

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Namibia WFP Country Strategic Plan 2017-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The report of the Evaluation of Namibia WFP Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2017-2023 presents quality and credible findings that users can rely on with confidence for decision-making. The approach to the methodology is explained in extensive detail and demonstrates a good balance of access to primary and secondary data. The findings include a good balance of strengths and weaknesses. The evaluation provides evidence and learning on WFP performance for country-level strategic decisions, to provide the foundation for the development of the next country strategic plan. The findings and conclusions are particularly effective in providing a separate assessment of the four country capacity strengthening (CCS) thematic areas of focus and linking them to specific activities and outcomes. The analysis of the funding situation is effective and of relevance in guiding WFP Namibia in considering its options and areas of focus for the next CSP, particularly given challenges noted with the funding environment in Namibia. The recommendations are well aligned with the evaluation objectives, although they are heavily focused on WFP operations. Recommendations which engage other external stakeholders such as UN Agencies, the private sector and civil society would have been helpful and possibly more strategic given challenges securing funding and sufficient human resource. Moreover, the objectives, purpose and rationale should have been more clearly stated and demarcated. More mapping and details on the different partners and stakeholders such as other UN agencies would have been helpful for WFP to consider possible partnerships and complementarities moving forward. Vulnerable populations and ways in which their perspectives were considered and captured should have been more clearly defined. The context section includes too much detail on official development assistance (ODA) funding and should have also highlighted funding challenges to the CSP implementation. The human rights approach including reference to government commitments appears to have been overlooked, as well as reference to gender commitments.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary report is well written. It covers all the relevant elements in the main report. It is well organized and includes the necessary overarching titles. The conclusions are well presented and offer an effective summary of some of the main strengths and weaknesses of the CSP. The recommendations are cited directly from the main report. However, the summary report includes too much detail in relation to the context and fundings.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The details in the context section and the section analyzing donor funding are extensive, too detailed and should have been cut back to focus more on the relevance to the CSP. The overview section presents effectively presents details on the strategic focus of the CSP and how they changed. The evolution of the CSP is well presented through the effective use of narrative and complementary tables and figures that capture changes in relation to activities and budget and how they correlate. Gender disaggregation and analysis of gender is also well done. More reference to the findings of other evaluations and their impact should have been included in the main body rather than just in the Annex. More details on the role of other partners including UN Agencies and CSOs would have been helpful.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes key information that is captured under section 1.1. It is presented in a general sense although it does not align completely with wording from the evaluation terms of reference. It would have been helpful if each of the key topics were clearly demarcated with titles as was done in the TOR. There is also no specific reference to gender and human rights in the objectives.</p>		

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section and annex provide a lot of detail regarding the general methodological approach and its limitations. The adoption of an approach to capture the evolution of the CSP made strategic sense given changes that occurred over the course of the CSP implementation. The ethical section is generally well presented. Details on how gender and social inclusion issues were accommodated, particularly in relation to vulnerable populations are given general attention under ethical considerations and should have been expanded in the methodology section. Furthermore, the interview questions do not include matters of gender and social inclusion.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings section is well written and sourced. It is clearly presented and structured such that it aligns with all the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The inclusion of summary boxes highlighting the strengths and weaknesses is helpful. The analysis offers a critical perspective in relation to WFP's strengths and weaknesses to guide its consideration of where to target its limited financial and human resources moving forward into the next CSP. It includes useful tables to complement the narrative. Data could have been more consistently triangulated and a more direct analysis of CSP components would have been helpful. It would have also been useful to clearly demarcate who are the vulnerable populations as concerned by the CSP presents their perspectives more comprehensively. The humanitarian section is strong in terms of noting WFP's engagement and linking it to broader humanitarian issues such as climate change and drought but does not include reference to humanitarian principles.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are balanced and are clearly presented. They capture the main elements of the findings with a strong focus on the operational dimensions, providing relevant information to WFP to take move forward with the next CSP. There are no notable gaps nor are there additional details included that are not in the findings section. The conclusions could have included more on the validity of the logic of the CSP to provide guidance as WFP considers its next steps.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are concise and well presented. They are also linked to the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. They include all the necessary elements to guide WFP, particularly from an operational perspective. However, the recommendations should have had a greater balance between strategic and operational considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written with no grammatical or spelling mistakes. It uses tables and visuals to complement the narrative in an effective way. However, key messages are not highlighted in bold, and it would have been helpful to be more specific about sourcing from KIIs and FGDs as well as the occasional use of quotes.</p>		

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: 4 points
<p>Gaps in access to data as related to gender are well noted. The objectives should have demonstrated a commitment to considering gender as a critical dimension of the evaluation. The evaluability assessment clearly notes challenges in accessing disaggregated data related to gender. The ethical considerations section refers to measures taken to address gender in a general sense and would have benefited from the provision of more specific details. The interview questions do not clearly demonstrate how issues of gender would be addressed directly. The findings reference gender but the recommendations do not specifically address GEWE issues.</p>	

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>