

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Türkiye WFP Country Strategic Plan (2018 – 2025)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>Overall, the <i>Evaluation of Türkiye WFP Country Strategic Plan (2018 – 2025)</i> is a credible and useful report that decision makers can use with confidence. It is well structured and logically organized, opening with a relevant overview of the country context and changes in WFP programming over time. The methodology is robust and tailored to the programme’s context and stakeholder interests. The mixed methods approach is suitable for answering all evaluation questions and integrates some consideration of gender equality and wider inclusion dimensions. Overall, the findings are evidence-based, objective, and supported by a strong and logical analysis of a wide range of secondary data sources. Conclusions are well grounded, providing higher-level insights that connect directly to lessons for wider consideration. Recommendations are practical, forward-looking, and logically derived from the findings, making them useful for supporting the development of a new country strategic plan. However, the evaluation could have been further strengthened by more fully integrating gender equality and wider equity and inclusion considerations throughout the evaluation’s data collection and data analysis. In addition, the evaluation could have more consistently used disaggregated data in the analysis and formulation of findings.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report is clear and concise and contains all key elements to enable it to serve as a standalone document that is useful for decision-makers. No gaps or significant limitations in the summary report were noted.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The introduction provides a clear, well-balanced, and relevant overview of the country context and WFP’s operations in the country. The inclusion of clear and informative graphics enhances the narrative by illustrating the evolution of programming over time in a concise and accessible manner. While the section integrates some gender and inclusion considerations, it could have benefited from a more explicit analysis of the intersectionality between gender-specific vulnerabilities and other identified contextual factors, and additional information on WFP’s gender-related initiatives.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly explains the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. A comprehensive description of scope and coverage across the transitional interim and interim country strategic plans represents a key strength. The report could have been strengthened by more explicitly addressing gender equality issues in the description of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and target groups.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design is relevant and appropriate for providing an objective and unbiased assessment against all evaluation questions. Key strengths include the tailoring of evaluation sub-questions to the country and programming context, as well as to stakeholder information needs; the alignment of the mixed methods approach with each WFP intervention area; the use of rigorous processes for data analysis and triangulation; and the clear articulation of how ethical standards were applied throughout the evaluation. However, the methodological description could have been further strengthened by providing an assessment of the availability and quality of data regarding gender equality results; offering more detailed information on the application of gender-sensitive approaches, and providing further disaggregation of the type of informants reached, including sex and other inclusion considerations (age, disability), particularly for focus group participants and camp beneficiaries.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation findings are evidence-based, impartial, and answer all evaluation questions. Key strengths include the clear articulation and well-structured presentation of summary findings statements; robust and logical analysis drawing on a wide range of secondary data sources; a high degree of internal consistency across findings; and clear explanations of causal linkages, as well as the contextual factors and constraints affecting implementation. The consideration of gender and wider inclusion dimensions in the findings could have been further strengthened with additional triangulation of qualitative data collected from stakeholders and beneficiaries representing specific social groups.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions provide a well-synthesized, higher-level analysis that effectively draws on and integrates the evaluation findings. They offer clear and forward-looking insights that are relevant for informing future country strategic planning, and they appropriately reflect considerations related to gender equality, women's empowerment, and other inclusion dimensions. The conclusions also identify lessons that are pertinent to wider organizational learning. A particular strength is the deliberate use of a theory-based approach, grounded in an analysis of causal pathways and underlying assumptions, to inform conclusions. No gaps or significant limitations were noted in the conclusions or lessons learned.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation presents an appropriate number of actionable recommendations that flow logically from the findings and conclusions. All recommendations are forward looking and designed to support the formulation of a new country strategic plan, with clear identification of areas requiring improvement or change. The recommendations could have been further strengthened by providing clearer differentiation in terms of prioritization and implementation timeframes; ensuring all sub-recommendations are fully aligned with the findings and conclusions; and explicitly referencing the need to address women's specific needs within relevant recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the report is well written, accessible and clear. It demonstrates a clear and logical flow with a high degree of internal consistency. In some areas, the report could have been further strengthened by presenting key message using visual aids such as graphs.</p>		

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	Approaches requirements	
<p>Overall, the report mainstreams gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) across multiple dimensions of the evaluation. It applies a mixed methods approach and uses purposive sampling designed to ensure gender and social diversity in data collection, and disaggregates quantitative data. The report also identifies general trends related to gender equality and unanticipated negative effects on gender. One sub-recommendation aimed at strengthening equitable access to programme interventions is included. GEWE integration could have been further strengthened by assessing the availability and quality of data to measure progress on GEWE related results; elaborating on how the referenced "gender lens" was applied during data analysis; including an analysis of how gender-specific vulnerabilities intersect with other interacting factors; and providing more specific and disaggregated data collected from diverse stakeholders and beneficiaries within the analysis of findings.</p>		

Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard		
UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Meets requirements	
<p>The evaluation integrated disability considerations as part of the evaluation's cross-cutting aims and through an analysis of inclusion dimensions relating to people with disabilities and refugees as part of the evaluation findings. Conclusions address wider disability inclusion dimensions and one sub-recommendation explicitly points to the need for disability disaggregated data to inform intervention designs that benefit target groups with diverse needs.</p>		

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.