

Evaluation title	Republic of Zimbabwe: An Evaluation of WFP Country Strategic Plan (2017-2020)	
Evaluation category and type	Country Strategic Plan Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>The report of the evaluation of WFP's Country Strategic Plan (CSP) in Zimbabwe is of high quality and provides useful information for WFP in assessing the CSP and in developing future ones. The methodological design was sound, and the data collection and analysis tools were appropriate for the evaluation questions, although understandably, data collection from beneficiaries was somewhat limited by COVID-19. The findings are extensive, well documented, address strengths and weaknesses and appear to be unbiased. All evaluation questions and sub-questions are systematically addressed in the findings. Conclusions are drawn from across the findings, and are generally at the strategic level appropriate for a CSP evaluation. Strategic and operational recommendations flow logically from the findings and conclusions, and are generally feasible and realistic, and include priority rating, timelines and responsibilities. Sub-recommendations define the overall recommendations in smaller, more specific and achievable actions. The report is well written, and follows the required template closely. Although there is significant information on gender it is not clarified what gender outcomes were expected, and consequently, this weakness follows a thread throughout the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Information on the evaluation objectives and users could have been moderately improved by providing more detail on the stakeholders, as well as greater attention to human rights.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary is clear, concise and useful. The purpose, scope and methodology are well summarized, the context and overview of the evaluation subject are clear, and graphics are well used. The findings are particularly well presented and clearly relate to the findings in the main report. The conclusions are also well presented although there are minor discrepancies with the wording presented in the full report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context and the overview of the evaluation subject are well written. Basic national-level information on Zimbabwe is provided, along with areas of specific relevance to the intervention, such as food and nutrition security, agriculture and climate change and migration, although the description would have been more informative had it identified some of the key findings from various analyses and needs assessments that influenced the design of the CSP. The CSP objectives are summarized and the logic and evolution of the interventions are clearly articulated, including those pre-CSP that led to the design of the CSP. However cross-cutting issues are not clearly identified in the intervention logic. Transfer modalities throughout the various shifts in the context, along with modified budgets, are clearly described.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, objectives and scope are well described in the report. The objectives of accountability and learning are given equal weight, the purpose of the evaluation is clearly articulated and the main users briefly listed. The scope is very clear in geographic, thematic and timeframe dimensions. Although the geographic scope of the evaluation was national, it is noted that in terms of field work, there were limitations due to COVID-19. The section could have been moderately improved by providing more detail on the stakeholders, as well as greater attention to human rights.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation methodology used was relevant and appropriate to the collection and analysis of data addressing the evaluation questions. The evaluation team considered the availability and reliability of monitoring data, and designed an appropriate response in the methodology. The methodological design, data collection methods, data sampling frame and rationale and analysis methods are clearly summarized with additional information provided in annex. The evaluation</p>		

team responded well to COVID-19 restrictions, although could not completely overcome them. Apart from this, minor improvements could have been made through greater attention to gender.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The findings are well founded, well documented and without apparent gaps or bias. All evaluation questions and sub-questions are systematically addressed, and take into account the challenges of a highly changeable context. Sources of data are generally clear and sufficiently triangulated to be reliable, except where it is explicitly noted that observations could not be fully validated due to limitations in the context. Findings are supported by useful quantitative data, where applicable, and illustrated with graphs and tables, although no mention is made of any unanticipated results. The report also notes that recommendations from seven previous evaluations since 2011 helped to formulate the CSP, although the specific recommendations and responses are not clear. Adherence to humanitarian principles is addressed at several points and explicitly in a few key findings. However, findings on GEWE are weakened by the lack of clear, stated gender objectives in the project description.

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

Conclusions were drawn from across various findings to provide mostly strategic conclusions such as comparative advantage, positioning, partnership, with operational elements such as capacity building. They provide a high level of analysis of the findings and useful contributions to organizational learning and development of the future CSP. Conclusions flow logically from the findings in the text, and are very well summarized in the Recommendations-Conclusions-Findings table in annex.

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

Recommendations are clearly and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. Each is identified as high or medium priority, operational or strategic, and provided with both a timeline and an indication of primary responsibility. Each recommendation is also qualified by a number of more specific and actionable sub-recommendations. Recommendations are geared to providing input into the next CSP, which was the main purpose of the evaluation.

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

The report writing is clear and very accessible. The report follows the template and includes all required elements and annexes. There are no distracting sentence constructions, grammatical or spelling errors. Acronyms are appropriately used. Graphs, tables, maps in the report itself are useful and clearly understandable, although some of the ones in the annexes appear to be meant for use by experts who need no further explanation. Additionally, some highlighting (bold face, use of colour) is used to help manoeuvre through the document, although for a document of this length, more would have been useful. Data is effectively used and generally well attributed.

UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets Requirement: 7 points
--	------------------------------------

There is significant information and attention to gender in most sections of the report. In its conception, the evaluation methodology included significant efforts to incorporate gender, with two fairly comprehensive gender dimensions in the evaluation matrix. The context addresses gender issues while the findings contain much information on gender, although they would have benefited from a more comprehensive analysis of why these data were important. With none of the six strategic outcomes and 13 activities in the CSP referencing gender, it is unclear throughout the evaluation what expected results/indicators were being assessed to measure progress on gender equality. Consequently, this weakness is reflected across the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

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>