

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of Eswatini WFP Country Strategic Plan (2020 – 2025)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The <i>Evaluation of the Eswatini WFP Country Strategic Plan (2020–2025)</i> provides credible, well-substantiated findings suitable for decision-making. It clearly explains the country's food security context and positions the CSP within it, with appropriate attention to disadvantaged groups. The evaluation purpose, scope, methodology, and GEWE considerations are well articulated, and the findings respond fully and objectively to all questions. Conclusions synthesize key insights, and the recommendations provided are logical, actionable, and appropriately prioritized for the next CSP. However, the report could have been strengthened in a few areas. Linkages within the reconstructed theory of change and with the evaluation matrix are not always coherent. Ethical standards are insufficiently described, and triangulation could be stronger, especially through more explicit use of qualitative data. Some unexpected results and key findings are not fully reflected in the conclusions. A GEWE-specific recommendation would have been appropriate given its prominence.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report offers a clear and concise synthesis of key information from the main evaluation report, including its core messages and full recommendations. It effectively explains Eswatini's food insecurity context—driven by climate shocks, COVID-19, and other factors—supported by regional comparisons. The summary also provides a structured overview of CSP components, the evaluation approach, and includes a useful timeline illustrating the transition from the previous T-ICSP to the current CSP.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and well-supported overview of the national and global factors driving food insecurity in Eswatini, including the vulnerabilities of specific population groups. It effectively traces the evolution of the CSP from the previous T-ICSP, and the reconstructed theory of change broadly reflects the CSP's key components. However, the report could have benefitted from clearer explanations of some contextual elements—such as IPC phases—and some theory of change linkages are insufficiently coherent.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly and explicitly outlines the overall aim, objectives, and scope of the evaluation, including gender equality dimensions. No significant weaknesses were found with the description of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation presents a generally appropriate methodological design, with data collection methods well aligned to the evaluation questions and sub-questions and responsive to monitoring gaps identified during the evaluability assessment. The methodology is adequately summarized in the main report and detailed in the annex, including a comprehensive evaluation matrix. Gender considerations are appropriately mainstreamed into the methodology. The evaluation matrix is generally coherent; however, it could have been useful to explicitly identify the standard evaluation criteria within it and to further clarify the distinction between some lines of inquiry and indicators. In addition, more details could have been provided on ethical considerations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The findings respond to all evaluation questions and sub-questions, presenting CSP strengths and weaknesses in a balanced and well-structured manner. Key findings are clearly highlighted and aligned with the sub-questions, enabling</p>		

easy navigation. Progress toward the three strategic outcomes is assessed comprehensively and with appropriate contextualization, and evidence gaps are transparently noted. However, some data sources are described only in general terms, and the report provides limited evidence of triangulation which reduces the clarity of evidence strength. The analysis could have benefited from more explicit use of qualitative primary data. The expected contribution of SO2 activities to resilience building remains unclear, and the report could have more clearly identified unexpected results.

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

The six conclusions appropriately synthesize findings across the CSP's strategic outcomes and address both learning and accountability objectives. They remain grounded in the evidence and integrate gender and inclusion considerations. However, some key findings are not fully reflected in the conclusions.

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

The three recommendations logically stem from the findings and conclusions, are actionable, and appropriately forward-looking. They clearly address the evaluation's learning and accountability objectives, and their prioritization is suitable given the limited number. The distinction between strategic and operational recommendations is also clear and appropriate. However, gender is not explicitly addressed, despite findings and conclusions highlighting missed opportunities for gender mainstreaming.

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

The report is well written and uses professional and accessible language. It maintains internal consistency, signposts relevant information effectively, and includes a good range of visual aids that enhance readability. Key messages are clearly highlighted throughout. However, additional cross-referencing to annexes would have strengthened the report's usability and some repetition in the findings section could have been avoided by merging overlapping findings and supporting evidence.

<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>	Meets requirements
--------------------------------------------------	--------------------

GEWE considerations are explicitly integrated into the evaluation scope and mainstreamed in the evaluation framework. Noted limitations in monitoring data availability are identified in the evaluability assessment. GEWE dimensions are specifically included in evaluation questions and sub-questions. The mixed-methods approach and detailed methodological annex demonstrate strong attention to gender analysis, and women are well represented among participants. Sex-disaggregated data are widely used. However, limited explicit description on the triangulation of evidence makes it difficult to assess whether diverse perspectives informed the findings. GEWE is not reflected in the recommendations, despite findings and conclusions highlighting missed opportunities for GEWE mainstreaming.

<b>Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard</b>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>UN-DIS individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements
-------------------------------------------	--------------------

The evaluation terms of reference require mainstreaming disability inclusion, and while disability is not explicitly reflected in the evaluation questions, it is incorporated through a line of inquiry under a sub-question. Persons with disabilities are explicitly referenced in the findings and conclusions.

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.