

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación Descentralizada del Efecto Estratégico 1, hacia los objetivos Hambre Cero a través de la abogacía, comunicación y movilización, del Plan Estratégico de País - Perú (2017- 2021)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	DE Thematic	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 95%	
<p>Overall, this evaluation is of a highly satisfactory quality and can be used by the Peru Country Office to inform the next Country Strategic Plan. The evaluation subject is clearly presented and provides an overview of the Country Office's analytical work and the theory of change. The methodological design was appropriate for this evaluation and effectively addressed GEWE considerations, including gender analysis, an appropriate range of data sources and methods, and a diversity of stakeholders. The findings are detailed and transparently and systematically, present strengths and weaknesses in a balanced manner, with all questions addressed, and gaps in information presented where relevant. Conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the findings. The report is structured logically, is easy to read, devoid of jargon, cites sources, and highlights key messages/good practices in bold text. Nonetheless, some sections of the report could have been enhanced by providing a few additional details such as in the executive summary and evaluability assessment, including a specific objective related to human rights and gender equality to ensure full cross-cutting integration of these dimensions, assessing actual versus planned outcomes in relation to WFP's contributions, rounding out lessons learned with lessons derived from less positive findings and conclusions, and integrating more indirect beneficiaries, including the most vulnerable, in the sampling strategy.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary is clearly presented and largely complete, describing the necessary features of the evaluation, including lessons learnt. The findings align with the evaluation questions, and conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the findings, while GEWE considerations are addressed in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, the conclusions significantly outnumber the findings, resulting in some imbalance in the synthesis of the results of the evaluation. Moreover, the recommendations in the summary do not specify prioritization, targeting, and/or the timeframe for their implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context and overview of the evaluation subject are well developed and complete. The country context provides a clear understanding of the socioeconomic conditions in the country, supported by disaggregated data. All necessary features of the evaluation subject are clearly presented, including a thorough description of the theory of change that highlights assumptions, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. GEWE dimensions are addressed in relation to food security and nutrition issues. However, the National Voluntary Report is not referenced in the report, and data and trends in relation to SDG 2 are presented but not in relation to SDG 17.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope are clearly defined and include GEWE considerations mainstreamed through the evaluation framework and methodology. The contours of the evaluation scope in terms of temporal, geographic, and programmatic coverage are well outlined. However, the evaluation would have benefited from identifying a specific objective related to human rights and gender equality to ensure full cross-cutting integration of these dimensions.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology is robust, well articulated, and appropriate for this evaluation. There is a brief evaluability assessment and a detailed description of the diverse range of data collection and analysis methods used to conduct this evaluation, with relevant details on the sampling frame, which includes a sex-disaggregated breakdown of evaluation participants per category of participant. Methodological limitations, mitigation strategies, and ethical considerations are fully discussed. However, the evaluability assessment could have been more complete, for example, by providing information on gaps in monitoring data, such as related to gender, and the sample does not appear to have significantly included representation of beneficiaries, albeit indirect beneficiaries.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The findings are detailed and complete, including a systematic assessment of evaluation (sub-)questions. The findings are well balanced, presenting both strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject, including identifying gaps, omissions, and inconsistencies in evidence where relevant. The findings explicitly address GEWE considerations where relevant, including assessing gender programming. Positive and negative unanticipated effects are fully discussed, including emerging from the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the evaluation could have assessed actual versus planned outcomes in relation to WFP's contributions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions and lessons learnt are presented in a logical and coherent manner. The conclusions provide a higher level of abstraction from the findings, presenting both positive and negative findings, and fully address GEWE considerations. Lessons learnt offer opportunities for wider organizational learning for WFP and partners. However, they tend to be based solely on positive findings and conclusions while learning could also have emerged from negative findings reported.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are structured in a logically consistent manner, organized by responsible actors, prioritization, and timeframe for implementation. They reflect the learning and accountability objectives of the evaluation and include GEWE-related recommendations. However, the recommendations exceed the requirements set by WFP in terms of length.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report is clearly structured, including all necessary lists and features as stipulated by the WFP template. All length requirements for the report and the annexes are adhered to. The report is written in a clear and accessible manner, sources are referenced, visual aids are effectively used, and key messages/good practices are summarized in bold text. Data sources are clearly referenced.</p>		

<b>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</b>		
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 7 points	
<p>Overall, this evaluation meets UNSWAP requirements for the integration of GEWE considerations, which are mainstreamed in the evaluation criteria and questions. While the evaluability assessment does not explicitly state that GEWE dimensions can be addressed, this is implied. The methodology integrates GEWE considerations effectively, including gender analysis and disaggregation. The sampling strategy could have included more indirect beneficiaries, including the most vulnerable. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations fully consider GEWE dimensions, including disaggregation as well as unanticipated effects in relation to GEWE dimensions.</p>		

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>		
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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

<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>