

Evaluation title	Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans (CSP)	Evaluation report number	OEV/2017/014
Type	Strategic	Centralised/ Decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Global - CSP Pilots	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category - Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI)– Overall report category and rating	
Exceeds requirements: 82%		Meets requirements: 8	
<p>The Evaluation of the Country Strategic Plan Pilots provides a strong assessment of the roll -out of the CSPs within the context of the wider Integrated Road Map. The findings are well derived from evidence and are balanced. The conclusions address appropriately all evaluation questions. The recommendations are logically derived from the analysis and are clearly targeted to responsible actors. Overall, it describes a very complex and strategic corporate initiative with clarity and accessibility. However, whilst data collection and analysis methods seem appropriate, the report lacks a comprehensive description of the methodology, which is fragmented in several annexes.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The executive summary meets expectations: the description of the evaluation subject (the CSP pilots) is clear and adequate background information is provided. In addition, key conclusions and recommendations are provided and the summary is clear and accessible. The summary would have benefited from a more detailed presentation of the stakeholders and users and of the methodology, including an explanation of the rationale for the evaluation.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds
The CSP pilot is well described and contextualised, within the broader institutional reforms. A strong body of evidence from normative documents and WFP reports is included. The theory of change is provided, and the main partners identified. The information in the overview is relevant and up to date. The overview could have been strengthened by an analysis of the resourcing profile over time and the inclusion of a stakeholder analysis.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The context section provides a clear description of the organisational reform that provides the backdrop for the Pilot of CSPs. The wider humanitarian and development agenda is described clearly and the rationale for the timing of the evaluation, and how it fits within WFP's broader learning objectives, is stated. The intended balance of learning and accountability is also stated but the main users and time of the evaluation are not.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Approaches
The evaluation's methodology has a few weaknesses, the most significant being the undefined application of the evaluation criteria. Although the report states that it has drawn upon the evaluation criteria set out in the TOR, they are not defined within the context of the evaluation and they are not used in the evaluation matrix. Moreover, despite having segments of the methodology described in various annexes, the report is lacking a solid methodology section. The other key weakness is that the evaluation report does not outline the risks or efforts to mitigate them. On the positive side, the data collection methods applied were appropriate and allowed for triangulation of data. Evaluation questions are well defined and there is a solid evaluation matrix. Ethical safeguards are also referenced.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
Findings make consistent, transparent use of evidence. The wider effect on WFP's strategy and on the wider UN system is discussed clearly, moving the discussion from output to outcome level. Potential risks and challenges are clearly framed in the narrative and findings are balanced, presenting achievements and challenges encountered. However, the narrative is organised by outcome area, which means that the discussion on constraining and enabling factors and unintended consequences is mainstreamed in the report, rather than being specifically signposted. Finally, efficiency issues are discussed in broad terms, but the findings don't clearly state whether WFP has made the best use of resources in its CSP piloting.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
Conclusions logically derive from the findings section and provide clear, summary answers, to the six evaluation questions. The logical link between the findings, conclusions, and recommendations is mapped out and the conclusions provide a balanced description of the variation between the countries included in the pilot, drawing a balanced picture of the positive		

and negative aspects of the CSP piloting. However, as for the methodology, there is no explicit reference to the evaluation criteria in the conclusions.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Meets
The evaluation report includes a specific outcome area and a sub-question on the progress achieved through the CSPs on gender and cross-cutting issues. It employs a diverse range of data sources from a wide sample of pilot countries to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility. Moreover, the evaluation also provides clear recommendations for how WFP can improve the CSP's integration of gender and clearly references ethical standards. However, the report does not fully discuss in detail equity issues and recommendations do not reflect equity dimensions.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds
The recommendations are highly relevant, logically derived from the findings, specific and actionable. They are also targeted to specific divisions within WFP with a clear timeframe for action. To enhance their effectiveness, recommendations could have been prioritized and could have captured all the contextual factors and constraints facing WFP.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report is clearly written, uses appropriate language, and meets requirements on length. It also describes a complicated strategic exercise with clarity and accessibility. The tone of the report is balanced and references are appropriately cited. The summary meets WFP length requirements. However, the table of contents and the table of figures are not accurate.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	8

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
Meets requirements: 60–74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements