

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Indonesia WFP Country Strategic Plan 2021 - 2025	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>The <i>Evaluation of Indonesia WFP Country Strategic Plan (2021 - 2025)</i> is of good quality and can be used by stakeholders with confidence for decision-making. The evaluation focus and methodology are clearly articulated. Findings address all evaluation questions and sub questions and are built on logical arguments based on diverse sources of credible evidence. Findings are impartial and neutral in tone, address all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and provide insightful analysis of the internal and external factors supporting and hindering output and outcome achievement and provide learning around good practices and necessary conditions for Country Capacity Strengthening (CCS) take-up by the government of Indonesia. However, additional reference to qualitative data sources could have further strengthened the evidence base for some findings. The conclusions are comprehensive and substantiated by evidence from the findings, however some conclusions could have been pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction. Recommendations are actionable and underpinned by findings and conclusions, however a few recommendations could have included further reflection on the scope of the next CSP relative to WFP CO capacity to manage for results.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report provides a concise overview of the key elements of the main report and can be used as a stand-alone document to support decision-making. It includes a concise but comprehensive overview of the evaluation rationale, purpose, scope, and methodology. Conclusions are presented as key insights and supported by relevant findings that include an appropriate level of detail and analysis. Recommendations mirror those in the main report. In addition, the summary uses visual aids and graphics effectively to depict key elements of the context and the CSP under review.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The context and overview of the Indonesia CSP are generally comprehensive. The context covers an analysis of policy, programming, and needs for key sectors associated with the CSP, including social protection, climate and disaster management, health, and education. The description of the CSP purpose, objectives, strategic outcomes, internal logic, delivery strategy, and budget information is well presented. However, it could have been improved with an explanation of changes in strategic focus of the current CSP from the previous CSP and how workstreams and activities under the current CSP evolved during implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and concise description of the evaluation purpose, objectives, and scope, as well as end uses and users. However, it could have been strengthened with a more explicit integration of gender and equity considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology description provides a clear and detailed overview of how evaluation questions were answered, based on credible and sufficiently diverse sources of information and using appropriate methods of data collection and analysis. The methodology could have been further enhanced by outlining how gender, equity, and inclusion results were measured and assessed.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings are analytical in nature and provide a clear assessment of CSP performance in terms of its strengths, weaknesses, and factors that supported or impeded CSP performance. Findings are impartial and neutral in tone, address all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and build from diverse data sources. They clearly present planned versus actual output achievement and WFP contributions to outcomes are captured through a cascade approach that explores the factors and conditions that enabled longer-term contributions to outcomes beyond the boundaries of this</p>		

CSP. However, findings could have been improved with further reference to qualitative data sources and additional disaggregation of qualitative data by gender, institution, level of government, etc.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS

Rating

Satisfactory

The conclusions are comprehensive and substantiated by evidence from the findings and do not contain new information. They provide a comprehensive overview of the key messages on CSP performance, including major challenges and factors impeding performance as well as learning around good practice principles in CCS. The line of sight between findings, conclusions, and recommendations is detailed and clearly presented in Annex 12. However, the conclusions could have been pitched at a slightly higher level of analytical abstraction and more forward-looking in terms of the implications for design and delivery of the next CSP.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS

Rating

Satisfactory

The recommendations logically derive from the findings and conclusions and include sub-recommendations that provide appropriate detail on how to implement the recommendation. Recommendations are actionable and feasible, with specific timelines and responsibilities assigned. However, a few recommendations could have been strengthened with a reflection on the scope of the next CSP relative to WFP CO capacity to manage for results. In addition, recommendations provide no reference to gender, equity, or inclusion or how these considerations could be integrated in the next CSP.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY

Rating

Highly Satisfactory

The report is clearly written, accessible, and free of complex terminology. The report effectively uses footnotes and tells a consistent story with appropriate reference to annexes. Key messages are highlighted in bold, and visual aids, graphics, and tables are used effectively to convey evidence and support key messaging.

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

Approaching requirements

While GEWE considerations are not explicitly reflected in the CSP evaluation purpose, objectives or scope, they are broadly mainstreamed within the evaluation. The evaluation matrix includes gender-related evaluation questions, and the evaluation methodology follows a mixed methods approach that incorporates data collection from diverse sources. The identified sampling strategy seeks and achieves gender parity for sampling of respondents for qualitative data collection. While the findings explore WFP integration of GEWE considerations in its efforts with government partners, they do not assess the results of these efforts in terms of government capacity, policy, and programming related to GEWE. There are no recommendations that specifically address GEWE or how the design and delivery of the next CSP can be improved in relation to these issues going forward.

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

The evaluation does not meet the requirements for integration of disability considerations. The evaluation provides disability prevalence rates within the contextual overview and includes two evaluation sub-questions that cover aspects of disability inclusion. The evaluation methods note the application of a disability lens within data collection and analysis processes and government agencies representing persons with disability are identified in stakeholder mapping. However, evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations do not sufficiently reflect a consideration of disability inclusion.

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

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

Highly Satisfactory	<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>
Satisfactory	<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>
Partly Satisfactory	<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>
Unsatisfactory	<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>