

Evaluation title	Evaluación del plan estratégico para El Salvador (2017-2022)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation - Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 93%	
<p>The El Salvador's CSP Evaluation Report is overall a high-quality document that can effectively be used to inform decision-making. It presents a clear, accurate, and complete description of the intervention context as well as a thorough account of the country context including relevant development indexes, national policies, frameworks and priorities. The report outlines how the CSPE was based on information generated through previous studies, analytical work and preceding interventions by WFP in El Salvador. It is strong at discussing the methodological design as well as the appropriateness of data collection methods to allow for adequately responding to evaluation questions. The collection of GEWE-related data was ensured through evaluation sub-questions, and methodological limitations are discussed along with mitigation strategies for each. The report clearly outlines the efforts made to reach a diverse range of stakeholders throughout the evaluation process, especially in order to capture the voices of the most vulnerable. On the other hand, the sampling frame should have been further addressed and the rationale for the sampling strategy discussed in detail. Findings are presented in an impartial fashion and demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP's performance. Conclusions provide a high-level analysis of the evidence presented and are pitched in a way that makes them relevant for the future of the CSP and can effectively inform decision-making. Recommendations are clearly formulated, realistic, and feasible.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary effectively and accurately informs on El Salvador's CSPE and provides a concise overview of the most salient elements of the CSP and the country's socio-economic indicators and contextual information, the evaluation rationale, its objectives and purpose, the time period covered (2016-2020), stakeholders, and methodology. Key findings are summarized, organized per evaluation question and addressing evaluation criteria and main themes. Conclusions and recommendations are clearly listed and faithfully reflect the information provided in the main report. However, the summary should have specified the main stakeholders of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report effectively presents a clear, accurate, and complete description of the context and its overview of the evaluation subject is very informative. It outlines how the CSPE was based on information generated through previous studies, analytical work and interventions by WFP in El Salvador. The report also provides a good description of the CSP rationale, theory of change, strategic outcomes, implementation modalities, and its evolution in terms of its planning, design and changes observed during the period covered by the CSPE. While gender mainstreaming through WFP work in El Salvador is described, the report could have addressed more in detail the situation of specific vulnerable social groups such as older people, persons with disabilities, and migrant workers.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents all of the most relevant features of the evaluation, correctly identifying its two objectives: to report on results to WFP stakeholders as well as to inform strategic decision-making for the development of the next CSP. In addition, the report refers to a specific assessment that sought to establish whether there was a GEWE dimension and to what extent it was considered in the CSP design and implementation. The report indicates that human rights and gender equality considerations were mainstreamed throughout the assessment</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report effectively discusses the methodological design and the appropriateness of data collection methods to answer the evaluation questions. The evaluation criteria used are aligned with the OECD/DAC standard criteria. The collection of</p>		

<p>GEWE-related data was ensured through a dedicated evaluation sub-question and indicators, and methodological limitations are discussed along with mitigation strategies for each. The methodology also discusses how the evaluation triangulated the evidence collected, including with regards to the gender-sensitive aspects of the project. The report clearly outlines the efforts made to reach a diverse range of stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Nevertheless, the sampling frame should have been further addressed and its rationale discussed in detail.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Findings are presented in an impartial fashion and demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP performance. They are supported by evidence from a wide range of sources. All evaluation (sub)questions are addressed with clear articulation of how activities/outputs contributed to outcome-level results. Moreover, the report assesses the CSP against humanitarian principles. Findings also highlight the ways in which the CSP's outputs actively sought to be inclusive and gender-sensitive and the findings include significant amounts of sex-disaggregated data. However, the report should have presented more details around the occurrence of any unintended effects in order to provide the reader with a better understanding of the broad range of CSP results and how these were generated.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions provide a high-level analysis of the evidence presented in the findings section and they are pitched in a way that makes them relevant for the future of the CSP and can effectively inform decision-making. Conclusions are logically linked to, and clearly derived from, the findings and are not a mere repetition of them. In addition, conclusions provide an assessment of the validity of the CSP's underlying logic. On the other hand, conclusions could have benefited from including further relevant messages related to GEWE issues that were addressed in the findings section.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are realistic and feasible, taking into consideration the implementation context as well as potential limitations. In addition, they clearly outline the specific actors targeted within WFP as well as supporting actors to contribute to their implementation. They identify the strategic or operational nature of each as well as a clear timeframe for their implementation. Recommendations address GEWE issues, explaining different paths of action.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report closely observes WFP requirements regarding the clarity of the information presented, the format and length expected for this type of report, and professionalism of the language used. Data sources are consistently provided for all information presented. The report includes most of the required lists and mandatory annexes, although a list of annexes with page numbers is missing and there should have been better and more extensive use of cross-references.</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: 8 points
<p>The description of the country context highlights gender inequalities along with regulatory frameworks established in the country to promote women's rights. The report effectively assesses the monitoring data available for the evaluation and provides a detailed explanation of the way in which the quality and availability of data influenced the choice of methodology for this evaluation. The evaluation mainstreamed GEWE through a differential analysis of the opinions and roles of women and men, and a demographic variable determined by gender considerations. The report explains the ways in which the mixed data collection and analysis methods incorporated and mainstreamed the GEWE dimension in the evaluation, detailing the triangulation of evidence. Findings report on equity and GEWE issues and several tables include sex-disaggregated data. The report includes one recommendation addressing GEWE issues.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>