

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of Kyrgyz Republic WFP Country Strategic Plan (2018–2022)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - CSPE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory (97%)	
<p>The Evaluation of Kyrgyz Republic WFP Country Strategic Plan (2018–2022) constitutes a highly satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence. The report effectively summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale, and methodology, as well as relevant information on internal and external contextual developments during the evaluation period. Drawing upon a range of data sources and methods of data collection, including extensive stakeholder consultations that also reached many CSP beneficiaries, the report presents clear findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions that are supported by evidence deriving from a range of secondary and primary data sources. Gender equality and wider equity and inclusion dimensions are consistently mainstreamed. The report formulates a set of well-crafted conclusions that synthesize the presented findings across evaluation questions and discuss their strategic implications for the future CSP. It puts forward a set of six relevant, prioritized, targeted and actionable recommendations that strike a good balance between being specific and leaving users space to adjust their implementation as needed. The report uses clear, understandable language that is free of jargon and makes good use of visual highlights, such as textboxes to summarize the main findings for each sub-question, bold font, as well as a variety of tables, graphs, and figures. The Executive Summary and Summary Evaluation Report constitute good practice examples in that they eloquently and effectively capture the evaluation's essence and key messages. The report's only weakness is its considerable length, which slightly limits its readability. The report might have benefited from additional editing to leave out selected details and/or further condense narrative paragraphs to reduce its overall length.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report constitutes a clear, accurate and highly useful synthesis of the evaluation. It briefly captures key evaluation and contextual features, clearly summarizes the main evaluation findings and supporting evidence, presents a summary of the evaluation conclusions and includes the evaluation recommendations. The summary as a whole constitutes a good practice example in terms of its clarity and readability.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and rich description of the evaluation context and the subject of the evaluation. It strikes a very good balance between detail and synthesis and reflects on gender equality dimensions. It provides a helpful overview of how WFP programming in the Kyrgyz Republic has evolved against the backdrop of changing internal and external contexts - emphasizing WFP's transition from implementer to enabler that the CSP under review aimed to facilitate. It references relevant analytical work that informed the design or implementation of the CSP and describes the main features of the CSP's internal logic in terms of its objectives, envisaged results at outcome and activity/output levels, modalities, budget, and beneficiaries. Minor improvements could have derived from highlighting progress against SDGs 2 and 17 more explicitly when summarizing findings of the country's first voluntary national review, and from commenting more explicitly on whether/how the CSP addressed the varying needs of different social groups.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report clearly outlines the evaluation objectives, purpose, and scope. It identifies the intended users, stakeholders and uses of the evaluation, especially in relation to informing the development of the next CSP and United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, and notes that gender equality and the empowerment of women, and accountability to affected populations, were mainstreamed in the evaluation. Explicitly mentioning gender equality and women's empowerment in the evaluation objectives could have drawn further attention to these dimensions of the evaluation.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation's mixed methods approach and its chosen data sources and methods of data analysis were appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in an unbiased way and allowed for effective data collection despite limitations posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. WFP contributions to cross-cutting priorities, including gender equality, are addressed through dedicated evaluation sub-questions and indicators. The evaluation made meaningful use of the CSP's reconstructed theory of change and WFP's country capacity strengthening framework to guide data collection and analysis, and its use of mutually complementary data sources facilitated triangulation to ensure validity of findings. Evaluation activities were carried out in alignment with relevant ethical standards and took gender and broader inclusion issues into account. The report could have been further strengthened by commenting on how limitations of WFP indicators for measuring progress on human rights and gender equality results informed the evaluation methodology.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation addresses all the posed evaluation questions and sub-questions in a clear and structured fashion. Supporting evidence is presented transparently and clearly, providing sources for all presented data and quotes, and using a neutral tone. The report discusses WFP contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way, considering contextual factors, including the COVID pandemic. The report reflects the voices of different stakeholder groups from both inside and outside of WFP and reflects a diversity of views. It could have been further strengthened by explicitly commenting on any positive or negative unintended effect(s) stemming from project implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The conclusions section provides a good practice example of how to effectively synthesize evaluation findings across evaluation questions and reflect on the strategic implications of these findings for the future of the CSP. The conclusions reflect both strengths and weaknesses of the CSP and its implementation, do not introduce any new information, and include reflections on gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation makes six relevant, realistic, and actionable recommendations that are prioritized, include a timeframe for action, and identify responsible actors. The recommendations logically and clearly derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions and strike a good balance between being specific and allowing evaluation users to fine tune their implementation. They include suggestions on how to improve GEWE and broader equity and inclusion dimensions in future CSP implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report follows the WFP template for CSPE and includes all the mandated annexes. It is written in clear, understandable, precise, and professional language and makes good use of visual aids including graphs, tables, textboxes, bold font to highlight elements, and colour coding in tables to facilitate ease of reading. The report provides sources for all data and quotes and effectively uses cross-references. The report considerably exceeds the recommended word limit for CSPEs and its readability could have benefited from reducing overall report length, e.g., by, occasionally, using bullet points instead of narrative paragraphs, omitting some details, or further condensing information presented.</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>	<b>Meets requirements: 8 points</b>
<p>GEWE considerations are well integrated into the report. The chosen mixed-method approach and evaluation methodology were based on deliberate considerations on how to effectively integrate GEWE. The evaluation matrix includes sub-questions and indicators related to gender equality and broader inclusion and equity considerations. The evaluation drew upon a variety of data sources and processes, thereby facilitating inclusion, accuracy, and credibility. Findings include reflections on GEWE dimensions, and four of 19 sub-recommendations address gender quality issues. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and</p>	

integrity. The report could have commented more explicitly on how limitations of WFP indicators for measuring progress on human rights and gender equality results informed the evaluation methodology.

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