

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of the South Sudan WFP Interim Country Strategic Plan 2018-2021	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - CSPE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 94%	
<p>The Evaluation of the South Sudan WFP Interim Country Strategic Plan 2018-2021 constitutes a highly satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision making. The report effectively summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale, and methodology and provides relevant information on external contextual developments during the evaluation period. The report articulates findings on all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and findings are well supported by evidence. Gender equality dimensions are addressed in the report wherever they are part of evaluation findings. The report presents well-developed and credible conclusions that synthesize the findings across evaluation questions, and offers six relevant, prioritized, targeted and actionable recommendations. While very few weaknesses are found with the report, it could have addressed more fully the equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the ICSP and could have been further strengthened by addressing the strength and validity of various sources of monitoring data. The report could also have referred more to focus group discussion responses through the findings, indicating where the perspectives may have differed by sex or age.</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 captures key contextual features, clearly summarizes the main evaluation findings and supporting evidence, presents a summary of the evaluation conclusions, and includes evaluation recommendations. The summary constitutes a good practice example in terms of its clarity and readability. The summary evaluation report could have been slightly enhanced with more background stating that per the TOR, the decision to undertake this evaluation was made on the basis of the extension of the ICSP to a 5-year duration and its classification as a Level 3 corporate emergency.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and thorough description of the ICSP as the subject of the evaluation. It references relevant analytical work that informed the design or implementation of the ICSP and describes the ICSP's internal logic in terms of its objectives, envisaged results at outcome and activity/output levels, modalities, budget, and beneficiaries. The report strikes a good balance between detail and synthesis and reflects on gender equality dimensions. It provides a helpful overview of how WFP programming in South Sudan has evolved against a constantly changing backdrop of urgent needs. The report could have addressed more fully the equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the ICSP.</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, including changes in the implementation of the ICSP in an increasingly volatile crisis context in South Sudan. It identifies its intended users, stakeholders and uses of the evaluation, especially in relation to informing the development of the next CSP, 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 (GEWE) in the evaluation objectives could have further strengthened the importance of drawing attention to these dimensions in the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed methods approach, and its data sources and methods of data analysis, are clearly described in the main report and in supporting annexes. Methods allowed for effective data collection despite the limitations posed by the COVID-19 pandemic and included primary data collection from a variety of stakeholders, including a large number</p>		

of CSP beneficiaries. WFP contributions to cross-cutting priorities, including GEWE are addressed through dedicated evaluation sub-questions and indicators, and the report comments on the extent to which relevant monitoring data on such (and other) issues was available, although the report could have been further strengthened by addressing the strength and validity of various sources of monitoring data. The evaluation made use of the reconstructed theory of change to guide data collection and analysis, and the use of multiple complementary data sources facilitated triangulation to ensure validity of findings.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

The evaluation addresses all evaluation questions and sub-questions in a clear and structured fashion. Supporting evidence is presented with sources for all data and quotes and using an objective and balanced tone. The report discusses WFP contributions to results in a fair way, taking into account contextual factors including the COVID pandemic. The report reflects the voices of different stakeholder groups from inside and outside of WFP, reflects the diversity of views, and comments on unintended effects of WFP programming. Overall, the report serves as a good practice example of how findings can be constructed for wide utility, however it could have usefully referenced focus group discussion responses more widely through the findings, indicating where perspectives may have differed by sex or age.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	----------------------------

The conclusions section provides a good practice example of how to effectively synthesize evaluation findings across evaluation questions. They reflect findings with accuracy and provide a more macro-level summary of the detailed findings. Conclusions are balanced in their presentation of both positive and negative issues, reflecting both strengths and weaknesses of the ICSP and its implementation, do not introduce any new information, and include reflections on GEWE and broader equity and inclusion dimensions. However, they could have been enhanced somewhat with a stronger focus on gender given the focus on gender through the evaluation matrix.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

The evaluation makes six relevant, realistic and actionable recommendations, including several sub-recommendations, that are prioritized, include a timeframe for action, and identifies responsible actors. The recommendations logically and clearly derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions and strike a good balance between being specific and making space for 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.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	---------------------

The report follows the WFP template for CSPEs and includes all of the mandated annexes. It is written in clear, understandable, precise and professional language and makes good use of visual aids including graphs and tables with good use of colour coding. The report provides sources for all data. The report moderately exceeds the recommended word limit for CSPE and could have highlighted key messages or good practices, and some annexes are not listed in the order that they are referenced in the main report.

<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</b>
--	---------------------------

Gender equality, and to a lesser degree women's empowerment, is mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis and across the evaluation criteria and questions. The evaluation matrix includes sub-questions and indicators related to gender equality and broader inclusion and equity considerations. The report notes the ICSP's challenges in reaching some particularly vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities, and makes recommendations for how the CO can strengthen its approach to GEWE. The mixed methods approach was appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations

ensuring the collection of sex-disaggregated data with a diverse range of data sources and processes employed. Ethical guidelines were adhered to throughout the evaluation. Intersectionality is well covered, and the findings include data analysis that triangulates the voices of different groups. However, the report does not describe strategies to incorporate the voices of household members with disabilities and there are no age breakdowns to indicate involvement of adolescent young women. While unintended effects focusing on human rights and gender equality are not addressed in the report, GEWE issues are addressed in the recommendations.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<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>