

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Tajikistan WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2024	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation – Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 83%	
<p>The Evaluation of the Tajikistan WFP Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2019-2024 is overall a quality document that can effectively be used to inform decision-making. The report provides a comprehensive description of both the transitional interim CSP (T-ICSP) (2018-2019) and the subsequent CSP, in terms of its rationale, strategic outcomes, implementation modalities, as well as its evolution with regard to planning, design and changes observed during the period covered by the evaluation. The mixed methods and theory-based approach used appear to be relevant and enabled the evaluation questions to be addressed. Although no specific gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) criterion was included as part of this evaluation, the collection of data related to GEWE was mainstreamed through evaluation questions and sub-questions. Findings are supported by a solid body of data and triangulation of different sources is evident throughout. Conclusions flow logically from the findings and provide a higher level of analysis on their implications for the future of the CSP. Recommendations are clearly formulated and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are realistic, feasible, and identify target actors within WFP. However, the report could have been strengthened in a number of areas, including further discussion of the sampling strategy, the unanticipated effects of the CSP and more fully developed conclusions to ensure that key messages from the high number of key findings were captured.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a brief yet comprehensive introduction and highlights the key findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the main report. It also provides an overview of the most salient elements of the CSPE, the context, and an overview of the CSP. Key findings are clearly summarized and include a discussion of cross-cutting issues such as humanitarian principles, GEWE-related and equity and wider inclusion issues. Conclusions capture the key messages presented in the findings. Recommendations and sub-recommendations are presented exactly as they are in the main report. However, while the intended users of the evaluation are referred to as the WFP country office and internal and external stakeholders including beneficiaries, said stakeholders are not properly identified.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a thorough, informative overview of the subject of the evaluation and the national context, which includes Tajikistan's main socioeconomic, demographic and geographic characteristics, and reliable sources to substantiate the information presented are identified. The context section discusses food security and nutrition rates with relevant indicators and provides some disaggregated data for several indices, such as unemployment, education, agriculture, and climate change and vulnerability to natural disasters. Relevant national policies and priorities are addressed, as well as their alignment with Agenda 2030, in particular with SDGs 2 and 17. The overview addresses cross-cutting priorities and the inclusion dimension of the CSP. Moreover, the report covers the evolution of the CSP in terms of its planning, design, and contextual changes that occurred since the beginning of the T-ICSP. However, a more in-depth explanation of the intersectional vulnerabilities of the populations affected by the T-ICSP and CSP is missing.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, as well as its dual objective of learning and accountability, are clearly outlined while the scope of the CSPE is described in geographic, temporal and operational terms. Even though the report does not include a specific objective related to human rights and gender equality as such, GEWE considerations were mainstreamed through sub-questions and indicators. Stakeholders of the evaluation are listed in an annex.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation used a theory-based approach drawing on a reconstructed theory of change, a mixed methods approach including key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), an e-survey, field observation and an in-depth document review. This enabled triangulation of data sources and methods and addressed challenges that were</p>		

encountered regarding data availability and how the availability of monitoring data informed the choice of methodology. Methodological limitations and mitigation measures are identified, and ethical considerations addressed. A purposive sampling approach was used for interviews, with the most relevant stakeholders selected based on a number of criteria. A consultation strategy was developed and used in the evaluation based on the stakeholder analysis and the sampling approach. However, the report should have discussed the sampling framework itself and the rationale with regards to data collection methods used in each case. Moreover, the report should have explained whether the CSPE adopted international evaluation criteria. Finally, the report or annexes should have clarified whether sufficient data on results indicators related to human rights, GEWE, and broader equity/inclusion dimensions was collected during the implementation period.

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

Findings are based on robust evidence and present a balanced discussion of both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject. Gaps in evidence and data are highlighted and well explained. The findings effectively articulate the link between activities/outputs implemented by WFP and the way in which these contributed towards outcome-level results. Findings assess the evaluation questions on the basis of quantitative and qualitative evidence collected and triangulated from different sources, as well as the achievement of the outcomes and outputs based on the indicators. However, the report should have more fully reported the way the voices of the most vulnerable groups were captured by the evaluation. Moreover, even though unexpected or unforeseen effects of the T-ICSP and CSP should have been included in the findings according to the inception report, these are not duly discussed.

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

Conclusions draw on the evidence presented in the findings and are pitched at a higher level of analysis. A mapping of findings, conclusions and recommendations is included in annex. Conclusions comment on the validity of the CSP's explicit logic and are grouped together under themes such as the strategic positioning and relevance of WFP work in Tajikistan. The lessons learned are correctly identified and formulated in a manner that reflects wider applicability. However, conclusions should have better captured some of the key messages from the large number of main findings, including those related to GEWE-related issues and messages found in the findings section, and could have explicitly addressed the way in which WFP is contributing towards relevant SDGs.

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

The six main recommendations and 15 sub-recommendations are formulated in a clear fashion and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are realistic, feasible and actionable, taking into consideration the implementation context as well as potential limitations. Responsible actors within WFP's Country Office are identified as well as actors at HQ and RB level. One sub-recommendation urges WFP to integrate GEWE, disability and accountability to affected persons (AAP) principles into CSP design and implementation.

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

The evaluation report uses professional language and consistently provides sources for all data presented. Good use is made of tables and figures, as well as cross-references which are insightful and useful in providing the reader with further information on different aspects of the CSP and the evaluation. For example, not only does the report consistently refer to complementary information found in different annexes, but it also provides references and even hyperlinks to complement the information presented. However, the report could have benefited from presenting respondent quotes and using bold consistently to highlight key messages across the report.

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
--	--

Gender was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation framework, methodology, and findings, with triangulation applied to findings to test their validity. It is also reflected in specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve in this area in future initiatives. However, the report does not sufficiently discuss the occurrence of any unintended effects on GEWE, address the way in which the voices of the most vulnerable beneficiaries were

captured to inform the evaluation, and the conclusions do not adequately address GEWE dimensions, even though the Inception Report states that unexpected or unforeseen consequences were to be included in the scope of the assessment.

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>