

Evaluation title	Évaluation du plan stratégique de pays du PAM Tchad 2019-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 73%	
<p>Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credibility of the findings and conclusions of the Evaluation of the WFP Chad Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2019-2023 to guide decision-making. Evaluation approaches, methods and sampling strategies were comprehensive and appropriate to answer key evaluation questions. Findings are well balanced, presenting both CSP strengths and weaknesses. The findings are clearly structured against and address each evaluation question and related sub-questions, with no inconsistency noted between them. Conclusions connect findings across evaluation questions and appropriately reflect the strengths and weaknesses of CSP performance. Recommendations clearly and logically flow from findings and conclusions and appear generally feasible and realistic given the context. Human rights and gender equality are integrated throughout the evaluation matrix in questions related to CSP relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. However, the evaluation methodology would have benefitted from greater clarity in how sampling was designed to ensure a diversity of voices, including those of the most vulnerable groups (and/or a discussion of the challenges in accessing the most vulnerable groups, including persons living with disabilities). Given the importance of gender equality to the CSP objectives in Chad and to WFP policy generally, the conclusions could have included a more detailed discussion on the strengths and challenges experienced by the Country Office in mainstreaming gender considerations across the CSP. Moreover, conclusions could have been strengthened by explicitly commenting on CSP logic and any causal links between CSP performance and progress related to national policies or the SDGs. Finally, the report would have been strengthened had it annexed a mapping of findings-conclusions-recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The introduction includes an overview of the evaluation purpose, objectives, scope, methodology, as well as a short description of the context and subject under review. The use of charts and graphs is effective in conveying information in a concise manner. Evaluation findings are structured in accordance with key evaluation questions and summarized succinctly under sub-headings. However, the introduction would have benefitted from a description of key stakeholders, evaluation users and end uses of the evaluation. The conclusions summarize key evaluation findings but should have included those related to CSP efficiency.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a graphic description of how WFP programming has evolved since 2015, as well as an overview of CSP strategic objectives, elements of the intervention logic and activities, supported by further details on the CSP line of sight and theory of change in annex. Budget details are clearly described by strategic outcome and source of funding. The narrative description of the CSP would have benefitted from greater detail on the analytical work underpinning its design, as well as the rationale for any adaptations in response to the WFP internal and external contexts. CSP target groups are disaggregated by sex and age for some activity areas, but the report would have been strengthened had this extended across all activity areas, describing the gender, equity and inclusion dimensions of the country programme.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The objectives of the evaluation, including learning and accountability, are clearly presented. Human rights and gender equality are integrated throughout the evaluation as reflected in the evaluation matrix (Annex 4) where questions relative to gender and cross-cutting areas are provided with respect to CSP relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. However, the report would have been strengthened with a more explicit description of stakeholders, end users and uses of the evaluation. The description of scope could have been strengthened with a clearer definition of target groups.</p>		

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Evaluation approaches, methods and sampling strategies appear comprehensive and appropriate to answer key evaluation questions. Human rights and gender equality are integrated throughout the evaluation as reflected in the evaluation matrix. The report contains a comprehensive assessment of evaluability, an overview of the evaluation approach and design, as well as data collection and analysis methods, and sampling strategies. Evaluation ethics are also described with a reference to UNEG standards. The methodology annex could have been strengthened by disaggregating all respondent categories by sex, age, sub-group, as appropriate, and would have benefitted from greater detail on sampling to ensure a diversity of voices including those of the most vulnerable groups (and/or a discussion of the challenges in accessing the most vulnerable groups, including persons living with disabilities). The report would have benefitted from a more comprehensive overview of key limitations and mitigation strategies.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Findings are balanced, presenting both CSP strengths and weaknesses, and supported by diverse sources of evidence. They are clearly structured against each evaluation question and related sub-questions, with no inconsistency noted among them. Findings comprehensively analyse output delivery and outcome achievement, noting where gaps in information prevent results measurement. Nevertheless, findings would have been strengthened with more reference to stakeholder perceptions as a source of data, disaggregated by sex, age, identity status or disability. The report would have benefitted from an identification of positive or negative unanticipated effects, including those related to human rights and gender equality, and a question on humanitarian principles is not adequately addressed in the findings. Finally, findings could have been strengthened by including references to analysis found in annexes.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions connect findings across evaluation questions and appropriately reflect the strengths and weaknesses of CSP performance, providing a summary of CSP performance by strategic outcome, which is a helpful overview for the reader. Conclusions are comprehensive and generally summarize all key messages highlighted in the findings. However, the conclusions could have been strengthened by explicitly commenting on CSP logic and any causal links between CSP performance and national policies or the SDGs.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations logically flow from findings and conclusions, and address both learning and accountability objectives. They appear generally feasible and realistic given the context, are prioritized and targeted at specific actors, with timelines for their implementation indicated. Recommendations could have been strengthened by including the need for further research and the development of an evidence base to underpin dialogue and advocacy efforts as well as the need to strengthen coordination mechanisms to ensure that other humanitarian-development-peace actors complement WFP efforts.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is clearly written. Acronyms are spelled out the first time they are used and the report uses visual aids to present elements of findings in a logical and useful way. However, there are a few typos and grammatical errors evident in the report and several instances where footnotes lack appropriate sourcing.</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>While not reflected in a specific evaluation objective or the evaluation's other objectives nor in a standalone criterion, gender equality considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation framework. Diverse data sources and processes were employed to ensure inclusion, accuracy, and credibility, although the methodology as described in the main report and annex is essentially gender neutral. The ethics discussion could have been strengthened with a mention of how the security and dignity of persons living with disabilities and other specifically vulnerable groups (refugees, asylum seekers, etc.) were assured. Quantitative data on beneficiary participation and reach are systematically disaggregated by sex</p>	

throughout the findings. No unanticipated effects related to gender equality and human rights are identified but GEWE issues are reflected in the evaluation recommendations.

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.