

Evaluation title	Evaluación del plan estratégico para Honduras (2018-2021)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation - Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 92%	
<p>The Honduras CSP Evaluation is overall a high-quality report that can be used with a high degree of confidence to inform decision-making. The report presents a thorough overview of the country context and the subject of the evaluation which is described in much detail. This includes a mention of the Country Office analytical and evaluative learnings that informed the CSP, a description of its strategic focus, its scope and modalities of intervention, as well as the evolution of CSP planning, design and adaptability to contextual change. The report also effectively addresses the gender dimension of the CSP, explicitly discussing the way in which a gender-sensitive approach was integrated in the design of the CSP and how gender was mainstreamed through WFP work in Honduras. The evaluation methodology describes mixed data collection methods used to answer the evaluation questions. Findings are impartial and strike a good balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP's performance, and are based on evidence drawn from a wide range of sources. Conclusions are expressed in a way that can effectively inform decision-making and recommendations are overall useful and realistic and show a clear linkage to both findings and conclusions. On the other hand, the report would have been strengthened by including a theory of change which described the logic of CSP expected results and assumptions underlying their achievement, especially since the report states that a theory of change was reconstructed by the evaluation team.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a good overview of the Honduras CSP and a thorough description of the most important elements of the work of WFP in the country, socio-economic indicators as well as contextual information such as the impact of COVID-19. Furthermore, the summary also discusses the rationale of the evaluation, its objectives, purpose, timeframe covered (January 2018- April 2021), and methodology. Main findings, conclusions and recommendations are explained in a clear fashion, striking a good balance between detail and synthesis, with findings that are organized per evaluation question and address evaluation criteria as well as main themes. Conclusions and recommendations are clearly listed and reflect the information provided in the main report. However, the summary should have specified the main stakeholder groups of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents an overview of the country context which is thorough and includes the most salient features necessary to understand both the CSP and the evaluation. The CSP is described in much detail, including information such as the CO's analytical and evaluative learnings that informed the CSP, a description of the CSP's strategic focus, its scope and modalities of intervention, and the evolution of CSP planning, design and adaptability to contextual change. On the other hand, the report should have included a graphic and narrative description of the theory of change, outlining the logic and chain of results of the CSP. Furthermore, a discussion on planned and actual beneficiary numbers per strategic objective should have been included in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and thorough overview of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. It also lists the key users of the evaluations, including WFP beneficiaries, the country office in Honduras, the Regional Office, Headquarters and the Office of Evaluation, the Government of Honduras (national and local authorities), donors, cooperating partners, other national and international organizations and the United Nations system.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report effectively describes the methodological design as well as the appropriateness of data collection methods which allowed for adequate answers to evaluation questions. For example, the report discusses the evaluability of the CSP based on monitoring data and explains how the quality and availability of data, along with the constraints due</p>		

to the COVID-19 pandemic, influenced the choice of methodology. The evaluation criteria were aligned with the OECD/DAC standard criteria, and the collection of GEWE-related data was ensured through evaluation sub-questions. Moreover, methodological limitations are discussed along with mitigation strategies for each. The report explains how the evaluation triangulated evidence collected, and outlines the efforts made to reach a diverse range of stakeholders to capture the voices of the most vulnerable. Finally, the evaluation followed relevant ethical guidelines such as integrity, accountability, respect, and goodwill, in accordance with UNEG guidelines and the "no harm" principle.

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

The evaluation findings are presented in an impartial fashion and are balanced between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP's performance. They are supported by a good amount of evidence drawn from a wide range of sources and methods used to collect data (document review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and online surveys). All evaluation questions are answered and the report clearly describes how activities/outputs contributed to outcome-level results. Findings also highlight the ways in which the CSP's outputs actively sought to be inclusive and gender-sensitive, and a significant amount of sex-disaggregated data is presented throughout. However, the report should have presented more details around the occurrence of any unintended effects, positive or negative, as per the Terms of Reference and the Inception Report.

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

Conclusions present a higher analytical level of the evidence presented in the findings section and are expressed in a way that can effectively inform decision-making. They are logically linked and explicitly derived from the findings yet add value to them as they include a perspective of future action by stakeholders. Conclusions provide an assessment of the way in which GEWE-related issues were included in the CSP. On the other hand, conclusions could have benefited from including further relevant messages related to wider equity and inclusion dimensions.

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

Overall, recommendations demonstrate a logical link with the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are for the most part realistic and feasible and take into consideration the implementation context. They clearly outline the specific actors targeted within WFP for their implementation, indicate whether they are strategic or operational in nature, and provide a clear timeframe for their implementation. GEWE issues are addressed and different paths of action are suggested. On the other hand, recommendations could have more consistently provided specific details regarding their subject matter.

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

The report observes WFP requirements regarding the clarity of the information presented, and the format and length expected for the different elements. Data sources are consistently provided for all information presented and the report includes all mandatory lists, i.e., table of contents, tables, figures, maps, annexes, and acronyms; and mandatory annexes. However, the report could have made better use of cross-references, including signposting of annexes to complement information presented.

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
--	------------------------------

The report highlights gender inequalities and explains regulatory frameworks established in Honduras to promote women's rights. The report effectively assesses the monitoring data available for the evaluation as well as the quality of data, highlighting the number of sex-disaggregated indicators corresponding to the expected results of the CSP. Data collection and analysis methods incorporate the gender dimension and the evaluation matrix includes a differential analysis by gender and age, and quantitative indicators are disaggregated by sex. The evaluation design was based on diagnoses and follow-ups on the differential needs of women and men, and a documentary review was carried out with emphasis on gender roles, power dynamics and the transformative approach to gender relations. Findings report on equity and GEWE issues and present sex-disaggregated data, but do not include any unanticipated effects of the CSP on GEWE. Recommendations address GEWE issues in accordance with evaluation conclusions.

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.