

Evaluation title	Evaluation of The Gambia WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2020	
Evaluation category and type	CE-CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The evaluation of the Gambia Country Strategic Plan (CSP) provides robust findings which decision makers can be confident in using for future programming. The report contains a comprehensive and nuanced description of the country context, and clearly describes how previous interventions informed the development of the CSP. The methodological approach was appropriate for this evaluation and facilitated a robust collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. The findings and conclusions are balanced and provide value-added insights into the CSP. However, the findings could have explicitly considered unanticipated effects of the CSP and conclusions could have reflected on the implicit and explicit logic of intervention of the CSP. Moreover, GEWE considerations could have been further mainstreamed across the evaluation questions to ensure full cross-cutting coverage despite the report having clearly emphasized the need for more robust gender integration in the next CSP. The recommendations flow from the findings and conclusions, are actionable and targeted.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report (SER) includes relevant information on the evaluation rationale, objectives, scope, methodology, context, and overview of the evaluation subject, as well as highlighting key evaluation findings and conclusions, and including all recommendations from the main report. Visual aids are used to support the CSP overview description and evaluation findings. The findings assess all evaluation questions and are presented in a clear manner while the conclusions are clearly summarized and do not include information not presented in the findings. However, the introduction of the SER could have been improved by clearly stating the evaluation stakeholders and users and the executive summary could have more clearly distinguished between the evaluation findings and conclusions.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The country context provides a coherent overview of relevant information including macroeconomics, poverty, food security, agriculture, climate change, and education. The country context addresses the SDGs and Agenda 2030 with respect to national policies, namely the National Development Plan (2018-2021). The report effectively addresses the previous interventions and reviews that informed the CSP, including a description of how the CSP was informed by the T-ICSP. Moreover, the CSP strategic outcomes, activities, and budget by strategic outcomes are presented, although the theory of change does not include the assumptions underpinning the causal linkages between outputs and outcomes. The evolution of the CSP over time, including external shocks, is clearly presented along with the evolving modalities of intervention. Beneficiary numbers for the CSP and T-ICSP by Strategic Outcome include appropriate disaggregation. However, the country context could have been improved by providing an analysis of how gender intersects with particular social groups affected by food insecurity.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The objectives of the evaluation are clearly stated, including mainstreaming of GEWE considerations in the evaluation criteria. The rationale and purpose of the evaluation, its main users and stakeholders are also clearly identified. While the scope of the evaluation is defined in terms of time period and the type of activities and dimensions covered, it could have been improved by describing the target groups/beneficiaries of the CSP covered by the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory

<p>The methodological design and sampling strategy are clearly outlined, and the methodological choice involving mixed methods of data collection and analysis (literature review, semi-structured interviews, mini-household surveys, direct observation) was appropriate for this evaluation. The evaluation framework clearly integrated both the standard OECD-DAC criteria and humanitarian criteria and allowed for an assessment of GEWE dimensions. Methodological limitations and mitigation strategies are addressed as are ethical considerations. However, the methodology does not address the availability of monitoring data and how this informed the choice of the methodology despite monitoring data being presented in the findings. Moreover, mitigation strategies could have been articulated for each methodological limitation identified.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall the findings assess the evaluation questions in a thorough and unbiased manner, leveraging both primary and secondary sources of data. The strengths and weaknesses of the CSP are clearly and constructively addressed. Evidence from primary sources is referenced without compromising the anonymity of informants. The findings present output and outcome level data, including assessment of the achievement or non-achievement of planned and actual outcomes. Findings are supported by disaggregated data and triangulated evidence. Contextual and internal factors affecting the performance of the CSP are also assessed. However, the findings could have been improved by addressing all sub-evaluation questions, particularly with respect to gender, protection, and accountability to affected populations in the CSP. Finally, the findings could have explicitly assessed the CSP interventions' alignment with International Humanitarian Principles and presented unanticipated effects of the CSP.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions expand on both positive and negative findings at a higher level of abstraction, connecting the findings across the evaluation questions, and emphasizing their strategic implications for the future of the CSP. They do not contain any major gaps or omissions and do not present any new information not included in the findings. The specific linkages between the findings and conclusions are presented in annex. GEWE and other equity dimensions are clearly addressed while causal linkages to national development goals and relevant SDGs are discussed. However, the conclusions could have been improved by reflecting on the implicit or explicit logic of the CSP, which would have been important given the evaluation's learning objective in view of informing the next CSP.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations flow logically from the conclusions and findings, are realistic, feasible, specific, actionable, and targeted, with responsible actors clearly identified. They present a timeframe for implementation and are clearly identified as either strategic or operational. However, they do not fully consider limitations or contextual factors such as challenges related to developing national capacity and systems, and are not prioritized.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report is presented in an accessible and clear manner, avoiding jargon and excessively complex sentences. Sources for data and quotes are provided, visual aids are effectively used, and annexes are well referenced. However, the order of the annexes does not follow the order in which they are referenced in the main report.</p>		

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: 7 points
<p>While GEWE considerations are not mainstreamed in the evaluation criteria, a standalone evaluation question addresses cross-cutting issues including gender. The methodology clearly states that a gender approach was used in the evaluation and the mixed methods approach was appropriate for evaluating GEWE considerations. A diverse range of data sources was used, including sampling of women, and some sex-disaggregated group discussions were held. The findings present GEWE-related information but unanticipated effects with regards to GEWE are not explicitly reflected. Moreover, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations could have gone further in addressing the CSP's shortcomings with respect to consideration of gender-based violence since this is a major problem in the Gambian context.</p>	

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.