

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Lebanon WFP Country Strategic Plan 2018–2021	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 85%	
<p>The report of the evaluation of the Lebanon Country Strategic Plan (CSP) provides credible findings that can be used by decision-makers with confidence. The evaluation used a methodology based on a comprehensive documentary review and key informant interviews resulting in findings that systematically answer all the evaluation questions, present the strengths and weaknesses of the CSP in a balanced manner, and meet the evaluation objectives of accountability and learning. The evaluation conclusions are very well balanced with respect to the CSP's strengths and weaknesses overall and useful for accountability and strategic decision making as are the lessons learned identified. The report contains an ambitious set of well-targeted and prioritized recommendations that appear realistic and feasible. Moreover, gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE), human rights, and equity considerations are generally well addressed in the report. However, there is some lack of clarity in the description of the CSP's intervention logic and the findings could have better described how WFP activities and outputs contributed to the achievement of outcome-level results. Finally, notwithstanding a few issues noted with respect to its accessibility, the report is complete and written in a professional, precise, and clear manner.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary is concise and presents a good overview of the main report overall. Most of the evaluation features and key findings are effectively presented and the conclusions and recommendations are generally aligned with the findings presented. Relevant figures from the main report are selectively and appropriately included as well. However, a few more details on key aspects of the evaluation, such as the subject itself, the methodology, and conclusions, could have been included.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes some relevant and recent information on the Lebanon country context - characterized by volatility due to multiple crisis - including key data and indicators, and provides a good intersectional analysis of vulnerability. Moreover, the context description includes relevant, clear, and succinct information on food and nutrition security, agriculture, climate change and vulnerability, as well as basic education in Lebanon. Strategic and operational shifts in the design and implementation of the CSP are also clearly described, with complementary details provided in tables and figures and in the annexes. However, the context description would have been enhanced with information on Lebanon's geographic variability. Furthermore, the wording of expected results/outcomes of the CSP lacks clarity while some key terms should have been clearly defined.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the purpose of the evaluation and its main users. The standard objectives of accountability and learning are respectively explicitly mentioned while GEWE and equity are identified as cross-cutting themes among others in the evaluation. However, the evaluation scope could have been more clearly presented.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a good description of the methodology overall, including a detailed evaluation matrix. The methodological design is clearly presented, including relevant data collection methods that enabled the evaluation questions to be answered. The report provides an excellent description of the integration of GEWE in the methodology. Evaluation limitations and mitigation strategies are also clearly outlined. However, there is no assessment of monitoring data in the description of the evaluation methodology and ethical considerations are not explicitly addressed in the report. Moreover, the sampling frame lacks clarity and data analysis methods should have been more detailed in the main narrative.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the evaluation findings are well balanced, clear and relevant, providing a critical assessment of the CSP through the systematic assessment of the main evaluation questions. Evaluation questions related to relevance, efficiency, and the factors influencing the achievement of results are particularly well addressed. The findings present comprehensive data on actual versus planned activities and the CSP's performance against the International Humanitarian Principles is also very well addressed. Data is gender-disaggregated and gaps in evidence are mentioned and explained through caveats. Numerous footnotes indicate the sources used to support the findings, although primary sources of evidence tend to be presented in a general way in footnotes, making it impossible to know the category of stakeholders that informed the relevant findings.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are well balanced with respect to the CSP's strengths and weaknesses overall and useful for accountability and strategic decision making. They flow logically from the findings, with linkages clearly reflected in the complementary findings-conclusions-recommendations matrix in annex. The lessons learned identified are relevant, clearly connected to the evaluation findings and conclusions, and contribute to broader WFP organizational learning. However, the conclusions tend to summarize key findings by main evaluation question rather than across them and could have commented on the validity of the implicit or explicit logic of the CSP and its key assumptions.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The well-detailed recommendations clearly flow from the evaluation findings and conclusions, and effectively respond to the evaluation purpose and objectives. They are well targeted, actionable, and prioritized with a clear timeframe indicated for their implementation. GEWE and equity/inclusion dimensions are appropriately reflected in the recommendations but women's empowerment could have been more fully integrated, notably in recommendations related to livelihoods, resilience, and social protection.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written, using clear and precise language. Key elements of information are highlighted in bold, sources are provided for all data and quotes, and information is accurately cross-referenced throughout the report, including to tables, figures, and annexes. Most of the requested annexes are included and are referenced in the text. However, the narrative is weighed down somewhat by the repetitive spelling out of terms for which acronyms are commonly used and clearly identified in the list of acronyms. Some discrepancies were found in the numbering of tables and figures. Moreover, it would have been useful to include text boxes with key findings and other key information, such as good practices.</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	Meets requirements: 8 points
<p>GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and while there is no specific evaluation objective dedicated to it, two evaluation sub-questions explicitly address GEWE, which is also identified as a cross-cutting theme of the evaluation. The report's methodology annex presents an excellent description of how the methodology ensured GEWE considerations were well integrated into the evaluation, through: a gender-sensitive approach; interviews with CO representatives and project partners whose work focused on gender issues specifically; data analysis that employed a gender lens; presentation of sex-disaggregated data where possible, etc. Gender and inclusion considerations are clearly reflected in both primary and secondary data sources consulted. However, the recommendations could have reflected women's empowerment considerations more fully.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>