

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Decentralized Evaluation of the Results of WFP's Food Assistance to Temporarily Dislocated Persons in Pakistan from 2015-2017	<b>Evaluation Report #</b>	
<b>Type</b>	Thematic area	<b>Centralised/ Decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global / Region or Country</b>	Pakistan	<b>PHQA date</b>	26-07-2018

Quality Rating - overall category	EPI – Overall Report Category	
Meets requirements: 60% - 74%	4-7 points = Approaches requirements	
<p>The report could have been strengthened through providing greater levels of detail and analysis of the evaluation subject itself (including the programme logic), and for the context in which it is operating (including analysis of the stakeholders, geographical and socio-economic challenges of food insecurity - and the development challenge). Further details about the differentiated challenges across the 7 FATA agencies, including an illustrative map, could also have helped to understand the depth and scale of the challenge. While the conclusions reflect the findings accurately, they could have been strengthened by reducing the number presented and making them more strategic. The evaluation demonstrates a fair level of focus on GEEW throughout; this could be further strengthened through presentation of more robust analysis of gender issues at an outcome level (drawing on both qualitative and quantitative data), and ensuring that gender considerations are also mainstreamed into recommendations (as they are throughout the wider report). Equity issues are also moderately addressed within the report, and this could be more systematically achieved through considering how equity dimensions could be integrated into the methodology (in a similar way to gender). Accessibility of the report could be further improved by highlighting key findings (for example at the end of each section), as well as organising key information (for example relating to coherence) more coherently. A professional proof-read would remove punctuation and grammatical errors.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
<p>The summary provides a good overview of the evaluation objectives and purpose, evaluation subject and key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The methodology and context in which the evaluation subject operates are limited and this would limit the confidence with which the report can inform decision-making, to some extent.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially
<p>The overview provides explicit details of the geographical coverage of the evaluation subject, and a description of partners and activities. It explicitly states that no changes to design occurred during implementation. Many of the details provided (such as the time period) related to aspects being covered by the evaluation, rather than the evaluation subject as a whole. Implementation details (for example related to transfers or beneficiaries) relate to actual figures, and do not include planned figures. The overview does not provide details on the analytical basis of the evaluation subject, nor any analysis of its logic model.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Meets

The context provides some analysis of gender disparities and of key contextual factors that are likely to have affected results; data sources are relevant, reliable and recent. Objectives and purpose of the evaluation are described in detail, with clear linkages; the balance, and mutually reinforcing objectives of learning and accountability are succinctly explained. Areas of improvement include: greater descriptions of (political, socio-economic, physical) challenges facing both displaced persons, returnees and host communities could have been provided - as well as some differentiation on conditions across the seven different FATA agencies; and, the scope of the evaluation could also have been more complete and more explicit.

#### CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY

Category

Meets

The matrix comprises all key elements, including an assessment of data availability and quality; detail provided indicates that it will enable systematic assessments against EQs. Methodology includes detailed description of triangulation principles and UNEG ethical safeguards. Whilst evaluation criteria are consistent with the purpose and scope; as the evaluation seeks to inform future support by WFP, Government and other partners - and generate learning - both coverage and connectedness would also be consistent with purpose/ scope. Impact is not comprehensively addressed, and is integrated into the analysis of effectiveness. There is limited detail of analysis, including application of IHPs.

#### CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Category

Approaches

Findings largely address the evaluation questions set out in the methodology; unintended effects are discussed, as well as enabling and constraining factors. The report discusses both successes and failures, and refers to some recommendations and learning from previous studies and evaluations. Whilst the report does provide links to data sources, greater evidence of triangulation (particularly in relation to KII and FGD data) would strengthen the findings presented. The evaluation also provides some assessment of performance against IHPs, although this could have been more explicit; issues such as TPMs and impact of late payment of beneficiaries could also have been discussed in this context.

#### CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS

Category

Meets

Conclusions summarise the evidence, with some effort to respond to the 'so what question'. Conclusions make explicit use of evidence from findings; all key findings are presented - including positive and negative. Whilst lessons identified are specific to the operation, there is an effort to make some of these applicable more widely - specifically in the context of future working in the context, and in some cases beyond.

#### CRITERION 7: GENDER

Category

Meets

GEEW dimensions are integrated into the evaluation methodology, and gender analysis is evident across the analysis and findings, as well (partially) in conclusions and recommendations. Whilst equity dimensions are not evident within the methodology, these are considered within the analysis; and better targeting of specific vulnerable persons is a key recommendation. The overview of the evaluation subject provides little analysis of the extent to which GEEW has been considered in design or implementation. Whilst there is evidence that perspectives of men and women were sought, there is limited use and discussion of disaggregated data (both qualitative and quantitative) at the outcome level. GEEW issues could have been addressed more comprehensively within the recommendations.

#### CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS

Category

Meets

All recommendations address purpose and objective, and are clearly derived from the analysis and findings; most critical areas are addressed. Whilst recommendations are broadly feasible and actionable, some recommendations are inter-linked and may therefore benefit from further sequencing. Opportunities to engage other parts of WFP (for example RO) in relation to learning and coordination around FFA/ development activities have not been considered.

#### CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY

Category

Meets

The report is accessible, using clear, jargon-free language and an appropriate tone. The tone of report is appropriately balanced. Whilst the report is organised in a logical way, selected findings could have been presented in a more coherent manner to improve clarity. Key messages could have been more distinctly highlighted. A good proof read would have removed grammatical and punctuation errors.

Criteria Scoring Scale Legend - Gender Integration EPI		
3 points = Fully integrated	1. Scope & Indicators	1
2 points = Satisfactorily integrated	2. Criteria & Questions	3
1 point = Partially integrated	3. Methodology	2
0 point = Not at all integrated	4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
	<b>Overall EPI SCORE</b>	<b>7</b>

Quality Rating Scale Legend Evaluation Reports	Overall Scoring of Gender EPI Scale Legend Evaluation Reports
Exceeds requirements: 75% - 100%	UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Meets requirements: 60% - 74%	11-12 points = Exceeds Requirements
Approaches requirements: 50% - 59%	8-10 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25% - 49%	4-7 points = Approaches requirements