

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Ghana WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 89%	
The Evaluation of Ghana WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023 provides credible and useful findings that can be used with confidence to guide decision making. The report draws upon relevant background information to guide the analysis and builds on past evaluations. The report is well written and clearly structured, particularly in the findings section, where it sequentially addresses the questions outlined in the detailed evaluation matrix and includes useful summary boxes. The findings present a balanced mix of strengths and weaknesses of the CSP and demonstrate that extensive research was undertaken using primary and secondary data sources that, in most cases, are properly cited. However, data triangulation could have been stronger. It would also have been helpful to prepare an aggregate list of vulnerable populations and to ensure that they were consistently referenced in the report. Furthermore, the report could have more strongly integrated issues of GEWE, social inclusion and human rights. The conclusions are well presented and comprehensive. Most of the recommendations are relevant, realistic and take into account the financial and human resources challenges noted. The report also effectively examines cross-cutting issues ranging from climate change, environmental protection to humanitarian principles and these are factored into the recommendations.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report summary is well written and clearly presented. The key points are well organized and generally adhere to the requirements for CSPE report summaries. The recommendations align exactly with those contained in the main report. However, the executive summary is quite long; in particular, the findings and conclusions sections could have been more concise. Key information related to the evaluation objectives should have been clearly stated.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
Both the context section and the overview of the subject are well done. Both make good use of visuals to support the narrative, effectively capturing the evolution of the CSP and percentage allocation in relation to strategic outcomes and budgets. Where possible, data is disaggregated to discuss gender and social inclusion considerations. There is also a separate section that effectively documents efforts to integrate gender into the CSP. However, more specificity on the SDGs related to this Plan should have been included.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
The evaluation objectives of accountability and learning are clearly stated. The description of the users of the evaluation is comprehensive and covers stakeholders beyond those in the terms of reference. The scope includes some of the key elements such as the timeframe covered by the evaluation and cross-cutting issues. However, the geographic scope should have been more explicitly identified given that this was a critical aspect of the strategy adopted for the evaluation. The evaluation rationale should also have been more fully addressed.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report clearly articulates the methodological design, noting that it used a theory-based approach and drew upon a reconstructed theory of change for the CSP. While the overall methodology is well articulated, the rationale for the adoption of a theory-based approach could have been explained. The description of the sampling frame is clear and detailed, noting the specific districts that were selected and the rationale for their selection. However, more detail on how gender and social inclusion were accommodated in the sampling and conducting of KIIs and FGDs would have been helpful. Limitations and mitigation strategies are briefly stated.		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The findings effectively present the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP in a balanced manner but could have demonstrated stronger triangulation of data to support the evidence base. However, they do note shortcomings where evidence was not accessible. Consideration of gender, social inclusion and humanitarian principles is well done, including in relation to WFP's own operations. However, the human rights dimension could have been more effectively integrated.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The conclusions are effectively linked to several key points contained in the findings section. GEWE, social inclusion and other cross-cutting issues such as climate change and the humanitarian situation are well addressed. Good and consistent connections are made to the CSP strengths and weaknesses in terms of leading to the recommendations. However, the conclusions overlook some key issues related to sustainability.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The recommendations are clear, concise, and realistic for the most part. They are fairly well aligned with the main objective of the evaluation, i.e., to inform the design of a new country strategy, taking into account the funding and socio-economic context in Ghana. However, prioritization is inconsistent throughout the recommendations. Consideration of the role of specific partners would have been helpful, particularly since the conclusions specifically note the increasing role played by the private sector and NGOs.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report is well written. It is well structured and covers all the requisite criteria. It makes good use of visuals as well as graphs and tables. It uses cross referencing effectively. Key messages are clearly highlighted.		

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
The report is strong in terms of its assessment of gender and social inclusion in the CSP. The evaluation framework includes a few GEWE-related questions. The report also demonstrates that efforts were made to consider gender and social inclusion in data collection. The findings and conclusions consider the gender and social inclusion dimension albeit inconsistently. It would have been helpful to include more gender-disaggregated information, for example when referring to vulnerable people. Unanticipated effects with respect to GEWE are identified. More details would have been useful in terms of how sampling accommodated gender and social inclusion considerations during key information interviews and focus group discussions.	

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.