

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Rwanda WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (CSPE)	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 87%	
<p>Users of the report of the Evaluation of Rwanda WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2023 can rely on the credible evaluation findings with confidence for decision-making. The report is well written, with findings generated transparently and impartially without bias based on an appropriate methodology. The report includes clear explanation of the evaluation's rationale/purpose, describes the main users and stakeholders but could have benefitted from describing the programmatic scope of the CSPE. The report explicitly presents relevant primary data, shedding light on intended and unintended outcomes of WFP's interventions through the Rwanda CSP. The evaluation's conclusions are substantiated by and flow logically from the findings, and they are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction. The evaluation's recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation's conclusions and findings, and are feasible, targeted and specific. The report would have benefitted from describing how the CSP addressed the conditions of different groups and/or presented the gender and equity dimensions of the CSP in relation to food security and nutrition issues. It could have also profited from the inclusion of an assessment of CSP monitoring data and the extent to which this informed the choice of the methodology. Finally, the methodology should have provided more information on the sampling criteria for selection of survey respondents, and a clearer description of the methodological limitations and mitigation strategies.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary report includes information on relevant elements of the evaluation. Key evaluation features, and the evaluation's context and subject are well covered. The main findings are summarized according to all four evaluation questions. However, conclusions are not concisely summarized.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes clear a description of the CSP's strategic outcomes, activities and outputs, cross-cutting priorities, the financial situation and performance of the CSP. It provides some comparison of the CSP with the previous WFP Country Programme 2013-2018, and the strategic and operational shifts undertaken during the CSP under review. The report provides a comprehensive overview of the country context, with relevant information of the food and nutrition security aspects, as well as key issues under SDG 2. The report would have benefitted from providing more detail on how the CSP addressed the conditions of different social role groups and presenting an analysis of the intersecting factors that contribute to their vulnerabilities.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report outlines the objectives of the evaluation, including a clear explanation of the evaluation's rationale/purpose, and it describes the main users and stakeholders of the evaluation. While the report includes a clear mention of the timeframe covered by the evaluation, it would have benefitted from explicitly mentioning its programmatic scope.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes summary information on the methodology, including its design, data collection methods, data sources, sampling rationale for site visits, and analysis methods. The evaluation matrix contains all relevant elements, including two specific dimensions of analysis focused on GEWE. The report also clearly notes that it considered ethical standards throughout the evaluation. The methodological section would have benefitted from a discussion of the quality and availability of CSP monitoring data and the extent to which this informed the choice of the methodology. Though the report provides information on sampling criteria for site visits, it would have benefitted from the inclusion of more</p>		

information on the sampling criteria or strategy for the selection of survey respondents. Finally, methodological limitations are noted, but they should have been more clearly described, together with their mitigation strategies.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The report's findings rely on an analysis of primary and secondary sources, and they are transparently and impartially generated without bias. The report explicitly presents relevant primary data collected in responding to each evaluation question, without compromising the anonymity of informants. It also clearly mentions where data or documents were not available, or insufficient, for the evaluation's analysis. WFP's contributions are well articulated and explained, as well as the roles played by the context and other actors. When relevant, the report provides precision on the type of stakeholder interviews or survey (e.g., internal WFP or external) to show differing opinions on a given issue. It also discusses several unintended outcomes related to WFP's interventions for refugee populations. While there are mentions to WFP maintaining a neutral and impartial stance, the findings would have benefitted from a clearer presentation of WFP's adherence to the other humanitarian principles of humanity and independence.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The evaluation's conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and highlight key implications for the future of the CSP. They are substantiated by and flow logically from the findings. The conclusions specifically cover CSP progress towards cross-cutting priorities and comment on the validity of key assumptions of the CSP's theory of change.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The evaluation's recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation's conclusions and findings, are feasible, and consider the CSP's implementation context. They identify leads and contributing entities within WFP and provide sufficiently specific actions that can be implemented. Recommendations and sub-recommendations are assigned timeframes for action, priority levels, and grouped according to whether they are operational and strategic.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
-----------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The report is well written, uses easily understood language, and is free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors. The report systematically provides sources for all documents. Relevant information from annexes, figures, tables, boxes and other findings is cross-referenced as relevant. The report uses current accurate information and includes visuals that provide an at-a-glance view of data that serves to add value to the report. While most annexes are listed in the order that they are referenced in the report, two specific ones are either not mentioned (Annex 4) or referenced later than subsequent annexes in the list (Annex 6).

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: 7 points
--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

While the evaluation included dimensions of analysis dedicated to examining GEWE, the report would have benefitted from including an assessment of the availability and quality of monitoring data on human rights and gender equality. The evaluation's methodology employed a mixed methods approach appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations. The evaluation includes specific findings on GEWE-related and inclusion issues and puts forward a recommendation that specifically addresses GEWE issues. However, it would have benefitted from the inclusion of information on the approach taken to generate its thematic case study on gender, and the context section of the report would have benefitted from an analysis of how gender-specific vulnerabilities intersect with other vulnerabilities.

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