

Evaluation title	Évaluation du Plan stratégique de pays en Mauritanie 2019-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized Evaluation – CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Partly Satisfactory: 59%	
<p>Evaluation users can rely on the findings provided in the Evaluation of WFP Mauritania Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2019-2022 and may use them for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided. The report is generally well written and addresses evaluation questions comprehensively. Findings are well structured against key evaluation questions, relying on diverse sources of data and highlighting key messages. The level of detail and analysis, on both CSP strengths and weaknesses, is reasonable despite some evaluation sub-questions and lines of inquiry not having been fully addressed in the findings. An appropriate line of sight is evident between evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. Recommendations are prioritized and their timeline for action specified. The methodology section of the report, however, could have been strengthened with the inclusion of a sampling strategy, further detail on how diversity and representation would be promoted in data collection, mitigation strategies for all perceived limitations, and a more comprehensive overview of evaluation ethics. The report would have benefited from more detail on CSP plans and expected results regarding cross-cutting aims. There could also have been greater clarity in the findings and conclusions on the extent of CSP performance (planned vs. actual) with regard to reaching the most vulnerable and achieving expected results with regard to gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE), inclusion, equity, and human rights.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary provides a good overview of the evaluation rationale, scope, methodology and intended users, the CSP and its context, as well as key evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. However, it would have benefited from the integration of evaluation objectives or key evaluation questions in its introduction, greater use of graphics and charts in the findings section, and a more detailed discussion of conclusions and recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a succinct overview of the country demographics, poverty levels, food security and nutrition, refugee and humanitarian context, education indicators, gender equality considerations, as well as related national policies and plans. The report provides a comprehensive overview of the evolution in CSP design, scope and resource allocation, beneficiary numbers and financing modalities, from 2018 to 2021. The evolution is depicted graphically and narratively and external factors responsible for the evolution in CSP design are explained. Nevertheless, the summary would have been strengthened with a comparison of resources required versus resources received, a succinct analysis of the equity, gender and inclusion dimensions of nutrition and food security, as well as what results were sought and how the CSP was designed to achieve improvements in equity, inclusion and gender equality.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale and objectives of learning and accountability are clearly stated, its uses and main users identified. Equity, gender equality, inclusion and protection considerations are mainstreamed in the key evaluation questions, sub-questions and indicators of the evaluation matrix. However, gender, equity and human rights could also have been reflected in key evaluation questions related to sustainability, partnership and resource allocation. The report would have benefited from a more detailed description of scope with regard to targeted beneficiaries.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section of the report clearly presents the four key evaluation questions, which are linked to standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, with nine learning themes developed and integrated into the methodology based on needs identified through stakeholder consultations and surveys during the inception phase. However, the methodology</p>		

would have been strengthened with a clearer presentation of data sources and collection methods, including how diversity (sex, age, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic group) was represented among respondents; a detailed sampling strategy, including sample frame, sample selection criteria and sample size for different qualitative and quantitative methods; further detail on how data was analyzed or triangulated; identification of a mitigation strategy for all limitations raised; and finally, greater detail on how evaluation standards were assured, and what measures were taken to ensure the safety, security, and dignity of different stakeholder groups throughout data collection and analysis.

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

Evaluation findings are generally informative, comprehensive and well balanced, presenting both strengths and weaknesses of CSP performance against key evaluation questions. Findings are structured against the evaluation questions and sub-questions, with key messages summarized. Diverse sources of data were used to support findings. However, the findings would have been strengthened with greater reliance on primary data collected, disaggregated by age, sex and other characteristics to discern how the voices of different social groups informed the findings. While the evaluation matrix flags limitations in data availability for cross-cutting themes, findings would have been strengthened had they addressed data availability and discussed the implications of any missing data on the validity and reliability of findings. Moreover, findings would have benefited from an analysis of how recommendations from previous evaluations influenced the current CSP design and its implementation. Finally, the report would have been improved had any unintended effects of the CSP, particularly related to GEWE and human rights, been presented and with an explanation as to why the International Humanitarian Principles were not addressed.

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

Conclusions are balanced, reflecting strengths and weaknesses of CSP performance, synthesizing key messages from the findings and reflecting on past CSP performance. Conclusions also address cross-cutting aims (gender, accountability, protection and environment). However, they would have been strengthened had they addressed the effectiveness of the CSP, in terms of expected outcome and output achievement, along with equity and inclusion dimensions. Conclusions would have benefited from a broader discussion of the extent to which the CSP targeted the most vulnerable and from an analysis of the internal results logic of the CSP, as well as a more forward-looking slant in terms of how the CSP could be adapted in future.

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

Recommendations generally appear to flow logically from evaluation findings and conclusions. They are aligned with the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning. Recommendations are prioritized, with timeframes for action specified. However, there are forward-looking suggestions in three conclusions, which are not reflected in the recommendations, and broader equity and inclusion dimensions are also not reflected in the recommendations.

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

The report is well written, follows the WFP template and includes all the required lists. The report is effectively cross-referenced across sections, findings, annexes. Key messages are highlighted but visual aids could have been used in the to clarify CSP results achievement against expected results and indicators in the findings section against each evaluation sub-question. The main report and its annexes exceed WFP requirements on length.

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: 5 points
--	--

While not reflected in a specific evaluation objective or the evaluation's other objectives, equity, gender equality, inclusion and protection considerations are mainstreamed in some key evaluation questions, sub-questions and indicators of the evaluation matrix; although GEWE could have been more comprehensively mainstreamed across all evaluation criteria and questions as well. The evaluation methodology contains details on the total proportion of women participating in data collection relative to men, it specifies that some group discussions were separated by gender, and that quantitative data collection results were disaggregated by gender. Diverse data sources and processes were employed to ensure inclusion, although the report would have benefited significantly from a sample frame, rationale,

and sampling strategy, which demonstrated how representation and diversity of voices in data collection was assured. Evaluation findings would have benefited from a more elaborate discussion of planned versus actual achievement of CSP-expected GEWE results and indicators, as well as any unanticipated effects on GEWE and human rights. Recommendations would have been improved with a reference to inclusion considerations for the CSP moving forward.

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.