

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of Pakistan WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2022	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - CSPE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 80%	
<p>The report for the Evaluation of Pakistan WFP Country Strategic Plan (2018-2022) presents evaluation findings that can be used with confidence for decision-making. The report effectively summarizes the evaluation purpose and rationale, as well as relevant information on the internal and external context during the evaluation period. The objectives and intervention logic of the CSP and its key assumptions are laid out in good detail. The report mainstreams gender equality concerns within its methodology, allowing for gender-related findings to be brought forward effectively. All the evaluation questions and sub-questions are addressed in the findings and supported by evidence derived from a range of both primary and secondary data sources. A particular strength of the report are the conclusions, which are presented from a strategic perspective, looking at the envisioned move with this CSP away from crisis response towards a concerted focus on resilience and root causes in Pakistan. These conclusions build on key findings that contextualize divergent outcomes, drawing on a wide range of information collected from a comprehensive document review and stakeholder consultations, including through interviews, surveys, and on-site observations. Another strength are the recommendations, which make relevant suggestions for the strategic position of WFP in Pakistan to be taken forward in the next CSP. However, the report would have been improved if it had gone further to situate the discussion of operationalization of the CSP in the context of the significant external changes in the country. It also could have better clarified how monitoring data and methodological choices were suitable to measure progress on human rights, gender equality and other equity and inclusion dimensions, as well as in the assessment of cross-cutting themes.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The summary is very clearly written, containing a concise description of the country context and the CSP, as well as a good overview of the evaluation questions, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, more could have been added to clarify how research was conducted after the inception phase and better explain the evaluation methodology. The conclusions could have been better structured to help guide the reader through the information.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear description of the evaluation context and of the CSP. There is good balance between detail and synthesis while reliable and up-to-date sources are referenced. There is a good overview of the planned and actual activities of the CSP, including the different implementation modalities. However, the report could have elaborated on different intersectional vulnerabilities related to beneficiaries and on the significance of external changes to the context, such as the COVID-19 pandemic or the humanitarian crisis in the border region with Afghanistan.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The objectives, rationale, purpose, and scope of the evaluation are outlined in good detail. The main users are identified as are the uses of the evaluation, including how this evaluation can inform the next CSP in the country.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The mixed methodology is clearly described, including data sources and methods of data analysis. The report drew on a variety of qualitative and quantitative data sources and used complementary methods of data collection to support data triangulation. The sampling frame, rationale and analysis methods were relevant and appropriate for the context, allowing the evaluation questions to be answered in an unbiased way. However, there is only limited discussion in the report of how the sampling frame reached a diversity of beneficiaries and the methodology used with focus groups is not described. The evaluability of cross-cutting themes, while noted as a limitation, is not elaborated upon.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation of the Pakistan CSP addresses and provides information on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions and the report includes both positive and negative findings in many instances. WFP contributions to results are discussed in a fair and nuanced way. The findings also effectively reflect the voices of stakeholder groups from inside and outside of WFP (e.g., government representatives, partner organizations, beneficiaries). The findings draw upon previous studies and evaluations where appropriate considering this is the first CSP for Pakistan. When the evidence base is inconclusive due to limitations in monitoring data at the country level, this is made explicit. However, the findings could have been further substantiated by more clearly identifying the different stakeholders consulted from which evidence was derived, including highlighting information garnered from observations at the beneficiary level.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report offers strong conclusions that synthesize evaluation findings, noting both strengths and weaknesses of the CSP implementation. The report reflects a very good effort to present this information from a strategic perspective, focusing on WFP's intended move away from crisis response in the country. The conclusions also reflect on gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) dimensions of WFP interventions. However, broader inclusion and equity dimensions of the CSP are not addressed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation makes four recommendations, which follow logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions. These are prioritized and their timing for action is aligned with the development of the next CSP in Pakistan. However, broader equity and inclusion issues are not effectively brought forward in the recommendations and at times the recommendations read in general terms, leaving them as broad concepts rather than as concrete possible actions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report is clearly written, with effective use of tables and graphs as visual aids. It is free from jargon. However, not all acronyms are spelled out at first use and there is some inconsistency with the formatting of the Annexes. The report also would have been improved with greater use of text boxes and summary sections to enhance readability.</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>The evaluation adequately addresses GEWE considerations in its analysis, with the context providing relevant information on intersectional vulnerabilities in Pakistan. GEWE is effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis, across the evaluation criteria and within the evaluation matrix. The methodology was gender-responsive, reflected in the mixed-methods design and the use of a variety of data sources and processes. However, it could have gone further to discuss how a gender-sensitive data collection method was applied at the beneficiary level. It also could have more clearly disaggregated by sex the sample of consulted beneficiaries (e.g., schoolchildren) as they represented a large percentage of the respondents overall for the evaluation. In the findings, the report explicitly comments on the availability of monitoring on GEWE-relevant indicators and draws upon the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups. However, the findings do not explicitly identify any unintended effects of the CSP related to gender and the findings would have benefited from giving more prominence to information gathered at the beneficiary level. There is one recommendation, with its related sub-recommendations, that addresses GEWE issues.</p>		

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>		
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</p>	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p><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.</p>	

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<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>