

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación del plan estratégico para el Ecuador (2017-2021)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized Evaluation - Country Strategic Plan	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 85%	
<p>The Evaluation of Ecuador's WFP Country Strategic Plan (CSP) (2017-2021) is overall a quality report that can effectively be used to inform decision-making. The report includes relevant context information leading into a good overview of the CSP. It clearly explains how the evaluation aimed at fulfilling the twofold objective of learning and accountability. While the methodology is outlined, a key annex that should provide additional methodological details is missing. The evaluation findings addressing the evaluation questions and sub-questions are well substantiated by evidence that is explicitly drawn from a wide range of sources. The report effectively articulates the link between activities/outputs implemented by WFP and their contributions towards outcome-level results. On the other hand, findings could have better reported on any unintended effects related to CSP implementation. Conclusions address both the CSP's strengths and areas for improvement and are forward-looking. Similarly, recommendations and sub-recommendations are formulated in a clear fashion and are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. Linkages between recommendations, findings, and conclusions are explained and the recommendations are realistic and feasible considering the implementation context.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary presents a balanced account of the most important elements of the CSP evaluation. Key findings are clearly summarized around the four evaluation questions and specific findings on humanitarian principles, gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) related issues and equity and wider inclusion issues are discussed under contributions to cross-cutting areas. Conclusions capture the key messages presented in the findings. The six recommendations and sub-recommendations are presented in a table that provides exactly the same information as in the main body of the report. However, stakeholders and users of the evaluation could have been highlighted in the summary.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context and overview of the evaluation subject is comprehensive, providing relevant information on the country situation, including data on nutrition and food security, climate change and vulnerability, national policies and priorities and their alignment with the SDGs, and the 2018 and 2022 National Voluntary Reviews. A strong intersectional analysis of vulnerabilities of specific groups impacted by the CSP is presented. The report describes Ecuador's CSP in detail, including its strategic focus as WFP's key instrument for its transition from a project approach to a programmatic approach at the country level, as well as key strategic shifts that have occurred since the previous CSP. The overview discusses the objectives, as well as the CSP's logical framework and key assumptions. However, the report would have been benefitted from a description of the Country Office's (CO) analytical work that informed the design of the CSP. Furthermore, the context section could have provided further details on education, agriculture and rural development in Ecuador. Finally, the overview of the CSP could have more fully covered cross-cutting priorities within the framework of the CSP.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The scope of the evaluation is described in terms of its geographic, time period, and programmatic coverage. While the report does not include a specific objective related to human rights and gender equality, the methodology section explains how the evaluation promoted a participatory approach, sensitive to gender and interculturality. The evaluation rationale is detailed, explaining how the evaluation intended to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the CSP in meeting its objectives, while adapting to contextual changes. Conversely, there is no mention of whether the evaluation adopted WFP principles for integration of GEWE in the evaluation process, although this dimension was mainstreamed in the evaluation.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation drew on a strong mixed methods design involving both primary quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis from a variety of sources. Despite a missing methodology annex resulting in some information gaps, such as details regarding the sampling strategy and evaluation ethics, the methodological approach was sound and appropriate, as well as clearly aligned with the evaluation purpose. However, while the report refers to an evaluability analysis that was conducted, this analysis is barely discussed in the report, making it difficult to understand how monitoring data (or lack thereof) informed the choice of the methodology. Finally, the main report makes no reference to the evaluation criteria and mitigation strategies are not consistently provided for all evaluation limitations presented, nor is any mention of the ethical guidelines.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation findings are well substantiated by evidence drawn from a wide range of sources, providing answers to all evaluation questions and sub-questions. They are impartially presented and discuss both the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP. Gaps in the evidence base are also highlighted and well explained. The report effectively links CSP activities/outputs and their contributions toward outcome-level results. Findings also examine the evolution and strategic shift of the activities that were initiated during the previous CSP and that continue in the current CSP due to their long-term perspective. The report explains the way in which recommendations and findings from previous studies, evaluations and reviews informed the current CSP. There is a strong sub-section that discusses CSP performance against humanitarian principles. However, while the findings are supported by some sex-disaggregated data, such as when discussing the number of beneficiaries of the school feeding complementary project, this is not consistent across findings. Finally, there is no real analysis of the one unexpected effect of the CSP identified.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The conclusions draw on the evidence presented in the findings and are pitched at a higher level of analysis. They address both CSP's strengths and areas for improvement and can effectively inform decision-making since they identify the future implications of the findings. Conclusions comment on the validity of the CSP's explicit logic and are grouped together under themes such as relevance, strategic positioning and coherence with national priorities, efficiency of the CSP structure for the WFP response in Ecuador, among others. A mapping of findings, conclusions and recommendations is included in the annex.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The recommendations and sub-recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are realistic and feasible and consider the implementation context as well as potential limitations. All recommendations specify which division or staff member within the CO is the main actor responsible for their implementation and identify other target actors who should support the primary responsible actors.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The language used in the evaluation report is professional, and information is presented in an accessible and clear manner. The report makes good use of visual aids such as maps, graphs, charts and tables. It includes most mandatory annexes that helpfully complement the information presented in the main body of the report. However, the report should have included a list of all the annexes and largely exceeds the maximum word count requirement for CSP evaluation reports in Spanish language. Finally, the report could have benefitted from a thorough final editing to enhance the overall presentation and format of the document.</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>Approaches requirements: 6 points</b>
<p>Although no specific GEWE and/or human rights criterion was included as part of the evaluation, the collection of data related to GEWE was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation. The methodology was appropriate to address GEWE considerations, including gender-related sub-questions and enquiry tools. A special effort was made to include and give voice to vulnerable groups such as indigenous women, afro-Ecuadorans, and migrants. The conclusions and</p>	

recommendations address GEWE issues. However, the report does not discuss in much detail whether sufficient data on results indicators in relation to human rights and gender equality was collected during the CSP implementation period. Moreover, there is no analysis of any unexpected effects of the CSP related to human rights of gender equality. Finally, neither the evaluation report nor any other annex makes any mention of the ethical guidelines used during the evaluation.

**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>