

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Dominican Republic WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2024	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 81%	
<p>The "Evaluation of Dominican Republic WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2024" is a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with confidence. A particular strength of the report are its findings, which are clearly presented using a range of data sources and methods of data collection, from document review to information drawn from stakeholder interviews. All evaluation questions and sub-questions are addressed and there was good effort to ensure gender equality and inclusion dimensions (e.g., migration) which are brought forward where appropriate. The report also offers a strong set of recommendations that strike a good balance between being specific and allowing space to adjust implementation as needed, supporting strategic decision making for the next Country Strategic Plan (CSP) in the country. In general, the report uses clear language and includes a summary that features the important elements of the main report. In terms of weaknesses, more could have been added to better describe previous analytical work that informed the CSP programme design and its evolution over time. Importantly, there is no clear discussion of how gaps in monitoring data at both the output and outcome levels for the CSP were addressed through the methodology. The mitigation measures put in place for the identified methodological limitations should have been more fully detailed. The findings could have explicitly identified unintended effects of WFP programming and the recommendations would have been strengthened by being more specific on contributing entities, such as partners or governments.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report summary offers a very good summary of the evaluation, including a clear description of the evaluation context in the Dominican Republic and the CSP itself, presenting a summary of the evaluation conclusions as well as the evaluation recommendations from the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good description of the context in the Dominican Republic, noting how WFP programming occurred in the context of shifting national priorities and changes to the external context. However, the SDGs and the most recent National Voluntary Report are not addressed and equity considerations for the design of the CSP itself are not discussed. Previous analytical work that informed the design of this CSP could have been described more fully.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives, purpose, and the activities of WFP's work are clearly outlined, as are the intended users and uses of the evaluation. How gender equality and women's rights and inclusion concerns were mainstreamed in the evaluation are also discussed.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The approach and methodology of the evaluation drew upon qualitative and quantitative data sources and used complementary methods of data collection to support data triangulation. Methodological choices were suitable to measure progress on human rights, gender equality and other equity and inclusion dimensions. However, there is no clear discussion of how gaps in monitoring data at both the output and outcome levels for the CSP were addressed in the methodology. The report would have been improved with greater discussion of data availability. The sampling frame for the focus groups is also not clearly described and methodological limitations are not fully discussed.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes findings that address the evaluation questions and sub-questions where evidence is presented transparently and clearly, and positive and negative findings are brought forward in a balanced fashion. The report presents the voices of diverse stakeholder groups to demonstrate how findings emerged from triangulated data. When there are inconsistent results, these are explained. The findings directly address how the CSP design related to the</p>		

<p>application of International Humanitarian Principles. However, stakeholder groups could have been more clearly identified when primary data is referenced, notably those at the beneficiary level. While unanticipated effects are identified, these are not related to human rights or gender and the report lacks a discussion on how findings from previous evaluations were addressed.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report offers strong conclusions that synthesize evaluation findings, noting both strengths and weaknesses of the programme and its implementation. The conclusions point out strategic implications for the next CSP in the Dominican Republic and include reflections on GEWE and broader equity and inclusion dimensions that were raised in the findings.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation makes six recommendations that flow from the evaluation findings and conclusions. These are prioritized, have a timeframe for action, and are logically grouped. The recommendations would have been strengthened further with greater specificity in identifying contributing entities.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written and generally free from jargon. In instances the report would have been improved with greater use of text boxes and summary sections to highlight key messages and to enhance readability as well as to identify sources more precisely for primary data.</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	Meets requirements: 7 points
<p>The evaluation of the Dominican Republic CSP effectively addresses GEWE considerations in its analysis. In the discussion of the context in the Dominican Republic, the report provides relevant information on gender and other intersectional vulnerabilities such as such as migration status, internal displacement, disability, and child labour. GEWE is effectively mainstreamed in the evaluation 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 monitoring data on GEWE relevant indicators. The methodology is gender-responsive although more could have been stated to address how sampling methods ensured the participation of the most vulnerable. Ethical standards were considered and applied, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The findings section reflects the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups to some degree; however, it would have been possible to have more explicit information drawn from data collection at the beneficiary level. While no unanticipated effects related to gender and human rights are explicitly noted, the report does include several recommendations/sub-recommendations that address GEWE and broader human rights/equity 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>