

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Cote d'Ivoire WFP Country Strategic Plan 2019-2025	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 85%	
<p>The <i>Evaluation of the Cote d'Ivoire Country Strategic Plan (2019 - 2025)</i> is of good quality and can be used by stakeholders with confidence for decision-making. The report is clearly structured and well written, based on a logical and coherent analysis that provides a well-crafted performance story for the CSP. The methodology was appropriate given the CSPE purpose, objectives, and key evaluation questions. Findings address all evaluation questions and sub-questions, with logical arguments supported by credible and diverse sources of data. Data analysis and triangulation are evident in the formulation of findings, and there is a relatively clear line of sight among findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Conclusions are generally of a sufficiently high level and provide a solid overview of CSP performance. Attention to gender, equity and inclusion - particularly as it relates to disability - could have been more fully integrated in the context analysis, methodological limitations, and recommendations. In addition, CSPE findings could have been strengthened with more consistent disaggregation of data by gender and disability dimensions as well as more consistent reference to qualitative data collection and the diverse voices of different social groups/stakeholders. Recommendations are actionable, with clear assignment of responsibility, but could have been improved with greater attention to the operational considerations required for the next CSPE, particularly regarding WFP internal expertise and capacity.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Generally, the summary evaluation report contains all required information and is presented in a clear and concise manner. There is a clear line of sight among the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The summary effectively serves as a standalone document to support decision-making but could have been improved with a more explicit presentation of the objectives and scope of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The sections related to the context and subject of the evaluation provide a clear overview of the relationship between the strategic focus of the CSP and country context in terms of policies, plans, and recent contextual evolutions. The report also describes the necessary elements to understand the rationale, strategic focus, delivery strategy and implementation status of the current CSP and how it evolved from the previous, transitional CSP. However, the context section of the report could have been strengthened with additional information on specific vulnerable groups (e.g. disability), particularly as it relates to nutrition, food security, and education, and the description of the CSP could have better clarified the transfer modalities applied under each Strategic Outcome.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The CSPE rationale, purpose, scope, and focus are clearly presented in the report. The CSPE purpose, objectives, scope, and key evaluation questions could have made more explicit reference to, or better mainstreamed, gender equality considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The description of the methodology provides a clear indication of how each evaluation question was addressed based on sufficient, diverse, and credible sources of data. The methodology appears robust and sound. However, the limitations section is brief and there is no discussion of mitigation strategies. There is a discussion on gender, equity, and inclusion in the methodology section, however the language is broad, offering limited details on how specific vulnerable groups were defined and integrated into the sampling strategy and considered in data collection and analysis.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory

Generally, findings address all evaluation questions, provide clear and logical arguments, based on triangulation across credible and diverse sources of evidence. The findings section is clearly structured with succinct summaries of key messages under each question, followed by detailed data analysis. Findings are balanced and constructive, identifying both strengths and challenges of CSP performance, as well as internal and external factors influencing performance. Unanticipated effects are explicitly presented as is CSP adherence to international humanitarian principles. The findings could have been strengthened with more consistent disaggregation of data by gender and disability dimensions, as well as more consistent reference to qualitative data collection and the diverse voices of different social groups/stakeholders including (e.g. women, government, CSOs, community, beneficiaries, etc).

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

Conclusions are formulated at a higher level than findings, bringing together multiple findings, often across multiple evaluation questions, to make a strategic statement on overall CSP performance. They address strengths and challenges of CSP performance as well as the key factors affecting performance. In this way, conclusions are useful for accountability and decision-making. In addition, conclusions could have included further consideration of disability and inclusion.

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

The number of recommendations is appropriate, and recommendations are generally clear, actionable, and coherent with findings and conclusions. The entity responsible for implementing each recommendation is clearly identified. The recommendations section could have been strengthened by more clearly specifying timelines for implementation of recommendations, and by further integrating gender, equity, and inclusion into recommendations, given findings and conclusions.

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

The report is very clearly structured and well written, with a strong internal logic and flow. The report is easily navigable and the CSP performance story unfolds logically and coherently. However, the main report and summary report exceed the required word count quite significantly, while no annex is provided mapping findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

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	Meeting requirements: 7 points
--	--------------------------------

Broadly the evaluation integrates GEWE considerations. While there is no explicit reference to GEWE in the evaluation purpose, objectives, scope or focus, GEWE is mainstreamed in the evaluation framework and specific evaluation sub-questions on the subject are provided. The evaluation uses a mixed-method design, including data collection across diverse stakeholder categories. Efforts are made to reflect GEWE in the evaluation methodology, although sampling considerations could have been more explicit in that regard. The limitations section could have been strengthened with a discussion of the quality and availability of GEWE data. Presentation of data disaggregated by gender is uneven through the CSPE report. Findings could have been more consistently supported by disaggregated data and analysis by gender and better reflected data from diverse voices across different stakeholder groups. Despite GEWE capacity limitations discussed in the findings, there is no recommendation to improve GEWE capacity, systems, or performance within the WFP country office in the future.

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

UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Missing requirements
---	----------------------

Broadly the evaluation does not meet the requirements for integration of disability considerations. Disability inclusion is not explicitly considered in the terms of reference nor the evaluation questions. Similarly, disability considerations are not explicitly reflected in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

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.