

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of Nepal WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - CSPE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 76%	
<p>Overall, the report of the Evaluation of Nepal WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023 contains credible findings that decision makers can use with confidence. The report's context section provides useful information, although more up-to-date data would have been needed to reflect the post-COVID-19 context. The methodology was appropriate for this evaluation, including a detailed evaluation matrix that guided data collection methods and analysis. However, despite the report clearly stating that monitoring data and past evaluations were reviewed in the documentary analysis phase, this information and how it informed the choice of the methodology are not presented. There are also omissions in the report on the methodological approach for certain elements of the evaluation questions, and Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations are not discussed for all data analysis methods. The findings are well evidenced, robust, logically presented and do a satisfactory job to answer the evaluation questions. There are noticeable gaps in the GEWE-related findings, and they would have benefited from more systematic use of disaggregated data. Unanticipated findings related to GEWE are not presented despite being included in the conclusions. The conclusions are derived logically from the findings and include GEWE conclusions, yet they could have benefited from going beyond a summary of findings and reflect on the strategic implications/higher level of abstraction. Nonetheless, the conclusions are derived logically from the findings and include GEWE conclusions. The recommendations were very well articulated and logically structured. GEWE-related recommendations are also included. Finally, the report is clear written, devoid of jargon and uses visual aids well.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report summary is well structured and concisely presents information contained in the main report in a systematic manner, including GEWE dimensions. It uses visuals and graphics that add value to the written narrative. The conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the findings. However, the scope of the evaluation could have been better presented by defining the programmatic and geographic dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The context is well defined, containing references to the SDGs, National Voluntary Review, and other key country data, disaggregated where possible. An overview of the CSP's evolution over time, including GEWE dimensions, as well as the CO's analytical work is also presented. The key assumptions underpinning the reconstructed theory of change are well articulated and the linkages between and among inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts are clearly identified. References to vulnerable groups are noted as well. However, the report could have provided more up-to-date information to reflect the post-COVID-19 context at this critical moment of reflection for the CO, transfer modalities could have been better defined, and some of the information about wasting could have been disaggregated by sex</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The rationale and purpose of the evaluation are clearly articulated as well as the main users. GEWE dimensions are reflected in the evaluation (sub-)questions and indicators. However, the objectives could have been presented in the main report. In addition, the scope could have defined the programmatic and thematic areas of assessment and the intended users could have been defined more specifically</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>

<p>The theory-based and mixed methodology adopted for this evaluation was appropriate and is adequately justified in the report. GEWE considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation criteria and questions as well as a sampling strategy that includes disaggregated data sources, but they should have been discussed across all data analysis methods. The methodological limitations and mitigation strategies as well as ethical considerations are well defined. However, the methodology could have assessed the monitoring data and explained how this was used to inform the evaluation. Additionally, certain elements of the evaluation questions presented in the report are omitted without explanation and methodological limitations should have been further elaborated.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The findings are balanced and assess all the evaluation questions with a good level of evidence. There is a clear assessment of the achievement against outputs and outcomes across strategic outcomes and activities. The findings could have used primary sources more systematically, including use of quotes of beneficiaries for example. They could have also been phrased to address some of the evaluation questions more directly. Additionally, whilst GEWE considerations are addressed in a dedicated sub-section, the coverage is incomplete and a more mainstreamed integration of GEWE considerations, including disaggregated data, is needed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are well formulated and substantiated. Most flow logically from the findings and make clear linkages to SDGs and national development goals, including GEWE related conclusions. However, the conclusions are not formulated in a strategic manner, and do not reflect on the strategic implications of findings. They could have been formulated at a higher level of abstraction. Additionally, some of the conclusions present information that is not in the findings.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are well formulated and logically derived from the findings and conclusions. They include prioritization, time needed for their implementation, target users, etc. They are realistic, feasible, and reflect GEWE considerations. However, the recommendations could have been more specific in terms of the relevant government stakeholder responsible for their implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written and structured in a clear manner. Visual aids are used in a manner that adds value and the report is easy to read. However, the report and the Annexes exceed maximum length requirements.</p>		

<b>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</b>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Approaches requirements: 6 points
<p>The report mainstreams GEWE-related dimensions through evaluation sub-questions despite there not being a standalone gender-related objective and gender criterion in the evaluation framework. While the scope description is incomplete, GEWE, human rights, and equity are mainstreamed in the evaluation. The monitoring data, including GEWE dimensions, was not assessed. The methodology was appropriate to assess GEWE considerations, but GEWE considerations could have been more systematically considered in the data analysis methods. A diverse range of data sources and processes were used to ensure the voices of men, women, boys, and girls were triangulated and validated. Ethical considerations are described but should have been more specific in terms of references to all four guiding ethical principles. The background section assesses several policies and instruments related to GEWE dimensions. The findings present some GEWE-related findings, but more systematic GEWE-related findings supported by disaggregated data would have been needed. The report includes GEWE-related sub-recommendations.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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.