

Evaluation title	Decentralized Evaluation of WFP's General Food Assistance to Syrian Refugees in Jordan 2015 to mid-2018	Evaluation report number	DE/JORDAN/2018/008
Type	Activity evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Jordan	PHQA date	March 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Exceeds requirements: 77%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP's General Food Assistance (GFA) to Syrian Refugees in Jordan between 2015 to mid-2018 exceeds requirements. It presents a high-quality summary and starts with a strong presentation of the context, purpose and scope of the evaluation. The methodology section is sound and complete and supports findings that are structured, triangulated and aligned to the evaluation questions. Moreover, conclusions and recommendations are useful, comprehensive, and address most of the critical areas identified by the findings. The report also effectively mainstreams gender in the narrative. In terms of minor areas for improvement, the report could have described in more detail the rationale for the evaluation's timing and sampling approach. Furthermore, it would have benefitted from a discussion of the effects that external factors, such as political churn or conflict changes in the region, have had on the programme.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The summary is clear and succinct. It includes a brief but informative description of the scope of the evaluation, the subject, the period of implementation, the geographical coverage, and the modality types. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are summarised without omissions. Moreover, the section provides a clear explanation of the intended users of the evaluation, including beneficiaries. The summary could have been further strengthened by outlining the limitations encountered and the rationale for the methods selected.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>The report provides comprehensive information about the evaluation subject, including a description of how the logical framework, activities, and number of beneficiaries have changed over time. Moreover, key partners are described in detail both in the main report and in the annexes. The overview draws on current and relevant project documents and country data and includes also a reference to lessons learned from previous evaluations, although they could have been discussed more explicitly.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The purpose, objectives, and scope are clearly described and explicitly linked to the subject of the evaluation. Contextual information provided on the refugee food security situation in Jordan is highly relevant, and the effects of the humanitarian response and the shifts in the resource landscape in the country are also detailed. The rationale for the timing of the evaluation could have been made more explicit, however.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The evaluation questions and criteria are clearly articulated and are largely consistent with the purpose and scope of the evaluation. The evaluation matrix is of high quality, appropriate methods (document review, interviews, FGDs) were selected to answer the evaluation questions and multiple data sources have been used to produce and validate findings. The section also states how ethical safeguards were applied and how the evaluation team mitigated limitations, even though efforts to address data gaps could have been described in greater detail.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The findings are clearly structured in response to each evaluation question and sub-question. They are triangulated from different sources and gaps in the evidence are clearly explained. WFP's role within the context is also well established in the narrative and there is a specific section on unintended consequences and enabling and constraining factors. However, in some cases findings stray into the realm of recommendations and do not fully assess whether WFP has made the best use of available resources.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The conclusions effectively summarise the information presented in the findings section and generally respond to the evaluation questions. They are also balanced, highlighting both positive and negative findings. Furthermore, the conclusions</p>		

emphasise challenges, although they could have summarised better the unintended consequences and the internal and external factors that contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of results.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Meets
A strong awareness of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions is evident in the evaluation indicators, analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation also clearly describes how gender issues were addressed in the methodology through gender disaggregated data, representativeness in focus groups, and gender balance in the evaluation team. Limitations around gender-disaggregated data were mitigated to some extent by disaggregating household survey data. However, there is no indication that data collection tools enabled the collection of data from women and men in ways that avoided gender biases and the report missed the opportunity to outline lessons and recommendations for gender-sensitive evaluation. Finally, equity dimensions are not clearly defined and consistently applied throughout the evaluation.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds
Recommendations are specific, actionable, and grouped for prioritization. They are relevant to the evaluation purpose, particularly to inform adjustments to the strategic direction of the GFA and programme design, and to the development of the CO Country Strategic Plan (CSP) and operational direction. Recommendations address most of the critical areas identified by the findings, are well-targeted and provide a clear timeframe for action. The section would have benefited from the inclusion of an explicit link with the findings and conclusions, to clarify the sequence from evidence to recommendations and avoid overlaps.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report is clearly written and free of jargon. Key messages are clearly signposted in the body of the report and visual aids are used effectively in the findings and annexes. Furthermore, a complete list of acronyms is provided and sources are consistently referenced. However, the table of contents is inaccurate and the accessibility of the report could have been improved by moving some of the key information in the main report rather than in the annexes.		

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