

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Afghanistan WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Partly Satisfactory: 59%	
<p>Overall, users can rely on the findings presented in the report of the 2018-2022 Afghanistan Country Strategic Plan (CSP) evaluation, while noting some shortcomings. The evaluation focused on the six Strategic Outcomes of the CSP as the main frame of reference to reflect the analysis. The evaluation objectives, main users, and scope, in terms of the time period and activities covered, are well outlined, as is the mixed methodology used. The report effectively captures the context within Afghanistan, drawing upon a strong bibliography of sources. The findings are comprehensive and include relevant details with the quantitative analysis particularly strong, although coverage of the evaluation questions/sub-questions is uneven and referencing to secondary sources to triangulate findings from interviews could have been stronger. The integration of gender, albeit limited, is quite well done, particularly as it relates to documenting actions taken and shortcomings such as the need to be more systematic in mainstreaming gender throughout the intervention using a transformative approach which is not sufficiently defined in the report. While there are clear references to vulnerable populations, there is a lack of clarity as to the actual focus, which is compounded by the fact that the main line of inquiry on inclusion in the evaluation matrix focuses exclusively on disabled people. Except for the recommendation on gender, which overlooks the inclusion dimension and fails to include sub-recommendations, the report generally effectively includes overarching general recommendations that are backed up by concrete, actionable and to a certain extent realistic sub-recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary is written clearly and concisely. The majority of the tables and diagrams are well presented as a means of synthesizing key points. The summary captures all key findings, including referencing gender and vulnerability dimensions. The conclusions are fairly well aligned with what is contained in the main report, while the recommendations are a direct cut and paste. However, reference to the evaluation stakeholders and users is overlooked and some of the conclusions come across as operational recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report effectively captures the evolution of the CSP, particularly from a financial perspective and from the perspective of the period preceding the CSP. This enables a good understanding of the logic of the current CSP while noting key assumptions. The use of tables helps to understand the six strategic objectives in relation to activities, expected results and links to relevant SDGs. The report includes one paragraph on gender issues but overlooks reference to other vulnerable populations.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives of learning and accountability, its scope in terms of time period and activities covered, and its main users (within WFP only) are presented in a general manner. It would have been useful to include the evaluation purpose, rationale, and geographic scope as well.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section of the report and Annex include a fair bit of detail on the approach taken, including noting significant challenges and limitations and how they were mitigated. Overall, the mixed methods approach to data collection and analysis was sound to allow for answers to the evaluation questions. The evaluation matrix covers all of the required information and is aligned with the questions outlined in the evaluation terms of reference. However, more detail on the methodological approach and sampling frame would have been helpful, particularly as concerns vulnerable groups.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The findings effectively respond to most of the evaluation questions, with extensive detail provided in some sections. The findings related to gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) are particularly strong in providing both analysis and concrete details on responses provided through the programming, as well as noting shortcomings with respect to mainstreaming. The presentation of findings is quite balanced, drawing principally on the results from interviews. Nevertheless, the evaluation matrix put forward a long list of questions, some of which have been overlooked, such as those on COVID-19. There is no direct assessment of either positive or negative unanticipated effects of the CSP or against the International Humanitarian Principles, which would have been pertinent in the Afghan context.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are balanced, particularly as they relate to noting some of the key strengths and weaknesses of the CSP. The report also refers to the Strategic Outcomes fairly systematically in presenting the analysis. It includes a mix of analyzing macro-level issues while also making reference to some of the specific activities of the CSP. However, this section is weak in terms of making causal connections to specific SDGs and to the national development goals. The inclusion dimension is focused on a less relevant set of vulnerable groups than is identified as a broader category in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are logically derived from both the findings and conclusions section and offer a good mix of macro-level recommendations and micro-level recommendations that are more operational in nature. Some recommendations are feasible and actionable and include reference to responsible actors. The sub-recommendations are well linked to the overarching recommendation. The recommendation on gender does not include sub-recommendations, which would have helped to provide clarity to actions that need to be taken. The issue of inclusion has been overlooked despite its importance to the CSP and the identification of vulnerable groups. A mix of prioritization of recommendations as well as more details on the responsible actors would have been useful. Recommendations could also have considered more fully the volatile country context.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report adheres to WFP's requirements for CSP evaluation reports. It is well written and professionally presented, supported with effective visual aids, although the use of bold and textboxes to highlight key points is limited. While the annexes provide very useful complementary information, the order in which they are presented should have followed that in which they are referenced in the main report.</p>		

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
<p>GEWE is effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation despite not being reflected in a specific evaluation objective or standalone criterion. However, the evaluation only included one sub-question related to gender equality and broader inclusion and equity considerations, and the report does not comment specifically on the availability of monitoring on GEWE relevant indicators. While the evaluation approach and methodology were appropriate to assess GEWE in the context of the CSP, reflected in the mixed-methods approach chosen and in the evaluation drawing upon a variety of data sources, the sample for all primary sources of data collection is not disaggregated by sex or other markers. It is therefore unclear how obstacles to accessing the internet and/or to participating in face-to-face interviews were addressed either methodologically or in terms of gathering a balanced perspective from men and women. Moreover, details on how evaluation participants were recruited in a fair manner are lacking. It would have been helpful to have more details given that women and vulnerable populations would likely face specific obstacles that would be critical to capture. There is limited reference to GEWE and wider inclusion issues in the evaluation findings. Positive or negative unanticipated effects on human rights and gender equality are not explicitly identified in the report. While there is one recommendation that addresses GEWE issues, it is quite general and does not draw upon critical wording contained in the findings section such as the importance of considering Gender-Based Violence as a key issue.</p>	

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.