

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Evaluation title | Evaluation of Guatemala WFP Country Strategic Plan (2021 – 2025) | |
| Evaluation category and type | Centralized – Country Strategic Plan Evaluation | |
| Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating | Highly Satisfactory: 92% | |
| <p>The “<i>Evaluation of Guatemala WFP Country Strategic Plan (2021 – 2025)</i>” is a high-quality report that decision-makers can use with a high degree of confidence. The report provides a detailed analysis of the country’s context effectively linking WFP programming to nutrition and food security challenges, major shocks, national policies, and national strategic priorities. It clearly discusses the evaluation’s purpose, objectives, and scope, noting the dual purpose of accountability and learning to inform the design of the next CSP with gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) considerations effectively mainstreamed. The evaluation’s mixed methods design effectively incorporates and triangulates quantitative and qualitative evidence. Findings present a balanced view of strengths and weaknesses and respond comprehensively to the four main evaluation questions. Several positive and negative unanticipated effects are identified throughout the findings. Conclusions draw on multiple findings across various evaluation questions and criteria, and are useful for strategic decision-making. The five main recommendations are logically linked to conclusions and findings, and are generally actionable, coherent, and forward-looking. The report could have benefited from reformulation of two recommendations to provide a clearer direction of action and clearer description of the changes sought from WFP, and including additional information on some key data collection efforts.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The summary evaluation report (SER) performs well as a standalone document, clearly presenting key messages and conclusions supported by coherent narrative analysis and well-integrated visual aids. The executive summary and introduction succinctly convey the evaluation’s purpose, scope, methodology, and context. Findings and conclusions are evidence-based, internally consistent, and cover all core criteria, including GEWE and inclusion, with clear links to recommendations.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation provides a detailed analysis of the country context effectively linking WFP programming to nutrition and food security challenges, major shocks (e.g. COVID-19, tropical storms), national policies and strategic priorities. It identifies key intersecting vulnerabilities—especially among indigenous populations, women, and dry corridor communities—and explains the CSP’s evolution from an emergency-focused portfolio towards a more holistic portfolio including resilience programming, institutional strengthening, and service provision. The intervention logic is comprehensively presented through a reconstructed theory of change> Clear and relevant visuals (e.g. timeline) and tables (e.g. budget figures, beneficiary figures) are provided.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation clearly defines its purpose and objectives, effectively articulating the dual purposes of accountability and learning for the development of the next CSP. The temporal, geographic, and thematic scope are clearly defined, and key stakeholders and users are identified.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation demonstrates a generally strong and appropriate mixed methods design. The evaluation follows a theory-based approach building from a reconstructed ToC that informs the evaluability assessment and analysis of causal linkages. Key mitigation measures are outlined to address the primary data limitations. The evaluation matrix includes evaluation questions appropriate for meeting the evaluation objectives, with relevant lines of inquiry, and indicators. GEWE considerations are well mainstreamed within the methodology with disaggregated data, purposive sampling and qualitative work. The report clearly articulates how UNEG and WFP ethical standards are applied. However, in some instances clarity could have been enhanced through the inclusion of additional information on some data collection efforts (e.g. online survey).</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation presents clear analytical findings grounded in a theory-based approach and underpinned by a robust triangulation of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Findings present a balanced view of strengths and weaknesses, respond to all evaluation questions, and transparently acknowledge evidence gaps when relevant. Causal linkages are identified in consideration of the implementation context, including external shocks like COVID-19 and tropical storms. An assessment of WFP’s adherence to humanitarian principles is provided. The analysis demonstrates strong integration of GEWE considerations, with particular attention to differential effects on indigenous populations and women, and the evaluation identifies several positive and negative unanticipated effects throughout the findings.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation provides conclusions that are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and useful for strategic decision making. They draw on multiple findings across various evaluation questions and criteria, ensuring a holistic perspective. The conclusions do not contain major gaps or omissions and explicitly reflect gender, equity, and inclusion dimensions.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation’s five main recommendations are logically linked to its conclusions and findings, and are generally forward-looking, feasible, actionable, and coherent. The recommendations are prioritized and sequenced to facilitate their implementation, and they address strategic and operational levels. However, recommendations could have been more actionable in some cases by indicating specific responsible units within the country office and Global HQ functions. In addition, recommendations 4 and 5 could have been reformulated to provide a clearer direction of action and description of the changes sought from WFP.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report has a logical flow, internal consistency, and effectively tells a story of WFP’s strategic evolution in the country. It consistently provides sources for figures, tables, and analytical statements, and includes effective signposting and cross-references between the main narrative and annexes. Visual aids are also used effectively to convey key information such as timelines, strategic shifts, and financial evolution. The report could have been strengthened by reducing the overall length.</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 | Meeting requirements | |
| <p>GEWE considerations are effectively mainstreamed across objectives, scope, methodology, findings, and recommendations. The evaluation follows a theory-based, mixed-methods design, that includes purposive sampling, and extensive triangulation of disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data. While consistent sex disaggregated data were only available in the later years of the evaluation coverage period—limiting longitudinal analysis—the evaluation transparently acknowledges these gaps and mitigates them through targeted qualitative work. The findings identify both positive and negative unanticipated effects related to GEWE. Ethical safeguards are included in line with UNEG and WFP guidance, ensuring integrity, accountability, beneficence, and respect throughout the evaluation process.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 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 | |
| <p>The evaluation demonstrates generally strong attention to disability inclusion. Disability considerations are well embedded in the terms of reference and the evaluation questions (e.g. EQ2.5, EQ2.6). Multiple findings (e.g. Finding 3, Finding 4) as well as conclusions (e.g. Conclusion 4) and recommendations (e.g. Recommendation 4) explicitly address gaps and propose actions to strengthen disability inclusion going forward. However, stakeholder mapping and data collection did not directly involve persons with disabilities or their representative organizations.</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. |