

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Évaluation du Plan Stratégique de Pays du PAM au Niger 2020 - 2025	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 95%	
<p>The WFP Niger country strategic plan evaluation (“<i>Évaluation du Plan Stratégique de Pays du PAM au Niger 2020–2025</i>”) is a high-quality report that can be used with confidence for decision-making. It provides a concise and highly relevant description of Niger’s context, clearly highlighting the multiple factors contributing to displacement and food insecurity. The report clearly states the purpose, objectives, scope, and intended users of the evaluation. Cross-cutting issues are explicitly addressed. The reconstructed theory of change effectively articulates assumptions and links inputs, activities, outputs, and expected impacts. Evaluation objectives—accountability and learning—are well defined. The methodological design, data collection, and analysis methods are generally relevant, robust, and suitable for answering the evaluation questions impartially. The methodology was intentionally designed to assess gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) and broader equity and inclusion dimensions. However, it could have benefited from specifying whether gender-analysis methods were applied beyond analysis of sex-disaggregated data. Findings are presented as clear analytical statements supported by systematic triangulation of evidence from multiple sources. Conclusions are pitched at an appropriate level of abstraction and provide strong value for accountability and strategic decision-making. The recommendations offer a coherent forward-looking roadmap for WFP in Niger.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report (SER) effectively supports decision-making by providing a clear and concise summary of the most salient elements and key insights from the evaluation. The SER functions well as a standalone document, presenting essential information on the context and evaluation features as well as appropriate summaries of the main findings and conclusions. All six evaluation recommendations from the main report are also included. However, the graphic included in the SER is visually and conceptually dense, which may limit its effectiveness. A simpler, more streamlined figure could have strengthened the presentation and enhanced readability.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>A concise and highly relevant analysis of Niger’s context is presented, highlighting key drivers of vulnerability such as extreme weather, food insecurity, and conflict-related displacement. The report identifies disadvantaged groups relevant to WFP programming and clearly acknowledges intersecting vulnerabilities, including linkages between gender and access to land and resources, poverty, and exposure to violence and displacement. The CSP’s strategic intent is well described, with a clear explanation of how the CSP built on the previous Transitional CSP and related lessons learned. The objectives—accountability and learning—are clearly articulated. The CSP intervention logic is well described and a reconstructed Theory of Change outlines key assumptions and logically links inputs, activities, outputs, and expected impacts.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation clearly explains the purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation, and identifies the main users and stakeholders. The purpose and scope explicitly integrate cross-cutting issues. Overall, the presentation of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope follows good practice with no significant weaknesses noted.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodology is informed by an evaluability assessment that notes the absence of a theory of change, quality issues with third-party monitoring data, unsystematic outcome indicators tracking, and insufficient disaggregation of data. In response, a reconstructed theory of change is developed and presented to articulate assumptions and causal links, and mixed methods approaches are identified to address data gaps. Overall, the methodological design, data collection, and</p>		

analysis are relevant and robust enough to answer the evaluation questions impartially. The methodology integrates gender and broader inclusion dimensions and explicitly references ethical standards.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The findings section demonstrates strong analytical quality, with clear statements supported by robust triangulation of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Findings respond comprehensively to all evaluation questions and sub-questions, presenting strengths and weaknesses in a balanced and transparent manner. The analysis effectively links the delivery of outputs and contribution to outcomes to the complexities of the context and consistently integrates gender, equity, and inclusion considerations. The report also identifies and examines both positive and negative unanticipated effects. While actual versus planned performance is presented through financial tables and beneficiary figures, the report could have been strengthened by a more consolidated narrative analysis of this comparison.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation presents conclusions at an appropriately high level of analytical abstraction, offering strong value for accountability and strategic decision-making. Each conclusion logically synthesizes multiple findings and flows directly from the evidence presented. Overall, the conclusions follow good practice with no significant weaknesses noted.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation provides six recommendations and 12 sub-recommendations that are relevant, forward-looking, and aligned with the evaluation’s rationale of promoting learning and informing the subsequent CSP. Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and are generally realistic, feasible, and actionable. However, rating five of the six recommendations as “high priority” may hinder implementation.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The evaluation demonstrates a clear logical flow and strong internal consistency. Annexes are effectively used to present supporting evidence, including detailed context and methodological information. The report reliably cites sources and makes good use of visual aids—maps, graphs, and tables—to convey performance and budget data. However, the report could have shifted some additional content to annexes to comply with length requirements. In addition, some visual aids —such as Figure 1—could have been simplified to improve readability and accessibility.		

<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>	Meeting requirements: 8 points
The evaluation integrates GEWE throughout. It uses mixed methods, sex- and age-disaggregated data, and gender-sensitive tools. Vulnerable groups—including women and girls, persons with disabilities, elders, refugees/IDPs, pastoralists, and youth—are clearly identified. Findings triangulate quantitative and qualitative data and address gender, equity, and inclusion, including unintended effects. However, the report does not clarify whether gender segregated FGDs were conducted nor does it explain the use of gender-analysis methods beyond sex disaggregation.	

<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>	Meeting requirements
The evaluation terms of reference require disaggregation by disability and overall, disability inclusion is addressed intermittently across findings and recommendations, however data gaps and limited methodological detail hinder a fuller assessment. Finding 11 which discusses the targeting of vulnerable households, including persons with disabilities, and recommendation 3.1 reflects on disability inclusion through a call for developing disaggregated indicators to monitor outcomes for women, girls, and persons with disabilities.	

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.