

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Mozambique WFP Country Strategic Plan 2017-2021	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>Overall, the report of the evaluation of the Mozambique Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2017-2021 contains information that can be used for an appreciation of the progress and performance of the Mozambique CSP and as a basis to reflect on future programming. Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use them for decision-making noting, however, that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided. The introduction provides a good description of the country context and overview of the evaluation subject. It also clearly outlines the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability. It presents a sound theory-based evaluation design and mixed methods of data collection, with a wide range of data sources consulted. The findings effectively and systematically assess the evaluation questions supported by reliable secondary sources of evidence. The conclusions provide a sound and coherent synthesis of the implication of the evaluation findings for the CSP and future programming. The recommendations are logically and clearly connected to the findings and conclusions and provide some insights on priority, timeline, and responsibility. Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) issues are mainstreamed to a certain extent. However, the report could have provided more details on the overall purpose/rationale of the evaluation and specific activities covered within its scope. Importantly, the findings show weak triangulation of evidence between primary and secondary data sources and there is limited disaggregation of data collected from respondents. In addition, with all recommendations identified as high priority and often timed simultaneously, there is a risk of conflicting priorities in their implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the summary of the evaluation report is clear, concise, and comprehensive. It provides key information from the report that is relevant for the accountability and learning objectives of the evaluation and to inform decision making. The key findings, conclusions, and all recommendations from the evaluation are well captured. However, the summary could have more clearly and specifically defined key stakeholders of the CSP.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The description of the evaluation subject and context, particularly the country context and the thematic contexts related to food and nutrition security, climate change and vulnerability, as well as education, is overall of good quality. The report also includes a good literature review of the Country Office's analytical work, the strategic focus of the CSP, and the evolution of WFP interventions in Mozambique over time. The context fully considers an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the interventions under the CSP. However, the CSP's logical framework should have been presented in the evaluation report or its annexes and the overview of the evaluation subject could have provided more details regarding gender and equity dimensions.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the report presents a clear description of the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability, including information on key internal and external stakeholder users and evaluation scope. While not explicitly reflected in a specific evaluation objective, human rights and gender equality considerations were mainstreamed to a certain extent in the evaluation. That said, the report could have provided more details on the overall purpose/rationale of the evaluation and the specific activities covered.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory

Overall, the report presents a sound theory-based evaluation design and mixed methods of data collection - ranging from key informant interviews to focus group discussions, through direct observations and surveys -, while noting the methodological limitations and some relevant mitigation strategies. A wide range of data sources were consulted, with specific data collection tools and methods dedicated to each stakeholder group identified in the evaluation process. The integration of various ethical standards based on UNEG and Humanitarian principles is also reported. However, much of the methodological information is included in the annexes with very little presented in the main report. It is also not immediately clear how some of the indicators identified for evaluation questions in the evaluation matrix could effectively be measured.

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

Overall, the findings effectively and systematically assess the main evaluation questions and sub-questions based on evidence that is generally reliable. Moreover, the findings often link back to the objectives of the evaluation by providing some data related to the delivery of outputs and CSP contributions to expected outcomes. The findings also make reference to recommendations from previous reviews related to capacity strengthening. While gaps in evidence are explained, the report tends to show weak triangulation of evidence between primary and secondary data sources underpinning the findings, with evidence heavily based on secondary data sources. In addition, there are no explicitly stated unanticipated effects of the CSP reported, including any unanticipated effects related to GEWE dimensions.

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

Overall, the conclusions provide a sound and coherent synthesis of the implication of the evaluation findings for the CSP and future programming. Moreover, they reflect in a balanced and nuanced way, the achievements, challenges, and adjustments that occurred throughout the implementation of the CSP. Dimensions of equity and inclusion are clearly presented throughout the conclusions. However, because the conclusions are organized according to the main evaluation questions they do not clearly connect across the different criteria/questions.

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

The recommendations are overall well crafted, concise, and relevant. They are logically and clearly connected to the findings and conclusions of the evaluation. Recommendations are organized as either strategic or operational and take into account contextual factors and WFP constraints. A few sub-recommendations could have been further refined in order to provide more actionable statements and recommendations could have been better prioritized.

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

The report is overall accessible through short sentences, simple and clear language, as well as visual aids. Relevant information is adequately signposted, whether in tables, graphs, figures or annexes, and data is appropriately sourced. While several key messages and takeaways are highlighted for the evaluation users, key findings statements are not systematically highlighted in bold and some annexes are not referenced in the report.

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	Approaches requirements: 6 points
--	-----------------------------------

GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis to a certain extent. While there is no standalone evaluation criterion or main question on GEWE, this dimension is reflected in some of the sub-questions. Overall, the methodology employed was conducive to an appropriate evaluation of GEWE considerations, with the sampling frame including a diverse range of stakeholders involved in the CSP interventions. However, the findings do not clearly reflect a gender analysis as they do not sufficiently demonstrate explicit methods of triangulation and sex-disaggregated data. Unanticipated effects related to GEWE dimensions are not discussed. While there are two sub-recommendations that specifically incorporate GEWE issues and priorities, there are no recommendations or sub-recommendations explicitly reflecting broader equity and inclusion dimensions, although this would have been appropriate in the context of this evaluation.

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.