

Evaluation title	Évaluation du Plan Stratégique de Pays du PAM en RDC (2020-2024)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 95%	
<p>The DR Congo country strategic plan evaluation (“<i>Evaluation du Plan Stratégique de Pays du PAM en RDC (2020–2024)</i>”) provides credible, useful findings that decision-makers can rely on with confidence. It offers solid evidence for both learning and accountability and provides an effective summary of WFP’s work in DR Congo and provides relevant information on food security, population movements, etc. It accurately captures the CSP’s strategic intent and provides a reconstructed theory of change and logical framework. While clear overall, the evaluation could have benefitted from more consistent CSP timeframe references and a more explicit statement of the evaluation period. The methodology is appropriate, using a mixed-methods, theory-based approach with sound ethical standards. The evaluability assessment is well integrated, acknowledging M&E data availability, reliability and limitations. However, some indicators in the evaluation matrix are inaccurately framed as “perception-based” rather than measurable indicators. Findings are balanced, impartial, and supported by triangulated evidence. They fully address the evaluation questions, incorporate gender and inclusion dimensions, provide sex-disaggregated analysis, and consider unintended effects and humanitarian principles. However, consolidating findings into a smaller number of points could have improved readability. Conclusions are well substantiated, high-level, and aligned with the evidence. Recommendations are actionable, prioritized, and clearly mapped to findings, though they could more precisely identify responsible CO units.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report (SER) can be read as a standalone document. Its structure—beginning with a clear summary and introduction followed by focused analytical sections—communicates key messages succinctly and coherently. The summary provides the essential features of the evaluation, including objectives, scope, and timeframe, and the conclusions and key messages presented are well supported by relevant findings synthesized in the main body of the SER. Findings appropriately address gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE), equity and inclusion issues.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context section is well aligned with WFP’s work in DR Congo and provides relevant, up-to-date information and maps on food security and nutrition (IPC levels, wasting, stunting) and population movements (IDPs, refugees). It accurately captures the CSP’s strategic intent, highlights the shift from the interim CSP, and clearly presents the objectives, reconstructed Theory of Change, and Logical Framework.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The introduction clearly states the evaluation’s purpose, outlining its dual objectives of accountability and learning. It presents the evaluation focus—strategic positioning, contribution, efficiency, and performance—and explicitly includes cross-cutting issues within its scope. However, the report could have specified more clearly the start and end dates of the period under review.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology was informed by an evaluability assessment, noting limitations in data quality and accessibility, coherence of the M&E framework, and inability to assess the effectiveness of emergency response. The evaluation questions, based on OECD-DAC criteria, are appropriate for accountability and learning. The mixed-methods, theory-based approach is relevant and appropriate, and ethical standards are clearly defined. However, some “perception-based” indicators included in the evaluation matrix are inappropriately formulated, reflecting data sources</p>		

rather than measurable indicators. Perceptions gathered through interviews or FGDs should be classified as primary data.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report presents findings that are transparent, impartial, and written in neutral language. They balance strengths and weaknesses, respond directly to all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and are well supported by diverse evidence sources (PDM, needs-based plans, audits, KIIs, previous evaluations, etc.). The analysis robustly assesses outputs and contributions to outcomes against planned targets, integrates gender and inclusion dimensions, and systematically disaggregates data by sex. Unintended effects are clearly examined, and WFP's adherence to the core humanitarian principles is assessed. However, some findings could have been consolidated to reduce their number and improve readability.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The conclusions are presented at an appropriately high level, moving beyond synthesis to provide clear judgments for accountability and strategic decision-making. They are well substantiated, flow logically from the findings, and do not introduce any new information. Gender and broader inclusion considerations are reflected in line with the evidence.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report provides six main recommendations that are coherent, actionable, and forward-looking. They clearly address both learning and accountability objectives and are logically derived from the findings and conclusions. Linkages are explicitly mapped in Annex 7. The recommendations are prioritized, clustered, time-bound, and assign responsibility to relevant actors. However, the recommendations could have been strengthened by specifying the particular CO units or functions (e.g., Supply Chain, M&E/VAM) responsible for leading their implementation.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report language is professional, precise, and avoids excessive jargon. It makes effective use of footnotes and annexes for dense material such as financial data and the mapping of findings. Data sources are consistently cited and key quantitative figures are clearly referenced. Visual aids—including maps, graphs, and tables—are used consistently and effectively. Key messages and conclusions are highlighted through clear headings and emphasized text, improving overall readability. However, the narrative could have been streamlined further by shifting some content to annexes.		

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	
Gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) is fully integrated through the evaluation purpose and scope, and a dedicated evaluation sub-question (EQ 2.3) is included. Evaluation methods appropriately consider the diversity of stakeholders through the conduct of gender segregated FGDs, consideration of sex-disaggregated data, and consideration of gender within sampling frames. Although the report identifies major vulnerable groups (e.g. persons with disability, refugees), it could have deepened its intersectional analysis of overlapping vulnerabilities. Findings and recommendations thoroughly address gender and equity, including actions to strengthen disaggregated monitoring, operationalize gender analysis, and support inclusive partnerships.		

Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard		
UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Meeting requirements	
The evaluation matrix includes a dedicated indicator focused on disability inclusion under evaluation sub-question (EQ 2.3) and uses the Washington Group questions within data collection tools. Disability disaggregated results are reported within evaluation findings, although somewhat sparsely. Conclusion 4 highlights the absence of a concrete approach to improving access and monitoring for persons with disabilities, and recommendation 3 calls for		

strengthening disaggregated indicators to better assess empowerment and inclusion of persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.

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.