

Evaluation title	Evaluation of China WFP Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation - Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 83%	
<p>The China WFP Country Strategic Plan (2017-2021) evaluation report is overall a high-quality report that that decision makers can use with confidence. The country context and CSP overview are clearly described, including the theory of change and the main strategic objectives. The report presents a good overview of the rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Moreover, the mixed methods used to collect and analyse data were an appropriate choice to meet the evaluation objectives. However, the report could have been strengthened by discussing more explicitly the gender-sensitive approach that was integrated into the methodology, as well as by including a clear description of the sampling rationale. Findings are substantiated by well-sourced evidence that is triangulated across a range of data sources and stakeholder voices, although those of the most vulnerable groups should have been given more visibility. Conclusions and recommendations are logically linked to the findings and in general observe good practices. However, the report could have more effectively captured key messages regarding GEWE and broader equity and inclusiveness presented in the findings. Nevertheless, the recommendations are useful, realistic, actionable, and clearly identify specific groups for action and timeframes for their implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report includes <i>inter alia</i> a concise overview of the country context, the evaluation subject, scope, and methodology, and highlights key findings, which are organized around the four evaluation questions and presented thematically. The summary presents the conclusions clearly, which are based on the information presented in the key findings and the recommendations faithfully mirror the recommendations table included in the main report. However, the summary would have benefited from specifying the key stakeholders of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report generally presents a clear, accurate, and complete description of the context. The overview of the evaluation subject provides thorough information on the country background, including relevant development indexes, national policies, frameworks and priorities. It clearly outlines how the evaluation was informed by previous studies and analytical work and includes useful information on the relationship between the Chinese government and WFP, and on the evolution of the CSP in terms of its planning, design and changes during the period covered by the evaluation. However, the report could have been strengthened by better addressing the gender dimension of the CSP. In addition, the report should have addressed the existing normative instruments/policies on human rights and gender equality, as well as 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	Satisfactory
<p>The objectives of the evaluation are clearly defined as accountability and learning, as well as informing strategic decision-making for the development of the next CSP. Human rights and gender equality considerations were mainstreamed throughout the evaluation. The report could have been strengthened by ensuring that all of the most relevant features of the evaluation were properly included in the first section of the main body of the report. For instance, the main evaluation stakeholders are only specified in Annex 10 but not in the main body of the report. In addition, the time period covered by the evaluation should also have been consistently identified in the report. While the CSP covered the time period 2017-2021, the CSPE focused on the time period 2017 to 2020 but the report offers no explanation as to the misalignment between the indicated dates.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory

<p>The report provides a satisfactory description of the evaluation criteria used for this assessment, which are aligned with the OECD/DAC standard criteria, and of the methodological design and data collection methods that allowed for unbiased answers to the evaluation questions. Moreover, the methodological limitations are discussed along with mitigation strategies for each limitation. On the other hand, the report could have been strengthened by presenting a more explicit methodological focus on vulnerable groups and gender mainstreaming through the evaluation process.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Findings are presented in an impartial fashion, providing information on the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP through a balanced assessment of all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Evidence is presented from a wide range of sources to substantiate the assertions made throughout the findings. Moreover, the report clearly articulates how WFP's activities and outputs contributed to outcome-level results and appropriately discusses the performance of the CSP against humanitarian principles. However, findings could have better integrated, highlighting the ways in which the CSP's outputs actively sought to be inclusive and gender-sensitive and should have included significantly more sex-disaggregated data. Unintended effects of the CSP could also have been further developed.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents conclusions that provide a high-level analysis of the relevance of the evaluation findings for the future of the CSP that can effectively inform decision-making. Conclusions are logically linked to the findings and provide an assessment of the CSP's underlying and explicit logic. However, they could have been strengthened by including some relevant messages regarding GEWE issues that are discussed in the findings section, such as the fact that, while gender was considered in the design of some activities, this did not necessarily translate into their implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>There are four recommendations and 14 sub-recommendations presented in the proper format, with timelines, responsibilities, and categorization as strategic or operational. The recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are also practical and feasible, taking into consideration the implementation context, including potential limitations, and clearly outline the specific actors targeted within WFP in each case, the strategic or operational nature of each, as well as the estimated timeframe for their implementation. However, the report could have been strengthened by making the sub-recommendation on gender and equality a recommendation and better capturing the main avenues for action with regard to GEWE issues and broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report observes WFP requirements regarding the clarity of the information presented, professionalism of the language used, and the format and length expected for this type of report. Furthermore, data sources are consistently provided and cross-references within the report are accurate and clearly signposted. Similarly, the report makes use of visual aids, such as tables and graphs, which are correctly listed at the beginning of the report. However, the annexes could have included a mapping of findings and conclusions.</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>The evaluation integrated GEWE in its scope of analysis and, while the evaluation framework did not include a stand-alone criterion on gender and human rights, evaluation sub-questions were designed to ensure that GEWE-related data would be collected. The report presents a relevant assessment of the availability and quality of CSP monitoring data, mentioning the lack, and scattered nature, of sex-disaggregated data. While the report states that data collection and analysis methods incorporated the gender dimension, it could have better discussed the specific ways in which GEWE issues were addressed, i.e., data collection techniques, data analysis approach, or how the evaluation design set out to collect sex-disaggregated data. The findings present some key messages regarding GEWE issues that reflect a gender analysis, although conclusions and recommendations for the most part do not fully capture them.</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>
	<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>