

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of the WFP Uganda Country Strategic Plan (2018 – 2025)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 87%	
<p>The <i>Evaluation of the Uganda WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018 - 2025</i> is well structured, clearly written and supported by a solid methodology, with findings that draw on multiple evidence sources and logically inform the conclusions and recommendations. The introduction provides an overview of the country context and CSP but could have more fully explained the evolution of WFP's historic engagement in Uganda. The methodology is coherent and well documented, though the final report would benefit from briefly noting key implementation challenges and mitigation measures. The findings are balanced and well substantiated, and the conclusions provide a higher-level synthesis of evidence without introducing new information. Recommendations are actionable and aligned with the evidence, though further reflection on feasibility—particularly given resource constraints—would have been useful. The report uses visual aids effectively, though cross-linkages between related issues could be signposted more consistently. While gender and inclusion considerations are present in the design, the final report could have more consistently strengthened their integration across the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The Summary Evaluation Report is well structured and succinctly captures the purpose and key findings and conclusions of the evaluation. Given the length and richness of the narrative, the summary report would benefit from more deliberate use of formatting—such as bolding and highlighting—to help the reader more easily identify areas of emphasis and navigate the content.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The introduction provides a clear evidence-based overview of the country context, the rationale for the Uganda CSP 2018 - 2025, and the adjustments made throughout the implementation. However, additional reflection on WFP's historical engagement and evolution in Uganda and the operational structure and capacity could have provided readers with a more complete understanding of the strategic environment in which the CSP was developed and implemented.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The rationale and scope of the evaluation are well-articulated with a clear and evidence-based narrative. Gender equality and women's empowerment are explicitly addressed in the evaluation scope, and mainstreamed throughout the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation questions and criteria are clear and appropriate given the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. The methodology is well-structured, mixed-methods, and supported by detailed annexes on indicators, data sources, and sampling. While risks and data limitations are identified in the Inception Report, the final evaluation report would benefit from briefly noting key challenges and mitigation measures. Gender, inclusion, and human rights are integrated into the methodology. Stakeholder engagement was broad, and ethical commitments are noted, though population-specific considerations—particularly for refugees and at-risk groups—could have been more thoroughly addressed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents clear, logically structured, and analytically rich findings that draw on diverse evidence to explain patterns, gaps, and results without bias. The findings fully address all evaluation questions and offer well-substantiated explanations of how and why the WFP Uganda CSP achieved or fell short of intended outcomes, including unintended effects. The analysis is largely balanced and triangulated across stakeholder groups, regions, and gender, though a few findings could have benefitted from deeper gender and inclusion considerations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory

The report presents five conclusions that offer a high-level synthesis of evidence and are logically derived from the findings, with no introduction of new information. While the conclusions are generally strong, they could be further enhanced by more explicitly addressing the multiple disadvantages faced by vulnerable groups, particularly in relation to gendered economic assets and opportunities. Conclusions explicitly discuss gender equality and inclusion as cross-cutting issues. The closing paragraph of each conclusion reads as an implicit lesson. To improve clarity and usefulness, the report could label these explicitly to signal their intended purpose.

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

The six recommendations are clear, actionable, and aligned with the findings and conclusions. Recommendations are focused and prioritized with timelines and responsible parties clearly identified. One recommendation explicitly addresses gender equality and broader equity and inclusion. However, given resource constraints, some additional reflection on feasibility could have been helpful.

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

The report is well-structured and clearly written, with all key sections and annexes included. Sources are consistently cited and visual aids – such as timelines, charts, figures - are used effectively, though cross-linkages between related issues could be signposted more clearly. Key messages are generally well highlighted but could have been checked for consistency across the document.

**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>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Meeting requirements</b>
--	-----------------------------

The evaluation effectively integrates gender equality and inclusion considerations into the evaluation scope and questions, ensuring that GEWE related data would be collected. In addition, the evaluation leverages gender-responsive mixed methods and tools, that allow for disaggregation of qualitative and quantitative data. The sample frame includes a diverse set of female and male stakeholders. While generally thorough and credible, the findings could have been strengthened by more consistently integrating gender-relevant information throughout—for example, incorporating gender dimensions when discussing policy gaps, economic constraints, and systemic challenges—and by summarizing the overall gender implications across the full set of findings. In addition, there is no mention of unanticipated effects on gender equality and although one recommendation addresses gender directly, there may have been an opportunity to integrated gender in other recommendations (e.g. Recommendation 4 on Livelihoods, Recommendation 6 on Thought Leadership).

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

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

Although the evaluation questions cover aspects of disability inclusion and the methodology outlines data collection among persons with disabilities and their representative organizations, more could have been done to reflect disability inclusion within the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>