

|   |  |                     |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>   | Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap (2022 - 2025) |                     |
| <b>Evaluation category and type</b>   | Centralized – Strategic Evaluation   |                     |
| <b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory: 90%   |                     |
| <p>The <i>Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap (2022–2025)</i> is a high-quality report that decision-makers can rely on with confidence. The report provides a detailed description of the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap, and outlines the external and internal factors affecting its implementation. The evaluation's purpose, scope, and dual objectives of learning and accountability are clearly presented, and the evaluation questions, sub-questions, and criteria are appropriately adapted to the context. A robust mixed-methods, theory-based design is employed incorporating extensive document review, key informant interviews, and quantitative modeling. Findings are clearly articulated, supported by strong triangulation, and enriched by a mixed-effect regression analysis. Evidence is robust, balanced, and reflects diverse perspectives, including those of vulnerable populations. Conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and provide strategic insights that go beyond simple synthesis of the findings. Recommendations are forward-looking, and clearly outline the strategic shifts required for WFP to remain a global leader in humanitarian logistics. However, the report could have further demonstrated the gender and inclusion dimensions of the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap within the contextual overview and could have further explored any unexpected positive and negative effects that result from the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap.</p> |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The summary evaluation report (SER) functions as a highly effective standalone document that supports both strategic decision-making and accountability. It offers a concise, well-balanced overview of the evaluation's rationale, purpose, objectives, and scope that allows users to quickly grasp the essential elements. It presents the evaluation's main conclusions in a coherent manner, with each point directly supported by the underlying findings. Recommendations are presented exactly as defined within the main report.</p>  |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The report provides a comprehensive contextual analysis that effectively outlines the external and internal factors affecting the implementation of the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap, including UN80 reforms and recent changes in the funding landscape. The report includes a description of the evolution of the Supply Chain function and outlines the function's linkages to broader corporate plans and policies. A detailed description of the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap is provided, outlining key pillars, enablers, and focus areas, and a reconstructed logic model is presented outlining key causal pathways and underlying assumptions. However, the report could have further demonstrated the gender and inclusion dimensions of the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap.</p>  |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report clearly outlines the evaluation's dual objectives of accountability and learning, along with its purpose and scope. Key stakeholders are identified as well as intended users. Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) considerations are mainstreamed across the evaluation objectives.</p>   |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>   | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation employed a robust mixed-methods, theory-based design incorporating extensive document review, key informant interviews, and quantitative modeling. The methodology is guided by a coherent and effective evaluation matrix logically connecting evaluations questions to indicators, data sources, and data analysis methods. Evaluation questions and sub-questions are well adapted to the context. Gender and disability considerations are integrated throughout, including targeted sampling, disaggregated data, and adherence to UNEG ethical guidelines.</p>  |  |                     |

|  |               |                     |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| <b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>   | <b>Rating</b> | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The findings are clearly articulated, supported by strong triangulation across multiple data sources, and enriched by a mixed-effect regression analysis. Evidence is robust, balanced, and reflects diverse perspectives, including those of vulnerable populations. Findings demonstrate a strong analytical depth and discuss WFP’s internal performance within the complex implementation context. However, limited analysis is provided on unintended positive or negative effects of the Supply Chain Strategic Roadmap.</p>                      |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report presents nine high-level analytical conclusions that logically derive from the findings, go beyond synthesis and offer strategic insights. Annex IX clearly maps each conclusion to its supporting evidence. Conclusions explicitly reflect gender quality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) considerations, synthesizing evidence from across the evaluation criteria.</p>   |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The report presents four high-level, strategic, and actionable recommendations. They are clearly derived from the findings and conclusions, and outline the strategic shifts needed for WFP to remain a global leader in humanitarian logistics. The recommendations include priority levels, timelines, and responsible actors. Each recommendation specifies whether it is operational or strategic. However, while conclusions and findings identify GEWE-related areas for improvement, these do not translate into a dedicated recommendation.</p> |               |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Satisfactory        |
| <p>All sections of the report follow standard templates and include mandatory lists and annexes. The report generally maintains a logical flow, uses footnotes and cross-references effectively, and incorporates visual aid to enhance clarity. Key messages are systematically highlighted through the use of bolding and text boxes, however in a few instances it is unclear whether text boxes constitute findings or other key takeaways.</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>  | Meeting requirements |  |
| <p>The evaluation effectively integrates GEWE, with a well-structured mixed-methods design and clear attention to ethical safeguards. GEWE considerations are embedded across the evaluation objectives, criteria, and questions. Methods include gender-disaggregated focus groups and semi-structured interviews designed to capture the differential perspectives of diverse social groups. A background on relevant normative instruments or policies related to GEWE is provided and findings systematically triangulate qualitative insights with quantitative data disaggregated by sex. However, despite identifying shortcomings related to GEWE within findings and conclusions, the evaluation does not translate these into explicit recommendations.</p> |                      |  |

|  |                      |  |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <b>Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard</b>  |                      |  |
| <b>UN-DIS individual evaluation score</b>  | Missing requirements |  |
| <p>The evaluation terms of reference adequately address disability inclusion. Evaluation questions incorporate disability considerations through indicators under evaluation sub-question 3.4 which focuses on cross-cutting priorities. However, limited information is provided on how persons with disabilities or their representative organizations were involved in stakeholder mapping or data collection. The findings present some evidence on the adaptation of logistics and delivery methods to overcome access issues. However, conclusions and recommendations do not explicitly address disability inclusion consideration.</p> |                      |  |

| 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.  |