

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluación del plan estratégico para el Perú (2018-2022) - Informe de evaluación centralizada	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - CSPE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 93%	
<p>The evaluation of Peru's Country Strategic Plan (CSP) (2018-2022) is overall a high-quality document that can be used with a high degree of confidence to inform decision-making. The report presents a clear description of the national context as well as of the CSP itself, including a discussion of the gender-sensitive approach that was integrated in the design of the CSP, as well as specific ways in which gender was mainstreamed through WFP work in Peru. The methodology section describes the mixed data collection methods used such as key informant interviews, focus group discussions, online surveys, as well as five case studies. The four main evaluation questions and corresponding sub-questions are explicitly identified with other details provided in a complete evaluation matrix. Findings are presented in an impartial fashion and demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP performance. They are substantiated by a wide range of sources that are explicitly identified in each case and respond to all the evaluation questions. Conclusions draw on the information presented in the findings and are pitched at a higher level of analysis. However, while conclusions address some of the evidence regarding GEWE-related findings, wider equity and inclusion dimensions are not reflected. Recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are generally realistic and feasible as they take into account the implementation context as well as potential limitations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report provides an effective summary of Peru's CSPE and a concise overview of the most important elements of the CSP (2018-2022), including contextual information. The executive summary describes the evaluation rationale, its objectives and purpose, the time period covered, stakeholders, and methodology. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented in a succinct fashion. They summarize the main findings and information presented in the body of the report, and are presented in response to the four evaluation questions. Finally, conclusions and recommendations faithfully reflect the information provided in the main report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a good description of both the national context and the subject of the evaluation. Relevant development indexes, national development plans, policies, frameworks and priorities are described in detail. The report also discusses the ways in which the CSP was based on information generated through previous studies and evaluations. It provides a good description of the CSP in terms of its rationale, theory of change, strategic outcomes (SOs), and the evolution of the CSP in terms of its planning, design and changes observed during its implementation period. The gender dimension of the CSP is also well addressed. However, more explicit details could have been provided on the modalities of intervention under each SO.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report clearly identifies the rationale of the CSPE and its learning and accountability objectives. The scope (period of time and activities covered) is clearly described, and the main stakeholders of the evaluation are identified. Furthermore, gender equality and women's empowerment and human rights considerations were mainstreamed in the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation methodology is well described overall, highlighting the mixed methods used and including a relevant assessment of the monitoring data available for the evaluation. The evaluation criteria - aligned with OECD/DAC criteria - are clearly identified as well as the evaluation questions and sub-questions. A complete evaluation matrix is presented in Annex. While no specific GEWE and/or human rights criterion was included as part of this evaluation, the collection of GEWE-related data was mainstreamed in the evaluation framework through evaluation sub-questions. Methodological limitations as well as mitigation strategies are outlined, and ethical considerations discussed demonstrating alignment with UNEG guidelines. However, the methodology section could have more clearly discussed</p>		

the sampling frame used as well as the rationale for the sampling. Moreover, the report should have provided more detail around how triangulation of different sources from the same set of tools or methods (for example, interviews with different stakeholders and critical analysis of different documents) was carried out in practical terms..

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

Findings demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP performance. They are substantiated by a wide range of sources that are explicitly identified in each case. Findings respond to all four evaluation questions as well as all of the sub-questions and are supported by sufficient evidence. Findings also report on gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions and provide an analysis of the inclusion of gender issues across SOs. The performance of the CSP against humanitarian principles is also discussed. However, the report should have captured and analysed any unanticipated effects, either positive or negative, since this was a requirement of the ToR and stated in the inception report.

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

The report presents six conclusions that draw on the information presented in the findings but are pitched at a higher level of analysis. All conclusions are logically linked to the findings and include some comments on GEWE-related aspects. The conclusions also comment on the validity of the explicit logic of intervention of the CSP and its key assumptions. However, conclusions in general could have included more meaningful messages discussed in the findings section regarding GEWE-related aspects as well as wider equity and inclusion dimensions.

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

The report introduces recommendations and sub-recommendations that are clearly presented and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions with links between conclusions and recommendations listed. Recommendations are generally realistic and feasible as they take into account the implementation context as well as potential limitations. All recommendations are classified as strategic or operational in nature and their level of prioritization is clearly indicated in each case. They provide a clear timeframe for their implementation and identify primary as well as secondary actors for action for some. However, recommendations should have addressed broader equity and inclusion dimensions in the same way that GEWE-related issues are treated.

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

The evaluation report uses professional, clear and grammatically correct language throughout. It makes good use of visuals, and data sources are consistently provided for all information presented. Readability is also enhanced by including boxes that summarize the most salient messages for each finding and using bold to highlight key messages throughout the report. Furthermore, the report is effective in linking evaluation questions and findings and complementary information elsewhere in the report or in the annexes.

### **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>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 7 points
--	------------------------------

While the evaluation did not include a specific GEWE and/or human rights criterion, it mainstreamed the collection of GEWE-related data and adhered to the Leaving No One Behind (LNOB) principle. Sub-questions examined the extent to which WFP contributed to the achievement of cross-cutting objectives, i.e., humanitarian principles, protection, accountability to affected populations, gender equality and women's empowerment. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach and sought to assess the extent to which activities carried out aimed at transforming gender relations and the scope of achievements in GEWE. Data collection techniques reflected a balanced representation of men and women, and data was disaggregated by sex, when possible. However, the report could have addressed in more depth the occurrence of unanticipated effects either positive or negative on human rights and gender equality.

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