

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Zambia WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 92%	
<p>The Evaluation of Zambia WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023 is overall a highly satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision making. The report effectively summarizes relevant information on internal and external contextual developments. The evaluation objectives, purpose, and scope, in terms of the time period, geographic areas, and activities covered, are clearly and succinctly discussed. The findings address all the evaluation questions and sub-questions in a well-organized and transparent manner, and clearly presenting findings that are positive and negative. The findings present the voices of diverse stakeholder groups from inside and outside WFP, such as government representatives, partners, and beneficiaries, which helps to demonstrate clearly how findings emerged from triangulated data. The findings also draw upon previous studies and evaluations. The conclusions point out strategic implications for the next country strategic plan (CSP) in Zambia. There is also a reflection on gender dimensions of WFP interventions, as well as other vulnerable groups, in the country in the conclusions. The evaluation recommendations are pertinent, well organized, and useful to the key stakeholders identified for their implementation. The report's only significant weaknesses are in the methodology, which could have included a greater discussion of the validity and quality of monitoring data, as well as the way in which gender-sensitive data collection methods and tools were used. The report would have also been improved with greater use of text boxes and summary sections to highlight key messages and enhance readability.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a clear description of the evaluation context and the subject of the evaluation, including how the CSP was intended to support a strategic shift in WFP's approach to its work in Zambia. It describes the main features of the CSP in terms of its strategic outcomes, as well as the planned results, budget, and targeted beneficiaries. The findings presented in this section are a good summary of the findings in the main report, being well organized and clearly stated. While this section is strong, more could have been added to clarify how the evaluation was conducted, including the methodology, and the conclusions could have been better structured to help guide the reader through the information more easily.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear description of the evaluation context in Zambia and the CSP with a balance between detail and synthesis. There is presentation of gender-specific vulnerabilities and changing or shifting national priorities and changes to the external context. The main features of the CSP are outlined. However, some contextual information is missing, such as previous analytical work of the country office and details on Agenda 2030 and SDG 17.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The objectives, rationale and purpose of the evaluation are outlined in detail. The main users and uses of the evaluation are clearly identified. How gender equality and women's rights, and inclusion were mainstreamed in the evaluation is discussed. The only minor weakness is there is no explicit evaluation objective dedicated to human rights and gender equality, which would have contributed to raising the profile of these issues in the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology, a mixed methods approach, described in the report was appropriate for answering the evaluation questions and for effective data collection. The evaluation drew upon a variety of qualitative and quantitative data sources and used complementary methods of data collection and analysis to support data triangulation. The sampling frame, rationale and analysis methods were appropriate for the context in Zambia. However, greater discussion of the validity</p>		

and quality of monitoring data and data availability would have improved this section. Moreover, sampling frames could have been more explicit, as well as the gender-sensitive data collection methods and tools that were used.

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

The report includes a strong findings section that addresses and provides information on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions, with evidence presented transparently and clearly. The findings discuss WFP contributions to results in a fair and nuanced way where positive and negative findings are brought forward in a balanced fashion. The report presents diverse stakeholder voices, effectively demonstrating triangulation. The findings draw upon previous studies and evaluations. The report also makes explicit when the evidence base is inconclusive or explains when there appears to be inconsistent results. There is a focused discussion on humanitarian principles and specific attention given to how the inclusion of gender considerations in the CSP design and delivery has been achieved. The only minor weakness is that unanticipated effects are not explicitly addressed although these are occasionally addressed implicitly.

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

The report offers strong conclusions that synthesize evaluation findings across evaluation questions, noting both strengths and weaknesses of the country programme and its implementation. They do not present new information that is not captured in the findings and do not contain any major gaps or omissions. The conclusions point out strategic implications for the next CSP in Zambia. There is also a reflection on gender dimensions of WFP interventions, as well as other vulnerable groups in the country.

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

The evaluation makes six recommendations that logically flow from the evaluation findings and conclusions, contributing to both the learning and accountability objectives of the CSPE. They provide relevant suggestions for the strategic position of WFP in Zambia which can be taken forward in the next CSP. The recommendations are prioritized, have a timeframe for action, and are logically grouped. While generally strong, some sub-recommendations appear to be without reference to possible constraints and there could have been greater specificity in the identification of responsible actors.

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

The report is well written and generally free of jargon. It provides sources for all data and quotes and effectively uses cross-references between sections. While overall clear and accessible, the report could have made greater use of text boxes and summary sections to highlight key messages. Moreover, not all annexes are referenced in the main 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	Meets requirements: 7 points
--	------------------------------

The context provides relevant information on intersectional vulnerabilities in Zambia. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) is clearly mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis, across the evaluation criteria and within the evaluation matrix and the evaluation questions. The report comments on the availability of monitoring on GEWE-relevant indicators. The methodological design is gender-responsive, reflected in the mixed-methods design and with the use of a variety of data sources and processes, which facilitated inclusion, accuracy, and credibility. However, more details could have been included as to how the focus groups were conducted with gender and inclusion in mind. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The evaluation effectively addresses GEWE considerations in its analysis. The findings section reflects the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups and disaggregates some quantitative data where relevant. However, no unanticipated effects regarding vulnerability or gender are explicitly highlighted in the discussion of the findings. Sub-recommendations address GEWE and broader human rights/equity issues.

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>