

|   |  |                     |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <b>Evaluation title</b>   | Evaluation of the Philippines WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018-2023 |                     |
| <b>Evaluation category and type</b>   | Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation                    |                     |
| <b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory: 95%   |                     |
| <p>The Evaluation of the Philippines WFP Country Strategic Plan (2018-2023) constitutes a highly satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence. The report clearly summarizes the evaluation purpose and rationale, as well as highly relevant information on contextual developments during the evaluation period in the Philippines. The theory-based and mixed methodological design is briefly mentioned in the main report and detailed in Annex 3, with each data collection method having its own analytical approach. A major strength of the report are its findings, which draw on a wide range of sources, data collection methods, and analysis, including extensive stakeholder consultations reaching targeted beneficiaries. They also reflect the triangulation of data sources as evidenced by inclusion of views from different groups of sub-national stakeholders and beneficiaries. Findings also address all evaluation questions and sub-questions, considering gender equality and broader equity and inclusion dimensions integrated into the CSP design and implementation. Conclusions are balanced, reflecting both positive and negative issues logically derived from the findings, providing specific action deadlines. The six recommendations are internally consistent and clearly linked to the report's findings and conclusions. They contribute to both learning and accountability objectives to inform future engagement and programming for the strategic positioning of WFP in the Philippines. However, the report could have elaborated further on unintended effects of the CSP, and the information offered in the evaluation could have been presented more clearly. Finally, the report could have been improved by also including a detailed analysis of intersectional vulnerabilities in the Philippines.</p> |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report summary provides a clear description of the evaluation context and the subject of the evaluation with a good balance between detail and synthesis. The summary emphasizes how this CSP was intended to support a strategic shift in WFP's approach to its programming in the Philippines. The report summary describes the main features of the CSP in terms of its strategic objectives and expected outcomes, as well as the planned results, the budget, and beneficiaries. The findings presented in the summary are succinct and reflect the key findings in the main report, as do the conclusions and recommendations. Additional information to clarify the methodology and how the evaluation was conducted – beyond a brief statement about the mixed methods design – would have been useful. A more effective presentation of the conclusions would have helped the reader identify this content with more clarity.</p>   |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>  | <b>Rating</b>  | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report provides a clear description of the evaluation context in the Philippines and the CSP as the subject of the evaluation. The section reflects a good balance between detail and synthesis and presents data from reliable and up-to-date sources. The section includes the Philippines' third Voluntary National Review highlighting the 'whole-of-government' and 'whole-of-society' approach to SDG implementation. It describes the main features of the CSP in terms of its strategic outcomes, planned results, modalities, targeted beneficiaries, and financial overview. It would have been useful to elaborate further on the strategic outcomes affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and on intersectional vulnerabilities.</p>   |  |                     |
| <b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>   | <b>Rating</b>  | Satisfactory        |
| <p>The evaluation report clearly outlines the evaluation's dual objective of learning and accountability, purpose, and scope in terms of the geography, time, and activities of WFP's work. The report highlights considerations of the WFP approach to mainstreaming gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) and the United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards for Evaluation. While gender equality was mainstreamed in the evaluation, it would have been pertinent</p>   |  |                     |

to identify these dimensions in a specific evaluation objective. Human rights considerations could have been more clearly addressed in the evaluation objectives as well.

|                                 |               |                            |
|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| <b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b> | <b>Rating</b> | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> |
|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|

The methodological design for the evaluation is well described, particularly in the methodological annex (Annex 3) with each data collection method having its own analytical approach. Annex 3 also explains four evaluability challenges that were assessed and validated with possible mitigation measures. The report clearly explains the type of analysis conducted, e.g., descriptive and frequency analysis with cross-tabulation for indicators and criteria of interest. The diverse sampling frame including a balanced participation of both genders, the rationale, and analysis methods were appropriate for the context in the Philippines. However, the distinction between dimensions of analysis, lines of inquiry, and indicators in the evaluation matrix is unclear and could have been improved.

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

The evaluation findings address and answer all the evaluation questions and sub-questions covering all aspects of the CSP. The section presents evidence transparently with data and description being sourced correctly and triangulated. The report provides gender and age marker scores for the humanitarian response, and it finds that the humanitarian principles and the importance of neutrality, impartiality, and independence are respected and acted upon in programming drawing upon FGDs and interviews. There are no major weaknesses in the findings, yet the report could have commented on any unanticipated effects of the CSP on gender equality and human rights.

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

The conclusions logically flow from the findings and are balanced reflecting both positive and negative findings. They do not present new information that is not captured in the findings and do not contain any major gaps or omissions. The conclusions represent GEWE-related aspects with one conclusion reflecting gender considerations and broader equity and inclusion dimensions integrated into the CSP design and implementation. However, they would have benefitted from further elaborating on the internal logic and underlying assumptions of the CSP.

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

The evaluation makes six actionable, realistic and targeted recommendations clearly linked to findings and conclusions. Recommendations are classified as either strategic or operational and are prioritized as high/medium with action deadlines. The report presents a matrix with recommendations and sub-recommendations that mainstream GEWE considerations and address issues such as food security, nutrition, and other essential needs, including in response to shocks and other stressors. This also covers social protection systems, disaster risk reduction, and mitigation perspectives.

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

The report is written in clear and professional language with appropriate use of visual aids including figures and tables. The report provides sources for all data and quotes and effectively uses cross-references. The readability of the report could have been improved with greater use of text boxes with suitable background colour and summary sections to highlight key messages. The summary boxes in the findings section have a dark colour background which reduces their readability, and some figures are difficult to read.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <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> | <b>Meets requirements: 7 points</b> |
|--|-------------------------------------|

GEWE is mainstreamed effectively in the scope of analysis and across the evaluation criteria and questions. The evaluation matrix includes sub-questions and indicators related to gender equality and broader inclusion and equity considerations, and the report comments on the availability of the monitoring of GEWE-related indicators. The evaluation methodology employed a mixed methods approach highly relevant to evaluating GEWE issues. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholder groups were treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. However, additional details could have been included as to how the FGDs were conducted with gender and inclusivity in the evaluation. The findings section reflects the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups and disaggregates some quantitative data

where relevant. The conclusions represent GEWE-related aspects and broader equity and inclusion dimensions integrated into the CSP design and implementation.

**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.  |