

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of WFP's Policy on Country Strategic Plans	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - Policy	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 85%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP's Policy on Country Strategic Plans is overall an informative report that evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making. The report presents an informative context section, which discusses the emergence of the policy under review and its alignment with SDGs 2 and 17. A reconstructed Theory of Change (ToC) of the Country Strategic Plans (CSP) Policy is presented, which outlines all stated goals and objectives. The report is strong at describing the scope of the evaluation and the evaluation framework includes all evaluation criteria, evaluation questions and sub-questions, qualitative and quantitative data collection tools and analysis. The methodological design and data collection methods are described in great detail; they allow evaluation questions to be adequately answered. The report outlines a number of data sources, as well as processes such as triangulation and validation to mitigate certain limitations. Findings are clearly presented and demonstrate balance between strengths and weaknesses of the CSP Policy. Findings present a complete assessment of the degree to which the CSP policy contributed to the achievement of expected results. Conclusions provide a forward-looking reflection on the information presented in the findings. Recommendations are realistic and pay attention to contextual factors that may have an impact on the implementation of some recommendations; the level of prioritization (high or medium) is indicated for each recommendation and a clear implementation timeframe is provided, although the report could have been strengthened by explicitly indicating the target actor for each.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary report observes all of WFP requirements, is thorough and contains sufficient information to adequately inform decision-making. It includes key features of the evaluation, as well as an overview of the context and evaluation subject, including its purpose and evolution. Key findings, as well as conclusions and recommendations, are provided in an abbreviated and more concise version to those found in the body of the main report. It provides clear and complete information and can be used as a stand-alone document.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report presents an informative context and overview of the WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans. Similarly, the alignment of the two WFP Strategic Plans (2017-2021 and 2022-2025) with SDGs 2 and 17 is discussed in detail in the report. The report also explains that the CSP policy mandated attention to cross-cutting issues, such as gender and climate, transitioning to national ownership, and sustainability. The overview presents a reconstructed Theory of Change (ToC) of the CSP policy and outlines all stated goals and objectives, discussing the activities carried out by WFP as part of the CSP policy. Moreover, the report refers to findings and recommendations of a number of previous evaluations. The report could have been strengthened by making further reference to the way in which the CSP policy contributed to other policies or gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and equity/inclusion objectives. Similarly, the ER should have discussed the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality. In general, the report should have further discussed gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the CSP Policy.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report outlines the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning, with an emphasis on the latter, especially the forward-looking dimension of such learning that allows for on-going contributions to further policy and strategy. It explains the rationale for the evaluation, stating that it is expected to inform decisions for the CSP policy revision foreseen for 2023. The report clearly describes the scope of the evaluation. While gender equality is implied to a certain extent in the evaluation objectives, the report could have been strengthened by including a specific objective on human rights and gender equality and could have shown more evidence of human rights and GEWE considerations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory

The report presents a thorough discussion of whether sufficient data was available for the purpose of this evaluation and explains the ways in which data quality and availability - both quantitative and qualitative - informed the methodology selected. The evaluation matrix lists all evaluation criteria, which are described as OECD DAC criteria, outlines the evaluation questions and sub-questions, qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis during the initial phase (secondary data), among others. GEWE considerations were mainstreamed to a certain extent into other evaluation criteria through evaluation sub-questions. The methodological design and data collection methods are described in detail and the report outlines a number of data sources, as well as processes such as triangulation and validation to mitigate certain limitations. The report could have been strengthened by including a discussion around whether data in relation to human rights and gender equality, as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions, was collected during the implementation period. Also, the report could have benefited from providing a more thorough description of how gender issues were addressed in practical terms throughout the evaluation process.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Findings are clearly outlined around three evaluation questions and demonstrate balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP policy. Findings are well cited and multiple references are made to sources; all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions are answered in a consistent and thorough fashion. Findings present a complete assessment of the degree to which the CSP policy contributed to the achievement of results, in particular as a response to EQ2. Furthermore, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data collected from different sources is consistently found across findings and the report explicitly identifies data sources to underpin assertions made in the analysis. Finally, the evaluation clearly discusses a number of findings and recommendations from previous CSPEs across different countries. The report could have been strengthened by including a discussion around unintended effects regarding human rights and gender equality and whether dedicated resources for gender were available.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report presents conclusions that show balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP policy and provide a higher-level and forward-looking reflection on the information presented in the findings section, which can effectively inform decision-making. Conclusions discuss information that spans across evaluation criteria and questions and draw exclusively on information discussed in the analysis presented in the findings section. However, since cross-cutting issues, such as gender and wider inclusion are included as part of the analysis presented in the findings section, conclusions should have addressed these dimensions.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

Recommendations are clearly drawn from the findings and conclusions presented and are well aligned with the evaluation objectives, with a particular emphasis on learning. Recommendations are realistic and pay attention to contextual factors that may have an impact on the implementation. The level of prioritization is indicated for each recommendation and a clear deadline is provided for the completion of each. Even though it is understood that WFP is the target actor for all recommendations, the report could have been strengthened by explicitly indicating which unit, division, or country office is responsible for implementing each. Should the target actor for all recommendations be one and the same, this should have been clearly indicated in the foreword to the recommendations table.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The report includes all of the required lists and almost all of the mandatory annexes as per WFP's requirements. Moreover, a complete list of acronyms is included at the end of the report with each acronym included in the body of the report fully spelled out at first use. The report uses language that is professional and grammatically correct, and the information included in the report is presented in a way that is factual and unbiased. Citations are consistently provided, clearly indicate the origin of every piece of evidence presented. Finally, the report consistently presents summarized key messages across findings and makes use of bold to capture key pieces of information. However, the report and 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: 6 points
<p>Even though GEWE considerations are not reflected in a standalone criterion in the evaluation framework, GEWE considerations are mainstreamed to a certain extent into other evaluation criteria through evaluation sub-questions. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach which seems appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations. While given the nature of the subject of the evaluation, voices of women or vulnerable groups were not specifically targeted, findings do provide a focus on gender and a number of findings address this aspect of the policy. The report does not discuss the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality. Conversely, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data collected from different sources is consistently evident across findings and the report explicitly identifies data sources to underpin assertions made in the analysis. While given the nature of the subject of the evaluation, voices of women or vulnerable groups were not specifically targeted, findings do provide a focus on gender and a number of findings address this aspect of the policy. The report could have been strengthened by including recommendations that address GEWE issues and priorities for action.</p>	
<p><b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b></p>	
<p><b>Highly Satisfactory</b></p>	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</p>
<p><b>Satisfactory</b></p>	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</p>
<p><b>Partly Satisfactory</b></p>	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</p>
<p><b>Unsatisfactory</b></p>	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</p>