

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Democratic Republic of the Congo Interim Country Strategic Plan 2018-2020	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (CSPE)	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The Evaluation of Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) Interim Country Strategic Plan (CSP) (2018-2020) presents credible findings on which decision makers can rely with confidence. The report is well written, providing relevant information on the country context and the various components of the DRC ICSP. With minor exceptions, the methodology is solid and the mixed data collection methods and sampling are well described. The findings are also comprehensive, systematically addressing all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Moreover, the report incorporates gender and ethical considerations very effectively overall. Nevertheless, there were some elements that could have been strengthened. The reconstructed theory of change for the ICSP is not clearly described and the line of sight from evaluation findings through conclusions to recommendations is also not fully clear. There was also a missed opportunity in the conclusions to address the overall programme strategy, and some of the recommendations could have been more specific or actionable.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report provides a very clear, concise, and structured discussion of the evaluation features, findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as key information on the context and overview of the ICSP. Conclusions flow from the findings and provide additional analysis relevant to the recommendations that follow. The one element that could have been further specified is the main stakeholders of the ICSP in the DRC.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report includes a good description of the context, including all the sectors/issues related to CSP interventions as well as others such as conflict, IDP/refugees, etc. that provide relevant background to understanding the challenges WFP faces working in the DRC. The evolution of the programme in the DRC, its positioning and strategic objectives, and key programme elements are clearly presented. However, there is some lack of coherence in the presentation of the CSP's line of sight and theory of change in annex, with no description of the assumptions underpinning the logic of intervention, and the conditions that would need to be in place for the CSP's five expected outcomes to be achieved. In addition, a depiction of the major phases of the portfolio in response to both external and internal events is missing.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, learning and accountability objectives, and scope are summarized in the report with additional details provided in the annexes. The main users and stakeholders of the evaluation are clearly identified. However, the discrepancy between the scope of the ICSP (2017-2019) and the ICSP (2018-2020) is not clearly explained and the how stakeholders will use the evaluation results could be more explicit.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>In addition to a brief section in the main report, the methodology is described in detail in the annexes which include appropriate data collection methods with a view to answering the evaluation questions related to the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Moreover, the methodology included a variety of data sources and considered GEWE, allowing for the voices of the most vulnerable to be heard. Limitations and mitigation measures are clearly identified in the annexes and ethical considerations are thoroughly addressed. However, the evaluation matrix should have identified the data analysis methods for each evaluation question, and it would have been useful to disaggregate by gender the results of the community survey upon which much of the report's analysis is based. More information could also have been provided on how vulnerability at the community level was assessed to ensure representativity.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings present an in-depth analysis of data in line with the key evaluation questions and sub-questions and the thematic priorities. The perspectives of different stakeholders are well balanced, and quotes are sourced without compromising the confidentiality of respondents. Findings provide a solid evidence base, contextualizing and effectively balancing strengths and challenges. Data triangulation is excellent, often specifically citing different sources for each</p>		

finding, including very relevant specific examples to illustrate the findings. Almost every section with the findings includes some observations on gender as well as reference to ISPs/refugees. However, the contributions of WFP interventions towards outcome-level results could have been more articulated; the analysis relies mainly on the degree of achievement of output-level results. Moreover, given the humanitarian context in the DRC, International Humanitarian Principles could have been more detailed and integrated into the evaluation framework, and a description provided of how they were applied in the data collection and analysis methods.

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

Conclusions are based on the four thematic areas identified, connecting findings across different criteria. They go beyond the synthesis of findings to identify the implications of the findings for the future of the CSP, providing an assessment of strengths and challenges of the ICSP, as well as highlighting areas for improvement in a manner that makes them particularly useful for decision-making.. However, despite significant attention given to gender considerations in other sections of the report, there are no conclusions on gender other than a note that this dimension was not well monitored through CSP implementation. Also, given that the line of sight is included in the annex, along with a reconstructed theory of change, it is surprising that there are no overall conclusions about the design of the ICSP. Linkages to national development goals and the relevant SDGs are also not addressed.

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

Recommendations are generally well formulated, prioritized, identified as operational or strategic, with responsibility specifically identified, and timelines proposed for their implementation. They capture important areas for improvement highlighted in the findings and contribute towards organizational accountability and learning. However, the wording of a few recommendations with regard to programme design, strategy and implementation could be more specific and actionable, and some recommendations related to a broadening of CSP scope and depth do not appear to fully consider, or be consistent with, the significant capacity and resource constraints of WFP in DRC highlighted in the evaluation findings and conclusions.

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

In general, this is a well-written report, using clear and accessible language that is appropriate and jargon free; sources are clearly identified and the graphs and tables are useful to illustrate key information. Key findings are also highlighted in bold. The main weakness is the excessive length of the report which could have been addressed by some editing and moving some of the details with respect to findings to the annex. A few other mandatory elements are also not included in the annexes, notably interview protocols and the fieldwork agenda.

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: 9 points
--	-------------------------------------

Gender is effectively mainstreamed throughout the evaluation criteria and questions, including specific gender sub-questions and lines of inquiry . The integration of gender in the methodology is particularly strong, with interview groups separated by gender to allow women, men and youth to freely express their views site visits which allowed direct observation of the lives of women (and men), and data which is meticulously disaggregated (with the exception of the community survey). Reference to women's and women’s rights organizations as sources of information are made several times in the evaluation matrix, although the list of people interviewed does not clearly identify who these are. The analysis is well triangulated and complete with the report also identifying some significant unanticipated results for women, including negative coping strategies (such as sex work) when there was a shortfall or delay in food/cash transfers, and the observation that even if women are the recipients of transfers, household gender dynamics do not give them control of these resources. However, the GEWE recommendations do not provide clear guidance on how WFP can improve GEWE mainstreaming in its next CSP. It would also have been useful to present gender-disaggregated analysis of the results of the community survey, given that the survey format allowed gender identification and a significant participation of women respondents was noted.

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.