

Evaluation title	Evaluation of WFP's Livelihood Activities in Türkiye, 2020-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 91%	
<p>The Evaluation of WFP's Livelihood Activities in Türkiye (2020-2022) includes credible and useful evaluation findings that users can rely on with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report includes a good description of the country context leading into relevant information on the subject of the evaluation. The evaluation scope is clearly delimited in terms of activity, time period, and geographic coverage and the evaluation's mixed methods approach was appropriate to meet its learning and accountability objectives. Gender equality and human rights are mainstreamed in the evaluation framework ensuring that data would be collected and analyzed on these dimensions. Report findings provide useful detail, are balanced in terms of programme strengths and challenges, and use figures to demonstrate key points. They also highlight the unique vulnerabilities of refugee women and children and refugees with disabilities. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations are logically linked, consistent, and evidence based. Figures and tables are used strategically to present summary information. However, the report would have benefited from an assessment of monitoring data and summary tables that present planned vs. actual outcomes. It also could have explicitly identified any positive or negative unintended effects of the programme. Conclusions could have been pitched at a higher level, connecting key findings across the evaluation criteria and main questions assessed. Finally, the recommendations would have benefited from being identified as either strategic or operational.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The Executive Summary succinctly summarizes the evaluation report's lengthy findings. Conclusions highlight and summarize key points from the findings. Recommendations accurately match the more detailed recommendations in the main body of the report. The Executive Summary would have benefited from the inclusion of a reference to the evaluation scope and a concise summary of methodology components.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is especially strong in highlighting contextual information related to the unique vulnerabilities of women, children, and refugees with disabilities. This report references key national policies that informed WFP's programme design and operations. It describes key international partners, the evolution of the programme's design over time, and presents relevant information on wider gender, equity and inclusion dimensions. The report does not identify any previous WFP-commissioned assessments or evaluations that may have informed the design of the intervention under review. Moreover, it could have described more fully how the gender dimension was specifically integrated into the intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability, as well as the evaluation purpose and rationale. The evaluation scope is clearly delineated in terms of activity, time period, and geographic coverage. The report describes evaluation stakeholders, including the evaluation reference group and lists them along with their respective roles and responsibilities. However, the inclusion of a specific objective related to gender equality and human rights would have given more prominence to these dimensions in the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design and data collection methods are appropriate for the evaluation. Data sources are also appropriate and allow for triangulation of findings. The evaluation matrix was well designed and includes evaluation questions by OECD criteria, relevant indicators, main data sources for each question, data collection methods, data analysis methods, data reliability assumptions, and links to stakeholders and tool reference numbers. Gender equality</p>		

and women’s empowerment (GEWE) is mainstreamed through the evaluation questions. The sampling frame is inclusive and representative of programme beneficiaries, with a key evaluation limitation and the mitigation strategy detailed. The report clearly outlines how ethical standards were considered throughout the evaluation. However, the report is missing an assessment of the intervention monitoring data.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The findings address all evaluation questions and sub-questions in detail with no inconsistency. Report findings provide useful detail, are balanced in terms of programme strengths and challenges, and use figures to demonstrate key points. The level of detail is well balanced across findings, and all details included in the findings are useful and add value to the report. The findings also give strong attention to GEWE and inclusion and indicate where results differ by gender. . The report would have benefited from summary tables that present planned vs. actual outcomes. Moreover, it could have explicitly identified any positive or negative unintended effects of the programme.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

Conclusions reflect a succinct, strategic summary of detailed findings. They are representative of findings and do not omit any important findings or include additional information not included in findings. A Findings-Conclusions-Recommendations Mapping illustrates the logical links between all. Conclusions also highlight gender aspects of the programme activities and identify gender barriers to programme participation. Three lessons learned are presented in report that contribute to wider organizational learning in WFP and guide future action, clearly building on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation. However, the conclusions largely read like key findings for each of the evaluation criteria rather than a more macro-level summary.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	---------------------

The report presents 10 recommendations. Recommendations are feasible based on report content, internally consistent, and flow clearly and logically from findings and conclusions. They include a useful focus on gender and disability issues related to the programme and identify lead and supporting actors for implementation. Each summary paragraph contains helpful contextual information to enable WFP to quickly see why these recommendations were selected and the intended changes they support. Recommendations are prioritized with a timeline for action but would have benefited from being identified as either strategic or operational. The recommendations exceed the WFP maximum word length requirement for decentralized evaluation recommendations.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The evaluation report meets all WFP accessibility and clarity requirements. Annexes are well signposted and report sections are well segued and linked. Annex requirements are met and exceeded, with the addition of more useful annexes beyond those that are required. Data sources are provided in footnotes and in the narrative text. Quotes provide the organizational and role of a respondent and do not contain information that would breach confidentiality. Bolded headings and subheadings, numbered paragraphs, and quotes in shaded grey enable user-friendly reading. While generally very well written, a few typos, missing words, and at least one instance of inconsistent spelling (programme vs. program) were found. The title of the evaluation on the cover page could have been more appropriately identified by referring specifically to the evaluand.

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
--	------------------------------

The evaluation report acknowledges that the programme design was informed by the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) gender analysis and as a result, the programme adopted a plan to promote women’s participation and reduce gender-specific dropout from the program. Human rights and gender equality inclusion are included in a specific evaluation objective and gender was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation framework. Evaluation questions highlight gender issues within the programme design. The sampling method was designed to ensure equal participation by female and male participants and focus group discussion (FGD) locations were selected to support access for both female and male participants. The evaluation report frames the evaluation within a gender

analysis while acknowledging that programme is not designed to address root causes of gender inequality or take specific actions to reduce gender inequality in targeted communities. Report findings highlight barriers to programme participation for women with children and the unique vulnerabilities of refugee women and children and refugees with disabilities. Findings delve below the measure of equal participation to understand possible gender specific reasons for differing programme outcomes. Conclusions describe key ways in which the programme supports GEWE, as well as gender specific barriers to programme participation. Several recommendations address GEWE issues.

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