

Evaluation title	Évaluation du plan stratégique de pays provisoire du PAM en République centrafricaine (2018-2022)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation – CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 89%	
<p>The Evaluation of the WFP Central African Republic Country Strategic Plan (2018-2022) is well organized, uses professional language, and provides a good assessment of the CSP, including its intervention logic. Relevant information on the national context is provided, although this should have included relevant national policies related to nutrition, agriculture, and human rights, as well as referred to the 2019 Central Africa Republic (CAR) Voluntary National Review (VNR) Report. The approach and methodology used for this evaluation were sound, combining different methods of data collection and data sources, which ensured unbiased answers to evaluation questions. The evaluation findings provide a balanced assessment of the CSP achieved results vis-à-vis planned results, and the factors influencing these results. Conclusions are pitched at a high level but could have been improved by clearly identifying the implications of the findings for the future of the CSP. The evaluation formulates six recommendations which, overall, are of good quality, feasible, sufficiently detailed to be actionable, take into consideration both the country context and potential WFP limitations, and integrate gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and broader equity and inclusion dimensions. However, the report overall could have reflected broader equity and inclusion dimensions more fully.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a good overview of the country context and most of the evaluation features. The summary makes good use of graphics and charts to convey relevant information and present data in a concise manner. The key findings are well summarized and organized around the main evaluation questions, and reflect GEWE-related, equity and inclusion dimensions. Conclusions are concise and recommendations reflect those presented in the main report. However, the intended users and key stakeholders of the evaluation could have been outlined more clearly.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents relevant aspects of the national context, including the political and security crises, which have characterized CAR for several decades. The report discusses the intervention logic of the CSP, the evolution of the CSP over time, and the adjustments made in terms of modalities of intervention. The description of the context could have been improved by adding information on the country's climate change and vulnerability situation, relevant national policies (such as those related to nutrition, agriculture, and human rights), by referring to the 2019 CAR VNR Report, and by adding beneficiary numbers disaggregated by sex and age.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The overall aim, objectives of accountability and learning, and the main users and stakeholders of the evaluation are clearly outlined. Gender equity and social protection dimensions are mainstreamed in two evaluation questions. However, including a specific evaluation objective on these dimensions would have given them more prominence. The temporal, thematic and geographical scope is well defined.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation framework is clearly outlined, including the OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and sustainability, as well as connectedness and coverage) and evaluation questions, which guided the evaluation, reflected as well in a detailed evaluation matrix. The key methodological approach that guided the evaluation and data collection methods are well outlined in the report. The ethical standards that were followed during the evaluation exercise are discussed in the report. However, while GEWE considerations are addressed in</p>		

<p>the methodology, the report does not include an analysis of whether sufficient data was collected on specific results indicators as to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results, as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions. The methodology could have been strengthened by including the strategy and criteria for the sampling of the five regions that were visited by the evaluation team and by adding details on how the most vulnerable stakeholders were consulted.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The CSP evaluation findings are discussed around the main evaluation questions and sub-questions; this way, the findings address most questions fully, without any inconsistencies among them, and are generally presented in a transparent manner, providing a balanced assessment of the achieved vis-à-vis planned results in CAR CSP. While the findings are supported by evidence, the report sometimes fails to systematically distinguish between the voices of stakeholders within one specific category (example, at national level, distinguishing the views of representatives of government, donors, and other UN agencies could have added value). Despite evaluation questions on the integration of the International Humanitarian Principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence, the report does not provide an analysis of how the CSP aligned with these Principles or how its interventions performed against each of these principles.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes 12 high-level conclusions, with one conclusion reflecting GEWE-related and wider equity and inclusion aspects. The conclusions could have been improved by clearly identifying the implications of the findings for the future of the CSP and by adding a robust reflection on the linkages between the logic of intervention and national development goals and the relevant SDGs.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation formulates good quality recommendations logically derived from the findings and conclusions which integrate GEWE and broader equity and inclusion dimensions, and meet WFP requirements, both in terms of number and word count. They are feasible, sufficiently detailed to be actionable, and take into consideration both the country context and potential WFP limitations. Moreover, they are categorized into strategic and operational recommendations, prioritized, and include a timeline for action. However, beyond protection, the recommendations could have reflected broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the report is well written, follows WFP structure and content requirements, including all relevant annexes and lists. Information that is found in other parts of the report (e.g., annexes) is properly cross-referenced and clearly signposted. However, the main body of the report exceeds WFP maximum length allowed for evaluation reports written in French.</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	Meets requirements: 7 points
<p>GEWE is generally mainstreamed in the evaluation framework. Although no evaluation criterion focused on GEWE considerations specifically, these are mainstreamed in other evaluation criteria (such as relevance and effectiveness) and the evaluation matrix includes several questions aimed at collecting data on and assessing GEWE-related aspects. Ethical standards were applied to protect the dignity of the people involved in the evaluation and the confidentiality of the information shared. The CSP evaluation findings draw on insights collected from different groups of stakeholders that were consulted, including women, and the report disaggregates data by sex as relevant. An analysis of the gender inequality situation in CAR shows the linkages between the situation of girls and women and their social vulnerabilities. While the report highlights the national gender equality and equity policy, it is silent about other relevant policies related to human rights. Unanticipated positive and negative effects of the CSP on human rights and gender equality are discussed in the report. Finally, the evaluation includes a specific recommendation, which reflects GEWE issues and protection dimensions.</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.