

Evaluation title	Évaluation du plan stratégique de pays du PAM pour Sénégal (2018-2022)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 97%	
The <i>Évaluation du plan stratégique de pays du PAM pour Sénégal (2018-2022)</i> is overall a high-quality document that largely observes WFP requirements and can effectively be used to inform decision-making. The report presents an informative description of the national context which includes socioeconomic, demographic and territorial characteristics, as well as Senegal's development indices. Also, the background section provides information regarding food security and nutrition rates in Senegal. The report clearly discusses the challenges and limitations to the evaluability of the CSP. However, the report could have been strengthened by including an analysis on whether sufficient data was collected and available to measure progress on human rights, gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) or on broader equity and inclusion dimensions. Also, the report should have provided more detail on the gender-sensitive lens adopted for data collection and the evaluation process as a whole. Even though no specific GEWE and/or human rights criterion was included as part of this evaluation, the collection of data related to GEWE and the leave no one behind principle was mainstreamed through the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The report presents findings in a balanced way which is devoid of bias. They address both the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP performance. Additionally, it presents conclusions that draw on the information presented in the findings and are pitched at a higher level of analysis. They are grouped together under themes such as relevance, strategic positioning, etc. Similarly, the report presents recommendations that are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The summary succinctly presents the key evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. It covers the most salient elements of the CSP evaluation including the evaluation rationale, its objectives and the time period covered. The main findings presented are organized according to the four evaluation questions. Finally, recommendations and sub-recommendations are presented the same way as in the main body of the report.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report provides an informative description of the national context which includes socioeconomic, demographic and territorial data, as well as Senegal's development indices. The background section provides information regarding food security and nutrition rates in Senegal. The context section includes an intersectional analysis of specific vulnerabilities in the Senegalese population. The report refers to the Country Office's analytical work that was used to inform the design of the CSP. Additionally, it provides a concise description of Senegal's CSP as well as the ICSP that preceded it, explaining their strategic focus in detail and outlining the intervention modalities privileged under both the CSPI and the CSP. Finally, the overview section outlines the evolution of the CSP regarding its planning, design, and contextual changes that occurred since the ICSP. On the other hand, the overview should have mentioned the Voluntary National Review (VNR), the latest version of which took place in 2022. Also, the equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the CSP should have been discussed.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report clearly presents the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning. Cross-cutting themes of gender, protection, PAA and adherence to humanitarian principles were incorporated into the evaluation, and the impact of COVID-19 was considered. Similarly, in Annex 3 on Methodology, it is stated that the evaluation complied with the guidelines on integrating human rights and gender equality into evaluations. The evaluation rationale is described as an exercise to analyse the support of both the CSPI and CSP for food and nutrition security (FNS), social protection and the resilience of vulnerable rural households to climate change. Finally, the scope of the evaluation is clearly presented.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory

The report discusses the challenges and limitations to the evaluability of the CSP. and explains the work done to verify, through numerous iterations, the validity of monitoring data. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach involving both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods used. The report explains that throughout the evaluation there was systematic triangulation of the different sources and methods carried out to validate the findings and avoid any bias in the evaluative judgment. Methodological limitations and ethical considerations are duly discussed. However, the report should have explained the ways in which the sampling would include perspectives of multiple stakeholders.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents findings in a balanced way, addressing both the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP. A good amount of evidence is drawn from a wide range of sources. All evaluation questions and sub-questions are answered, and the findings describe how CSP activities/outputs contributed to outcome-level results. It also clearly identifies the basis of qualitative evidence, collected, and triangulated from different sources. Findings also include an analysis of positive and negative unintended results.		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents six conclusions that draw on the information presented in the findings and are pitched at a higher level of analysis. They address both CSP's strengths and its areas for improvement. Conclusions do not introduce any information that was not already presented and discussed in the findings. Annex VII presents a mapping of findings, conclusions and recommendations.		

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The six main recommendations and 24 sub-recommendations are clearly presented. They are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. They are realistic and feasible and consider the implementation context as well as potential limitations. Recommendations and sub-recommendations clearly identify the actors responsible for their implementation, namely WFP's CO or the CO research, analysis and monitoring unit.		

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation report generally observes the WFP template for CSPEs and includes all the required elements. It consistently provides sources for all data presented. Key messages are captured by using bold and colour boxes to highlight them throughout the report. The report could have benefited from including maps as visual aids showing the geographic coverage of the CSPE and/or WFP operations.		

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
Even though the report does not include a specific objective related to human rights and gender equality as such, considerations of GEWE were mainstreamed into the evaluation criteria through sub-questions and indicators. GEWE was among the cross-cutting themes addressed. The discussion around the methodological design explains that throughout the evaluation there was systematic triangulation of the different sources and methods to validate the findings and avoid any bias in the evaluative judgment. However, the report does not provide much detail as to the ways in which the evaluation design adopted a gender-sensitive lens in concrete terms throughout data collection and the evaluation process nor does it sufficiently explain the ways in which the sampling sought to find respondents with potentially different perspectives. That said, the findings present qualitative and quantitative evidence that is drawn from different sources to respond to each of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Moreover, the conclusions and recommendations reflect gender considerations.	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels

Highly Satisfactory	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.
	Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

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>