

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Sudan WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>The Evaluation of the Sudan WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023 constitutes a satisfactory report that can be used with confidence for decision-making. The report effectively summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale and methodology, and relevant contextual information. Drawing upon a range of primary and secondary data sources collected through a variety of methods, the report presents findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Gender equality and wider equity and inclusion dimensions are consistently mainstreamed. The report formulates a set of well-crafted conclusions and puts forward five relevant, prioritized, targeted and actionable recommendations. It uses clear, understandable language and makes use of some visual highlights, such as bold font, tables, graphs, and figures. The Executive Summary and Summary Evaluation Report adequately capture the evaluation's essence and key messages. The report's considerable length unfortunately limits its readability, as does the evaluation's extensive use of short paragraphs that sometimes make it difficult to detect coherent messages. In some cases, the report could have provided clearer answers to evaluation questions and sub-questions by formulating fewer but higher-level findings, omitting some descriptive detail, and consistently formulating analytic rather than descriptive findings. Using internal cross-references more frequently could have helped to avoid duplications and reduce overall report length.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary constitutes a clear and accurate synthesis of the evaluation. It captures key evaluation and contextual features, summarizes the main evaluation findings and supporting evidence, presents a summary of the evaluation conclusions, and includes all the evaluation recommendations. The summary of findings could have been strengthened by presenting key messages in relation to each of the evaluation questions more explicitly and/or by visually highlighting key messages. The Executive Summary might have benefited from briefly mentioning progress made in relation to country capacity strengthening, e.g., positive results in the context of school feeding. Use of some of the presented figures could have been further increased by adding a brief explanatory reference to them in the supporting narrative text.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report effectively summarizes the evaluation context and subject of the evaluation and provides an overview of how WFP programming in Sudan has evolved against the backdrop of an evolving and often challenging external context. It strikes a good balance between detail and synthesis and reflects on gender equality dimensions. The report references analytical work that informed CSP design and implementation and describes the CSP in terms of its strategic objectives/outcomes, assumptions, activities, modalities, budget, and beneficiaries. The context section, while it does not contain any major weaknesses, could have been strengthened by mentioning the 2022 Voluntary National Review and any relevant policies or frameworks on gender equality and broader equity/inclusion issues, as well as by commenting on intersectional vulnerabilities.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report clearly outlines the evaluation objectives, purpose, and scope. 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 and accountability to affected populations have been a particular focus of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<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 included primary data collection from WFP staff, stakeholders and CSP beneficiaries. Gender equality and other cross-cutting priorities are addressed through dedicated evaluation sub-questions and indicators. The evaluation made meaningful use of the reconstructed theory of change for</p>		

the CSP. Its use of multiple, 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 methodology could have been further strengthened by discussing the availability and quality of monitoring data on GEWE and broader equity and inclusion issues; including the evaluation criteria in the evaluation matrix and drawing upon the corporate WFP framework for country capacity strengthening.

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

The evaluation addresses all evaluation questions and sub-questions in a structured fashion. Supporting evidence is presented transparently and clearly, providing sources for all data and quotes, and generally using a neutral tone. The report assesses performance against the International Humanitarian Principles and discusses WFP contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way, considering contextual factors. It reflects the voices of different stakeholder groups, and comments on unintended effects of WFP programming. The clarity of answers provided to the evaluation questions and sub-questions could, in some cases, have been further enhanced by using fewer, higher-level findings statements; and by consistently formulating analytical, rather than descriptive, findings statements. In a few cases, the report would have benefited from more specificity regarding the groups whose voices are being reported. The discussion of unanticipated effects of CSP implementation could have been strengthened by discussing effects on gender equality.

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

The conclusions are pitched at a higher analytical level and effectively synthesize evaluation findings across evaluation questions and reflect on the strategic implications of these findings for the future of the CSP. The conclusions are balanced, reflecting both strengths and weaknesses of the CSP implementation, and do not introduce any new information. Finally, the conclusions include reflections on gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) and broader equity and inclusion dimensions. The report could have explained better how it arrived at the conclusion that in order for WFP to strengthen its enabling role, it should better understand government workings and how to operate in a conflict-sensitive manner.

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

The evaluation makes five relevant, realistic, and actionable recommendations that are prioritized, include a timeframe for action, and identify responsible actors. All sub-recommendations are prioritized as either high or medium and are also grouped into strategic and operational recommendations respectively. 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. For one of the five recommendations, the report could have brought out more clearly how the presented sub-recommendations relate to and elaborate on the main recommendation.

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

The report follows the WFP template for CSPE and includes all the mandated annexes. It is written in clear and understandable language and makes good use of visual aids including graphs, tables, and bold font. The report provides sources for all data and quotes and uses several cross-references within the main report and regarding annexes. However, it considerably exceeds the recommended word limit for CSPE and could have benefited from occasionally using bullet points instead of narrative paragraphs, omitting some descriptive details in the findings section, using more internal cross-references, and synthesizing observations into higher level findings. The report version made available to the reviewer still contained some spelling mistakes and could have used acronyms more sparingly. The annexes could have been reduced in length, and all annexes should have been referenced in the main report and in the correct order.

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	Meets requirements: 8 points
--	------------------------------

GEWE considerations are well integrated into the report. The chosen mixed-method approach and evaluation methodology were gender-responsive and based on deliberate considerations of 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 one of five recommendations addresses gender quality issues. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The context section provides relevant information on different social role groups and their respective challenges. It could have benefited from reflecting more explicitly on intersectional vulnerabilities when discussing issues of disability, displacement, and protection. The findings section reflects the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups and disaggregates some quantitative data where relevant. The report reflects on unanticipated effects of CSP implementation including on the most vulnerable, although it does not specifically comment on such effects on gender equality and human rights. One of five recommendations addresses GEWE priorities, and four of 19 sub-recommendations address GEWE and broader human right/equity issues.

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