Evaluation title	Evaluation of the DG ECHO funded Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) in Turkey	Evaluation report number	DE/TRCO/2018/001
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Turkey	PHQA date	March 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 74%		Meets requirements: 8 points	

The evaluation of the Directorate General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operation (DG ECHO)-funded Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) in Turkey meets requirements. It conveys a large amount of information in a well-structured report. The context analysis and overview of the subject are insightful and comprehensive. The methodology is complete and well supported by extensive annexes. Moreover, findings are well referenced and validated by triangulation and are followed by lessons that contribute to wider organizational learning. The report could have benefitted from wider targeted recommendations and a more in-depth discussion on gender and equity dimensions.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds

The report summary is well structured and includes all the key elements of the evaluation. It provides a clear description of the subject, describes the main features of the methodology, and summarises well all the recommendations. The key strength of the section is the presentation of the findings, which are summarised in a very effective way. The conclusions would have benefitted from a similar approach.

CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds

The overview of the evaluation subject is brief but comprehensive, including all the key information required (e.g. duration of the evaluation subject, planned beneficiary numbers, scope, key activities, amounts of transfers, main partners, resourcing profile, etc.). It explains and assesses the analytical basis of the subject and describes well the evolution of the programme thanks to a very clear timeline. Finally, it is based on relevant and well-evidenced information sources.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds

This section is well documented, placing the ESSN in the context of in-camp and not-in-camp refugees. Purpose, rationale and scope of the evaluation are clear and explain the intended balance of accountability and learning. There are no significant weaknesses, even though more discussion on any potential effects of operational modifications on results would have been helpful.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds

The presentation of the methodology adequately covers the evaluation questions, sources of data, means of selection and sampling. The selected methods are relevant and triangulation principles have been used consistently. The text in the main report is also well supported by extensive and detailed annexes that expand on the approach and analysis conducted. Some further detail on the extent to which the planned design was fully realised or where any compromises were necessary would have further strengthened the section.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets

Findings are presented in a detailed and balanced way. The section provides a good discussion on how programme approach has influenced national policy over the years and a convincing analysis of underlying reasons for achievement / underachievement of results. Moreover, triangulation is evident and careful reference to the sources of information enhances the quality of findings. However, while they follow the structure of the evaluation questions, two questions are not directly addressed, and their omission is not explained.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds

Conclusions cover most of the issues summarised in key points under findings and take them further into coherent statements. The section is structured by the four sets of evaluation questions and presents no major omissions. Lessons are correctly identified and deliberately look for issues that are potentially of wider replication in other contexts and situations.

The section would have been strengthened using more prominent concluding statements - as done for lessons and recommendations - which would have improved the link to the summary.

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Meets

A strong awareness of gender dimensions is evident in the evaluation indicators, analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Moreover, arrangements for interviews included plans to give voice to women and avoid gender bias. However, while both gender and equity were implicit in the approach and methodology, neither were clearly defined and the opportunity to look beyond participation and consider other principles, such as inclusiveness and empowerment, was partially missed.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets

Recommendations flow directly from the analysis and conclusions and all the key issues from the findings section are adequately reflected. They present a clear timeline for action, are specific, actionable and grouped into strategic and operational types to enable prioritisation. However, the section does not mention the learning component of the evaluation and misses the opportunity to give a recommendation about the final upcoming evaluation.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets

The report is well presented and nicely written, conveying a large amount of data in a coherent and understandable fashion. The tone of the report is appropriately balanced and objective, and sources are provided for all data and quotes. The extensive and detailed annexes provide additional information for readers with a specific interest. The use of highlighted text, introductions for each main section, and prominent concluding statements (as used for the lessons and recommendations) would have further strengthened the presentation.

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