Evaluation title	Corporate Emergency Evaluation of the WFP Regional Response to the Syrian Crisis (January 2015-March 2018)	Evaluation report number	OEV/2017/016
Type	Evaluations of corporate emergency responses	Centralised/ decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey Republic, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt	PHQA date	January 2019

Overall category – Quality rating	Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating
Meets requirements: 68%	Meets requirements: 8 points

The Corporate Emergency Evaluation of the WFP Regional Response to the Syrian Crisis 2015-2018 meets requirements. It presents a short but comprehensive overview of the evaluation subject, a clear justification of the intervention in the complex context and is based on an extensive and robust methodology. Findings are well structured and present a wide-ranging analysis, drawing information from multiple sources. Moreover, recommendations are of high quality and crafted in a way that enhances their future implementation. The report would have benefited from more explicit conclusions against the overarching evaluation questions and from a stronger presentation of the contribution analysis, also to generate insights for WFP's programmes in other settings.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets

The summary, longer than usual, covers all the main elements of the evaluation, reflecting the report's structure and presenting all conclusions and recommendations, without omissions. However, more space and emphasis could have been given to the description of the methodology and findings. Finally, there is no mention of the theory of change/ contributions analysis approach.

CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds

The overview of the evaluation subject is a concise and effective summary based on relevant and well-evidenced information sources. The section includes the right mix of graphics, tables and text, which present effectively the evaluation subject. Moreover, the reconstructed logical framework helps to get a clear and comprehensive understanding of the interventions. However, there is a tendency to rely on annexes for detail and to not bring salient facts into the text.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds

The highly complex setting of the evaluation is well presented, providing a strong justification for the approach. The purpose, objective, and scope are clearly described along with relevant humanitarian issues, government policies, priorities and institutional capacity, and any relevant work of WFP and other key actors in the context. The four main evaluation questions are listed, even though the changes made during inception could have been more explicitly stated and explained in the main text.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets

The methodology is clearly presented, including the conceptual framework, theory of change, evaluation criteria and matrix, data collection methods, breakdown of respondents, risks and ethical standards. There are no major weaknesses, but two elements could have benefited from further detail. First, it would have been helpful to discuss any efforts to minimise selection bias in accessing respondents for focus group discussions and key informant interviews. Second, the section would have benefited from the application of findings from previous evaluations as data sources within the methodology.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets

The findings are well structured, triangulation is used systematically, and references are completed and well presented. Moreover, reasons for achievement and underachievement are identified and their effects on results are made clear. However, while findings are structured by evaluation questions, the sequencing and questions differ from the evaluation matrix, without any introductory text to explain the changes implemented vis-à-vis the inception.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Approaches

The conclusions do not sufficiently consider the theory of change and contribution analysis specified in the methodology. There are also no lessons presented in the report even though this was identified as an objective in the terms of reference.

On the positive side the conclusions are linked to the evaluation criteria, flow logically, and are balanced, considering both positive and negative findings.

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Approaches

Gender is not mainstreamed in the evaluation criteria and there is no dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation. Equity dimensions were also not fully considered. Nonetheless, the evaluation examined targets, indicators, and disaggregated evidence by gender and the methodology employed mixed methods approach appropriate to integrate gender and protection considerations.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds

The recommendations are concise, actionable statements that flow logically from the conclusions. They are also addressed to specific units and have a clear timeframe for action. Finally, they are designed to inform WFP's management decisions with respect to strategic positioning, efficiency, and sustainability even though they make no reference to WFP's partners or to the wider UN Humanitarian system.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets

The report is clearly written and well presented, with good referencing to sources and to more detailed material in the annexes. However, a short note to explain the changed sequence of questions as well as a more systematic use of text linking and introducing paragraphs would have improved its accessibility.

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	8

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
Meets requirements: 60—74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements