

Evaluation title	Evaluation of WFP Sri Lanka Country Strategic Plan 2018-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP Sri Lanka Country Strategic Plan 2018-2022 represents a clear, analytical and well-written assessment of CSP performance for the period under review that can be used with confidence for decision-making. The evaluation is based on an appropriate mixed method design, including a robust sampling strategy for all sources of data. Findings are grounded in credible data, which is diverse and appropriately sourced and triangulated. Findings are balanced, presenting both strengths and challenges of CSP performance, addressing all evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions. Conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the findings. More detail could have been provided on how recommendations from previous evaluations informed CSP planning and implementation. The report could also have been improved with a more comprehensive integration of gender and human rights considerations in the evaluation methodology, across evaluation criteria and lines of inquiry, as well as in resulting findings and conclusions. Moreover, findings could have been somewhat improved with a more explicit assessment of progress with regard to the reconstructed CSP theory of change, including cause-effect relationships along the results chain and underlying assumptions. Some recommendations are more clearly articulated, realistic, and actionable than others, particularly with regard to gender, equity and human rights.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The Report Summary is very comprehensive with regard to providing detail on CSP context, description, evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations, including good coverage of gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE). Graphics and charts are used effectively to convey information. However, details on the context, CSP, and findings could have been further summarized and shortened. The objectives, end users and uses of the evaluation report could have been specified in the introduction. Conclusions could have been more focused on overall CSP performance.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and comprehensive overview of the CSP context, its objectives, strategic outcomes, activities, as well as the shifts in its focus and transfer modalities from direct service delivery to policy and capacity development. A reconstructed theory of change is annexed to the report. Beneficiary numbers, disaggregated by sex, age and location, are provided as is planned to actual budget information. The context section of the report could have been strengthened with greater detail on the content of national policies, strategies and their relevance to Agenda 2030, as well as on recent data and trends related to SDGs 2 and 17. Overall, analysis of gender equality, equity and inclusion could have been more elaborated in both the context section and the overview of the CSP.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes relevant information on evaluation rationale, objectives, scope, end users and uses of the evaluation, with human rights and gender equality considerations effectively mainstreamed. However, information on evaluation scope could have been synthesized in one section to include temporal and geographic scope, activities, and reach, although these details are provided in other areas of the main report, including under Subject of the Evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>A comprehensive evaluation matrix is found in annex comprising four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria and key questions aligned with the evaluation TOR and inception report (IR). The mixed methods design, clearly described in Annex 3, was appropriate to answer key evaluation questions and to address GEWE. Limitations are comprehensively presented with mitigation strategies outlined for most and the evaluation adhered to ethical standards. The report would have benefited from a clearer explanation as to whether modifications to the methodology were made since the IR, given the extent of</p>		

limitations. The evaluation methodology would have been strengthened had gender and human rights been more systematically integrated under other evaluation criteria, particularly that of relevance, and with a clearer explanation of how data collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. The decision to include (or not) the participation of minors in data collection could have been addressed, given the CSP target groups.

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

Findings are impartial and balanced, identifying CSP strengths and challenges, and relying on multiple and credible sources of data. Findings are clearly structured around key evaluation questions and sub-questions from the evaluation matrix. Findings triangulate the voices of different stakeholder groups and, where evidence or data is lacking, this is flagged. Findings include analysis of the external and internal factors affecting performance. Several findings under the Effectiveness criterion present both positive and negative unanticipated effects of CSP delivery for male and female beneficiaries. However, effectiveness findings could have been improved with a more explicit assessment of progress with regard to the reconstructed CSP theory of change. Findings could also have been strengthened had stakeholder perceptions been more systematically disaggregated by sex, age, disability, to identify wider gender or inclusion. Finally, the evaluation report would have been improved with a more explicit assessment of the extent to which the CSP incorporated recommendations from previous evaluations, particularly the gender gap analysis.

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

The conclusions present CSP strengths and challenges against the evaluation criteria, effectively bringing the analysis from findings up to a more strategic level. There is a clear line of sight between the findings and conclusions. Conclusions effectively synthesize key messages from the findings under each key evaluation question and foreshadow areas for action in the recommendations. Gender and equity considerations could have also been integrated into other conclusions, including conclusion 4 (root causes), 5 (targeting), 9 (social protection). Conclusions do not address validity of the CSP logic or the extent to which the reconstructed theory of change and underlying assumptions held true.

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

Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and are aligned with the evaluation objectives. Responsibility and timeframe are clearly identified for each recommendation and sub-recommendation. Recommendations are prioritized and sequenced appropriately with a clear deadline for action specified for each. Several recommendations are more clearly articulated, realistic and actionable than others. Recommendations related to GEWE (sub-recommendations 1.3, 1.4, 2.3) could have been improved with greater specificity in terms of what a gender-informed nutrition strategy entails and how exactly gender could be more effectively integrated into the next CSP. The realism and actionability of sub-recommendations (3.2, 3.3, 4.1) could have been improved with the identification of actions specific to WFP and its immediate sphere of control.

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

The report meets all WFP requirements for accessibility and clarity. The only area where the report accessibility and clarity could have been improved is with regard to highlighting good practices in the narrative of 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
--	--

There is no specific evaluation objective or stand-alone criterion on gender equality, although GEWE considerations were effectively mainstreamed in the CSP evaluation. The evaluation design, methodology, and sampling strategy involved mixed methods of data collection from diverse stakeholder groups. This was appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations, although the methodology does not mention GEWE or human rights specifically nor does it include analysis of the quality or completeness of GEWE or human rights data collected during CSP implementation. Findings triangulate the voices of different stakeholder groups (WFP staff, government, donors, beneficiaries), although the report could have more systematically disaggregated data by sex, age, disability, or other social characteristic, to identify wider gender, human rights and inclusion dimensions. Findings also could have linked more explicitly the unanticipated effects identified to CSP strategies to promote human rights and gender equality. Two recommendations refer to GEWE, although

they could have shown greater specificity in terms of how exactly gender could be more effectively integrated into the next CSP.

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.