

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Iraq WFP Transitional Interim and Country Strategic Plans 2018-2024	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (CSPE)	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 89%	
The report of the Evaluation of Iraq WFP Transitional Interim and Country Strategic Plans 2018-2024 presents quality and credible findings that users can rely on and use with confidence for decision-making. The findings are evidence-based, transparently and impartially generated without bias. The information provided is relevant to answering all evaluation questions and sub-questions. The conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and provide points of reflection for the future of WFP's work in Iraq. The evaluation's recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, are realistic and provide a high level of specificity to be actionable. They also offer a clear direction for intended change. The report provides a good overview of the country context and the food and nutrition security landscape. It includes a clear comparison of the strategic focus of the T-ICSP and the CSP in the main report and its reconstructed theory of change in annex. The main report and Annex 3, in sum, provide detailed information on how the data collection and analysis were conducted. The report also includes a dedicated sub-section on risks faced by the evaluation, with specific mitigation measures undertaken for each risk. In terms of areas for improvement, the report would have benefitted from mentioning the target groups of the CSP that are included in the scope of the evaluation, and a more fulsome description of the sampling approach taken for stakeholder respondent and site visit selections.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report summary fulfils all requirements for CSPE summaries. Its executive summary includes all required elements, as does its introduction. All evaluation findings are included accompanied by graphics for performance and financial data, taken from the main report, which serve to add value to the narrative presented. The evaluation's conclusions are concisely summarized and capture the essence of the conclusions in the main report, ensuring logical flow.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report provides a good general overview of the country context, and almost all required information on food and nutrition security. The section also includes information on relevant national policies and strategies and includes mention of the Iraq National Voluntary Review. There is a clear comparison of the strategic focus of the T-ICSP and the CSP and clear visuals present their evolution over time. The report, however, would have benefitted from the inclusion of budget figures for the interventions and a clear mention of the modalities of each activity in both the CSP and T-ICSP.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report outlines the objectives of the evaluation, which included a specific line of inquiry dedicated to assessing WFP performance in integrating GEWE, disability inclusion, AAP, protection and PSEA. The report also includes the main users and stakeholders of the evaluation. While the report includes elements of the scope of the evaluation, in terms of the timeframe and programming covered, it would have benefitted from mentioning the target groups of the CSP included in the evaluation.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The main report and Annex 3 provide detailed information on how the evaluation data collection and analysis were conducted. The report also includes a dedicated sub-section on risks faced by the evaluation, with specific mitigation measures undertaken for each risk. The report notes that the evaluation conformed to UNEG ethical guidelines and provides a summary of how they were applied during the evaluation. While the report's evaluability assessment describes challenges of missing data on cross-cutting issues, age-disaggregation and disability, the report would have benefitted from the inclusion of an assessment of monitoring data for indicators of Strategic Outcomes and Activities of the CSP. Moreover, the evaluation matrix would have benefitted from inclusion of the evaluation criteria while the report would		

have benefitted from a more fulsome description of the sampling approach taken to select stakeholders that were consulted, and to select sites that were visited.

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

The report explicitly and comprehensively draws upon multiple sources of information across secondary and primary data collected through different methods to substantiate the findings. The findings were impartially generated without bias. They include a strong synthesis and presentation of differing views from various data sources, which serves to provide necessary nuance to the findings, reflecting T-ICSP and CSP strengths and weaknesses in a balanced way. Overall, information provided in the findings is relevant to answering all evaluation questions and sub-questions. The report clearly explains WFP contributions towards outcome-level results and provides analysis of actuals versus planned outcomes, and other actors and factors that contributed to results. The report notes the category of stakeholder, where relevant, when presenting interview data, such as in referring to WFP staff or other types of stakeholders. The report would have benefitted from including an assessment of adherence to humanitarian principles of neutrality and independence. Furthermore, while the findings include an unintentional effect of WFP's approach for refugees, IDP and host communities, they do not explicitly reference gender equality.

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

The evaluation's conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and provide points of reflection for the future of WFP's work in Iraq. The conclusions flow logically and are based on the evaluation's findings. They include a reflection on gender, equity and inclusion dimensions and comment on the validity of the intervention logic.

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

The evaluation's recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation's findings and conclusions, are realistic and take into consideration the implementation context of WFP in Iraq. They provide a high level of specificity to be actionable and a clear direction for intended change. All sub-recommendations are prioritized as either high or medium, and a clear deadline for implementation is assigned to each.

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

The report is well written and free from grammar, spelling or punctuation errors. It uses clear language and avoids jargon or excessively complex sentences. Acronyms are spelled at first use, consistently. The report provides sources for all documents and data that it draws upon, and cites sources for quotes. The report systematically references other sections of the report to direct readers to different, but related, findings. The report utilizes a variety of relevant visual aids, including graphs, tables, maps among others, throughout the report.

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
--	-----------------------------------

The context section provides key information on gender-specific vulnerabilities, information on the normative frameworks to mainstream gender in national legislation. It also includes an intersectional analysis combining the situation of women with that of people with disabilities. The report provides information on the gender, equity and inclusion dimensions of the CSP. GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis, despite that no specific evaluation objective refers explicitly to this dimension. A gender-responsive methodology was selected, including collecting sex-disaggregated data. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations clearly reflect a gender analysis. The report includes sex-disaggregated data and discusses its analysis of this data in depth. One recommendation addresses GEWE issues and priorities for action.

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.