

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Armenia WFP Country Strategic Plan (2019 - 2025)	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>The <i>Evaluation of Armenia WFP Country Strategic Plan (2019 – 2025)</i> is a well-written report that can be confidently used for decision-making. It provides a clear description of the Armenian context and CSP evolution as well as the evaluation’s objectives, purpose, and rationale. The methodology includes a mixed-methods approach, with data sources and analytical methods clearly described in the main report and annexes. The findings address all evaluation questions with evidence presented transparently and objectively. The findings distinguish WFP’s contributions from those of other actors and offer credible supporting evidence. Conclusions flow logically from findings without major gaps and provide useful learning and accountability insights. Recommendations are well aligned with findings and conclusions and clearly identify timeframes for action and responsible actors. However, data sources are not consistently cited which limits clarity on evidence triangulation and sampling frames for qualitative data collection are insufficiently detailed. In addition, some recommendations could have been improved by more explicitly considering resource constraints and by adding further detail to sub-recommendations to enhance actionability.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report (SER) generally presents a clear and concise summary of the evaluation. It presents the evaluation rationale, objectives, and intended users, and provides relevant context and an overview of the Armenia CSP. It effectively summarizes the main findings and conclusions of the evaluation, and includes the recommendations as presented in the main report. However, the utility of the SER as a standalone document could have been improved with additional information on the evaluation scope and methodology.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and useful description of the external context relevant to the Armenia CSP, including key contextual changes. It outlines the evolution from the T-ICSP to the CSP, presents the reconstructed Theory of Change, and describes the intervention modalities.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly presents the evaluation’s objectives and purpose, and identifies the intended users, key stakeholders, timeframe, and rationale. However, the report does not explicitly define the target groups or the specific activities covered by the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation uses a mixed-methods approach, with data sources and analytical methods clearly described in the main report and annexes. The methodology is appropriate for answering the evaluation questions, enables effective engagement with diverse stakeholders, adheres to ethical standards, and integrates gender and inclusion considerations. The evaluation matrix is largely comprehensive and internally coherent. However, the sampling frame for key informant and group interviews is insufficiently detailed, and the ethical principles followed are not explicitly stated.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings address all evaluation questions and nearly all sub-questions, with evidence presented transparently and objectively. WFP’s contributions are clearly distinguished from those of partners, and key contextual factors influencing results are well captured. Data from multiple sources and stakeholder groups is generally used effectively for triangulation. The findings provide sufficient analytical depth, incorporate gender considerations, and directly assess humanitarian principles. However, primary data from key informant interviews is not consistently cited, as informants</p>		

are not referenced by location or stakeholder group, limiting the clarity of evidence use. Secondary data sources are also not clearly identified. These gaps in citation practices weaken triangulation at times. No unintended outcomes are reported, and more could have been done to show how evidence was triangulated across different social groups.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---------------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The report presents well-substantiated conclusions that align with the findings and introduce no new information. Gender-related conclusions are clearly articulated. However, in some cases, the conclusions could have gone further to provide deeper analytical insights for the purposes of accountability and strategic decision-making.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The evaluation provides recommendations that include timeframes for action and identify responsible actors. They are well aligned with the findings and conclusions. However, the recommendations could be strengthened by more explicitly considering resource constraints, adding detail to some sub-recommendations to enhance actionability, and offering clearer prioritization to guide sequencing.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
-----------------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The report is written in a clear and accessible way. It makes good use of bolding and text boxes to highlight key information, and cross-referencing between the main report and annexes supports navigation. The table of contents and the figures and tables are accurate and helpful. However, both the main report and annexes exceed the word limit, and some required annexes are missing. Some graphs and tables could be better designed for clearer interpretation and acronyms are occasionally overused.

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
--------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The evaluation integrates GEWE considerations though with some gaps. GEWE is mainstreamed across the evaluation, with a dedicated sub-question and indicators, supported by a mixed-methods approach that draws on diverse data sources and adheres to ethical standards. However, the methodology provides limited detail on how progress on gender results is assessed, and it does not clearly explain how the sampling frame considers the diversity of stakeholders. The contextual analysis includes relevant intersectional factors, and quantitative data is disaggregated by sex. However, the diverse perspectives captured through qualitative data are not clearly reflected in the findings, and no unintended GEWE-related effects are identified. Nonetheless, GEWE is appropriately reflected in the recommendations, particularly through Recommendation 3, which focuses on inclusion of women and vulnerable populations.

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 incorporates disability inclusion in several key areas. The evaluation terms of reference explicitly require consideration of effects on persons with disabilities. Disability inclusion is mainstreamed in the evaluation framework—particularly under evaluation sub-question 2.2—and the findings provide evidence on related practices, such as attention to disability within school feeding and food assistance. Conclusions and recommendations also reflect these findings, notably through Recommendation 3. However, explicit references to persons with disabilities or their representative organizations within the stakeholder mapping and description of data collection methods are limited, preventing a clearer understanding of how the perspectives of these groups were considered.

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>