions and sub-questions. Contextual factors shaping targeting and prioritization decisions are well examined, and country case studies provide strong illustrative examples. Conclusions are pitched at an appropriate level of analytical abstraction and follow logically from the evidence presented. Recommendations are generally realistic, well-prioritized, and clearly assign responsibility and timelines for follow-up. However, greater conciseness and more extensive use of internal cross-references could have improved accessibility and readability. Further clarification on how the theory-based approach was applied in practice could have enhanced transparency and more precise lines of inquiry and qualitative indicators could have strengthened the evaluation matrix. In some cases, key findings are descriptive in nature with critical analytical insights embedded within extended narratives rather than clearly highlighted. In a few instances, recommendations extend slightly beyond the explicit evidence provided, however, these extensions represent reasonable operational approaches to address identified challenges rather than significant departures from the evidence base.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report (SER) provides a concise and well-structured overview of the main evaluation report, offering balanced information across the evaluation features, context, and subject. It clearly and succinctly presents the key evaluation messages related to relevance, appropriateness, and effectiveness. The conclusions are supported by summarized findings, and the evaluation recommendations are included exactly as presented in the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report offers a solid analysis of the humanitarian funding landscape, clearly illustrating the widening gap between needs and resources with relevant data. It effectively explains the context for targeting and prioritization at WFP, providing clear definitions, visualizations to communicate the conceptual framework and normative framework, and descriptions of relevant staffing capacities. However, the analysis could have provided additional information on factors beyond funding constraints that influence targeting and prioritization decisions, and more explicitly identified disadvantaged groups that may be affected by these decisions.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and comprehensive description of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. No significant weaknesses are identified, as the information is complete and well-structured.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation uses a robust mixed-methods design, combining qualitative and quantitative data across seven case studies, ensuring good geographic coverage. It presents four manageable and coherent evaluation questions aligned with the evaluation's dual purpose of accountability and learning. A comprehensive evaluation matrix is provided that integrates gender, equity, and inclusion. Methodological limitations are transparently acknowledged, with appropriate</p>		

mitigation measures described. However, further clarification on how the theory-based approach was applied in practice could have enhanced transparency. In addition, more precise lines of inquiry and more specific qualitative indicators could have strengthened the evaluation matrix.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
The report presents clear and comprehensive findings statements that address all evaluation questions and sub-questions. Findings are well-triangulated, balanced, and transparent about evidence limitations. Contextual factors shaping targeting decisions are well examined, and country case studies provide strong illustrative examples, particularly on the shift to vulnerability-based targeting. Internal enablers and barriers are identified and a critical assessment of intended and unintended effects of targeting practices is provided. However, in some cases key findings are descriptive in nature with critical analytical insights embedded within extended narrative paragraphs rather than clearly highlighted. In addition, stronger alignment between findings and the evaluation matrix could have improved traceability and a greater use of disaggregated data and perspectives from different social groups could have deepened the analysis.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The conclusions are pitched at an appropriate level of analytical abstraction, going beyond a summary of findings to synthesize insights across evaluation questions and criteria. They logically follow from the evidence, outline strategic implications, and incorporate several gender and inclusion considerations.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The report presents four main recommendations that logically flow from the findings and clearly articulate the changes sought from WFP. They are realistic, take implementation context into account, are prioritized, assign responsibility, and include timelines. However, the recommendations could have been strengthened by ensuring that all sub-recommendations are specific and focused on a single envisioned change. In addition, in a few cases, the recommendations extend somewhat beyond the explicit evidence provided in the report, however, these extensions represent reasonable operational approaches to address identified challenges rather than significant departures from the evidence base.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report is internally consistent, flows logically, and aligns with WFP requirements for structure and content. It uses clear, professional language, and provides sources for all data. Internal cross-referencing is used, and visual aids such as figures and tables effectively convey complex information. However, the report could have been more concise by reducing some redundancies and limiting detailed descriptions. Clarity could have been improved by using internal cross-references more extensively to link related content across sections.		

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	Meeting Requirements	
The evaluation integrates GEWE well across its objectives, scope, methodology, and questions. GEWE considerations are integrated within the evaluation matrix and the methodology includes mixed-methods, triangulation, and efforts to capture a diversity of perspectives. While the findings acknowledge the importance of inclusion considerations in targeting and prioritization, they demonstrate limited triangulation of data from different social groups and minimal disaggregation of quantitative data. Several sub-recommendations explicitly reflect on GEWE considerations.		

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

The evaluation terms of reference adequately integrate disability inclusion, and the evaluation reflects disability considerations in several findings and one conclusion. However, disability is not explicitly covered in the evaluation questions and stakeholder mapping and data collection methods do not explicitly involve persons with disabilities and their representative organizations

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.