

Evaluation title	Evaluation of the State of Palestine WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 90%	
<p>Overall, the Evaluation of the WFP State of Palestine Country Strategic Plan (CSP) can be used by decision makers with a high degree of confidence to inform the design and implementation of the next CSP. The report summary, context, the overview of the evaluation subject, evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope are well defined, with a few shortcomings noted with respect to the overview of the CSP and evaluation objectives in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) dimensions. The methodology is also well defined and appropriate for this evaluation, including the integration of GEWE dimensions, but could have assessed the monitoring data available and provided more detail regarding the sampling strategy and ethics. The findings are well presented, robust, and supported by sufficient levels of evidence. The conclusions could have been improved in terms of balance and capturing all key findings in the assessment of evaluation questions and criteria without inconsistencies, gaps or omissions. GEWE-related findings, delivery of outputs and outcomes, performance of the CSP related to International Humanitarian Principles (IHP), and unanticipated findings are discussed. The conclusions present a synthesis of findings, as opposed to a higher level of abstraction, not fully capturing the depth and breadth of the findings and tend toward a bias in presenting positive findings. The recommendations are well-defined, including GEWE-related considerations. The report is well structured, easy to read, and contains all necessary features, although it exceeds WFP's maximum length requirements.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary report is well presented, containing all the necessary features, and uses visual aids effectively, particularly in the findings section. The introduction clearly states the evaluation purpose/rationale, programmatic scope, methodology, and stakeholders. The context and overview of the evaluation subject are complete. The summary fully reflects upon GEWE-related dimensions in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, it could have been improved by clearly distinguishing between findings and conclusions.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context is well defined, covering all relevant information related to the situation in Palestine, including SDGs, national policies, and an intersectional analysis of specific social groups. The overview of the evaluation subject is clearly presented, including an assessment of past evaluations, the evolution of the CSP over time, assessing strategic shifts, and evolution of transfer modalities. The theory of change and intervention logic are clearly presented, including all necessary features. Up-to-date budget figures and beneficiary numbers are provided. Visual aids are used very well in the presentation of the overview of evaluation subject. However, the context and overview of the CSP could have better addressed GEWE-related dimensions. Additionally, details regarding the transfer modalities could have been elaborated on in terms of service delivery and technical support.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The rationale/purpose and main users of the evaluation, its objective in terms of accountability, and its temporal and programmatic scope are clearly stated. However, the report could have defined the geographic coverage, included a GEWE-specific objective, and explicitly stated the objective in terms of learning.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation uses mixed methods, theory-based, and contribution analysis, with the integration of these methodological approaches is clearly shown. The evaluation matrix contains the evaluation questions and most features except the evaluation criteria and data analysis methods, with linkages to data sources for each evaluation (sub-) question. The methodology provides for data collection among a diverse set of stakeholders allows for triangulation of</p>		

data and is appropriate for this evaluation and fully integrated GEWE considerations. However, the methodology could have provided more elaboration of the sampling strategy and ethical considerations. Although methodological limitations are included, mitigation strategies are not provided for all limitations. Whilst an evaluability assessment was conducted during the inception phase, the report does not follow up on that analysis in a meaningful manner. Additionally, there is no discussion regarding the reliability and availability of the monitoring data, including in relation to disaggregated data.

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

The findings assess the main evaluation questions and sub-questions without inconsistencies, gaps or omissions, while mentioning where there was inconclusive evidence. The findings are transparently and impartially generated, without bias. The information provided balances detail and synthesis. Sources are cited to protect anonymity. The findings assess WFP's delivery of outputs and contribution to outcomes, the performance of the CSP in relation to the IHP, and how past evaluations and studies informed the design of the current CSP, particularly the strategic outcomes and modalities. The findings provide a clear discussion of GEWE-related issues, including positive and negative unanticipated results. The findings clearly triangulate the voices of different social groups, including the use of cross-cutting indicators and disaggregated data. However, findings for some evaluation questions focus mostly on strengths.

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

Conclusions address the evaluation criteria and questions across the findings. They make clear linkages across findings and recommendations in Annex 8. GEWE-related conclusions are presented, as well as conclusions related to the validity of the explicit assumptions of the CSP logic of intervention. However, the conclusions are presented as a synthesis of the findings as opposed to reflecting a higher level of abstraction. They also present mostly positive findings and could have discussed shortcomings/challenges presented in the findings. The conclusions do not represent the breadth and depth of the findings.

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

The report presents five recommendations that are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives. The recommendations are realistic and feasible, targeted, actor specific, prioritized, time specific, and grouped. The recommendations reflect on how GEWE-related dimensions can be improved in the future CSP. The recommendations meet length requirements.

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

The report is well structured and coherent, containing all the necessary features. It is supported by a relevant set of complementary annexes. Clear and professional language is used, that is devoid of jargon, with key messages presented in bold text for the ease of readers. However, it exceeds WFP's maximum word length requirement for CSPEs.

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: 8 points
--	-------------------------------------

While the report does not have a specific GEWE-related objective, GEWE dimensions are mainstreamed across the evaluation framework and evaluation (sub-)questions. The background section includes an intersectional analysis of different social groups. The methodology fully integrated GEWE dimensions in the data collection and analysis methods. The sampling frame includes a diverse range of stakeholders, including the most vulnerable. Ethical considerations address GEWE dimensions through the evaluation process, and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations reflect on GEWE dimensions.

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.