

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Cameroon WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2020	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (CSPE)	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The report of the evaluation of the Cameroon WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2020 presents credible evidence-based findings that users can rely on with confidence. It is well written, with key messages clearly summarized, and provides a balanced assessment of the CSP against the main evaluation questions. The CSP objectives, strategic outcomes, planned activities, and expected results are clearly outlined. Findings are transparently and impartially generated without bias and explicitly sourced. Comprehensive conclusions flow logically from the findings and are forward-looking, while recommendations are actionable, realistic and well aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives. However, important elements related to the methodology are missing in the report and the main lines of inquiry with regard to GEWE and equity dimensions could have been strengthened.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report clearly outlines the main elements of the evaluation and can be used as a stand-alone document by decision makers. It provides a brief overview of the CSP and its context and outlines the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation. Moreover, all recommendations are included as they appear in the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of the country context, such as the demographic profile, basic macroeconomic indicators, education-sector indicators, as well as relevant national policies, including Cameroon Vision 2035 and the MINADER National Agricultural Investment Plan. It also includes a very good description of WFP activities and their evolution over time in response to external events as well as operational shifts from previous programming cycles. The transfer modality for each activity is clearly presented. However, the report would have benefited from a more complete presentation of the CSP's gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions. In addition, the context section could have provided basic data on agriculture or smallholder farmer productivity given their importance for food security.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale/purpose and objectives are clearly outlined as are the intended users. Moreover, the report provides a clear description of the evaluation scope, namely the time period, target groups, specific activities as well as the thematic dimensions covered.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>While the methodology section clearly presents data sources and data collection methods, as well as methodological limitations and mitigation strategies, it does not adequately present key elements such as the description of the methodological approach, the sample frame and sampling strategy, as well as the evaluation matrix. The main lines of inquiry with regard to GEWE and equity dimensions could have been strengthened. Most of this information is found in the inception report but should have been included in the final evaluation report itself.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Findings highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the Cameroon CSP through a systematic assessment of the evaluation questions. They are substantiated by evidence that is clearly presented and explicitly sourced and analyze how WFP interventions contributed to outcome-level results while considering the implementation context. Findings also clearly consider WFP's contribution to the achievement of cross-cutting aims related to humanitarian protection, accountability to affected populations, gender equality and other equity considerations. The findings also provide ample evidence of the way the CSP integrated recommendations from previous evaluations. However, the report would have</p>		

benefited from a discussion of any unanticipated effects, either positive or negative, and providing further proof of triangulation, in particular when discussing gender issues.

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

Conclusions logically flow from the findings and do not include information that has not already been discussed in the findings. They are balanced in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP and add value to the findings by identifying their strategic implications for the future of the CSP. Conclusions correctly reflect GEWE-related aspects and equity and inclusion dimensions. However, conclusions would have benefited from commenting on the validity of the CSP logic or its assumptions.

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

The report presents recommendations that are well formulated, demonstrating a good understanding of WFP work, including its capacities and limitations. They are identified as operational or strategic, with the level of priority clearly indicated. Moreover, targeted actors and the implementation timeframe are clearly identified for each recommendation. However, gender and broader equity and inclusion dimensions could have been further addressed in the recommendations.

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

The report uses clear, precise and professional language and includes visual aids such as maps, graphs and tables that are relevant and complement the narrative in the report. Key messages are highlighted in bold throughout the document, contributing to its accessibility and clarity. The annexes are appropriately referenced in the report and include most of the required elements, although some key pieces, such as the evaluation terms of reference and evaluation matrix, are missing.

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	Approaches requirements: 6 points
--	--

The gender information provided in the context is not adequately relevant to the specific issues addressed by the CSP. Although the evaluation committed to gender-sensitive data collection methods, the report does not specify how many male/female beneficiaries were consulted and it is not clear in what context women-only groups may have been interviewed. The report attempt at including findings on GEWE, which are however not adequately backed by triangulated evidence. While conclusions correctly reflect GEWE-related aspects and equity and inclusion dimensions, only two out of twenty sub-recommendations specifically address gender: one to mobilize additional technical expertise through partnerships, and another to systematically consider gender and conflict dynamics.

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.