

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation Of WFP Livelihood Support, Asset Creation and Climate Adaptation Activities in Iraq from January 2020 to December 2021	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>The report for the Evaluation of WFP Livelihood Support, Asset Creation and Climate Adaptation Activities in Iraq from January 2020 to December 2021 is a well written report that evaluation users can rely on with confidence. A key strength of the report is its robust reflection on gender equality and broader equity dimensions relevant to the programme, notably in the contextual overview of changes (e.g., COVID-19, drought) which influenced the programme since its mid-term. The findings of the report are also strong, drawing on a range of data sources and methods of data collection. They answer the evaluation questions and sub-questions with due consideration given for how gender issues were mainstreamed within the programme at its mid-point. The seven recommendations at the end of the report are relevant for future resiliency programming. While overall a strong report, there are some areas for improvement. The report's methodology could have included more details on the quality of monitoring data and the sampling frame for interviews and focus groups. In addition, while gender is effectively mainstreamed, there is little attention to broader equity and inclusion dimensions (e.g., IDPs, disability, etc.) in the conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. Finally, some of the required annexes were not included in the final version of the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary presents concise information on most evaluation features and key findings, including gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) -related ones, and recommendations from the main report. However, the lessons learned omit important information on timeframe and prioritization and a discussion of the evaluation context is lacking.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides an excellent description of the evaluation context, reflecting upon gender equality and equity dimensions. Relevant national policies and the SDGs are also described. There is good discussion of important contextual changes which influenced the programme at its mid-term. Relevant analytical work that informed changes in the programme is noted and the planned activities of the programme are clearly explained. The evaluation subject is well described, and includes details on the geographic coverage, implementation period and beneficiary numbers disaggregated where relevant. Gender dimensions and broader equity considerations are included and discussed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives and purpose are clearly outlined for the reader, as are the intended users, stakeholders, and uses of the evaluation. The scope of the evaluation is clearly presented, and human rights and gender are incorporated in the evaluation objectives through evaluation questions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed methods approach, its chosen data sources and methods of data analysis were appropriate for answering the evaluation questions and allowed for effective data collection from a variety of stakeholders. Evaluation activities were carried out with attention to GEWE issues. However, little information is provided on the availability and quality of monitoring data, including if any progress was made on human rights and gender. The methodology does not sufficiently address the sampling rationale, including how other vulnerable groups were included in this evaluation, such as IDPs or refugees.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>This report includes strong findings that are balanced and address all evaluation questions, considering contextual factors, including the COVID-19 pandemic and drought in the country. The report includes the voices of different</p>		

<p>stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, reflecting a diversity of views to support effective data triangulation. Disaggregated data is used when available. The section also discusses the application of recommendations from a previous study on mainstreaming gender. However, the contributions of other actors to the results of the programme could have been made clearer in some instances.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions flow logically from the findings with attention given to GEWE-related issues. However, the conclusions could have been better formulated to address their wider implications for the future of the programme and could have brought forward wider equity concerns discussed in the findings. The report includes lessons learned which are broadly framed to be applicable for future programming related to resilience activities.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation makes seven recommendations that include a timeframe for action and identify responsible actors. They derive logically from the evaluation findings and address GEWE issues specifically. However, more could have been done to address WFP constraints in their implementation, to clearly prioritize the recommendations, and to be specific concerning broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written, using understandable and professional language and makes good use of tables, graphs, and figures to depict information. The report provides sources for data and quotes and is within the required word limit. There is very effective use of bolding to highlight key information and the report includes all the required lists. However, some annexes are missing while the annexes that are included are not referenced in the same order that they appear in the report.</p>		

<b>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</b>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 7 points
<p>This evaluation effectively addresses GEWE considerations in its analysis. The context provides relevant information on gender and GEWE is clearly mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis. The methodology was gender-responsive, reflected in the mixed-methods design and in the use of a variety of data sources and processes. The methodology was centred on participatory and gender-responsive approaches, including key accountability to affected persons principles, this being important given the context of the evaluation, although more could have been included to demonstrate how vulnerable groups were addressed the sampling frame of the evaluation. The findings draw upon the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups and make use of disaggregated data throughout. For example, the voices of women beneficiaries are drawn upon explicitly in the findings. One unanticipated effect related to gender is identified in the report’s findings. The report includes one recommendation that specifically address GEWE issues.</p>	

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>