

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of Joint WFP/UNICEF/ILO Programme: Towards a Universal and Holistic Social Protection Floor for Persons with Disabilities and Older Persons in the State of Palestine 2020-2022	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - JE	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>The report of the Evaluation of the Joint WFP/UNICEF/ILO Programme “Towards a Universal and Holistic Social Protection Floor for Persons with Disabilities and Older Persons in the State of Palestine 2020-2022” is a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with confidence. The report is particularly strong in providing relevant information on internal and external contextual developments during the programme implementation period and on intersectional vulnerabilities related to gender, old age, and disability in Palestine. In its methodology, the evaluation effectively draws on a range of data sources and methods of data collection and includes thoughtful consideration on how to mainstream issues of gender and inclusion. The findings are evidence-based and address the evaluation questions. The five recommendations are relevant to the objectives of the evaluation and identify responsible agencies and timeframes for action at the conclusion of the programme. The summary, on the other hand, fails to sufficiently capture the conclusions of the main report. Findings do not include disaggregated data or the voices of women who participated in focus groups, and they do not identify the contributions of WFP to results within the joint programme. Finally, the scope of the evaluation and the transfer modalities of the programme could have been summarized more clearly in the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary presents concise information on most evaluation features, key findings, and recommendations from the main report. However, the evaluation questions are not referenced in the summary findings and GEWE-related findings discussed in the main report are not mentioned. The conclusions are too brief and do not fully capture those in the main report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good description of the evaluation context, reflecting upon gender equality and equity dimensions. The report references analytical work that informed changes in the programme and makes appropriate reference to gender and disability and inclusion considerations. However, the context section does not include a discussion of the Agenda 2030 framework and some important contextual information is missing. The overview of the subject presents information on activities and cooperating partners, as well as the implementation period. It also introduces disaggregated data of beneficiaries, the results framework, and the theory of change. Additionally, gender and broader equity dimensions of the intervention are appropriately discussed. However, the geographic coverage and the transfer modalities of the programming could have been outlined in greater detail.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation objectives and purpose are clearly outlined, as are the intended users, stakeholders, and uses of the evaluation. Human rights and gender are incorporated in the evaluation framework through the evaluation questions. However, the scope of the evaluation is only outlined in general terms while specific activities, geography or dimensions covered by the evaluation itself are not stated.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed methods approach, and its data sources and methods of data analysis, are clearly described in the main report and in complementary annexes. The methodological design includes gender-sensitive approaches to data collection to ensure the perceptions and priorities of women and men were represented in data analysis, as well as those from other vulnerable groups such as older people and people with disabilities. The evaluability assessment offers a clear discussion of the mitigation measures used for each limitation identified in the evaluation. However,</p>		

changes made to the original evaluation questions are not explained in the report, and the sampling frame for key informant interviews is not detailed.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The evaluation addresses all evaluation questions and sub-questions in the findings, and these are presented in a nuanced way that considers contextual factors, including the COVID-19 pandemic and the 11-Day War. The report reflects the voices of different stakeholder groups. However, the specific contributions of WFP to the achievement of results are not clearly identified and voices from focus group discussion participants are given less prominence than key informant interview participants. There is no data broken down by gender and unanticipated effects specific to human rights and gender equality are not discussed.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The conclusions flow logically from the findings with attention paid to GEWE-related issues. While some conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction, in general the conclusions could have been framed to address the implications of the findings for future programming more effectively.		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The evaluation makes five recommendations that include a timeframe for action and identify responsible actors. The recommendations logically derive from the evaluation findings, are ranked, and address GEWE issues specifically. However, more could have been done to address WFP constraints in their implementation.		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
The report is well written, using understandable and professional language and makes good use of tables, graphs, and figures to depict information. Key information is highlighted visually, and the report includes the required lists. However, not all annexes are referenced in the main report when it would have been appropriate to do so, not all acronyms are spelled out at first use, and a few spelling and grammatical errors were found in the report.		

<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
The evaluation effectively addresses GEWE considerations across several sections of the report. The context section provides relevant information pertaining to specific social groups in Palestine, notably women, people with disabilities, and older people, including how these vulnerabilities intersect. GEWE is clearly mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis, across the evaluation criteria and within the evaluation framework. The methodology was gender-responsive, reflected in the mixed-methods design and in the use of a variety of data sources and processes. For example, the evaluation used gender-disaggregated focus groups and related data collection tools. While the findings sometimes triangulate the voices of different social role groups, the voices of women from the focus groups are not specifically represented and data is not broken down by gender to support the findings. While unanticipated effects are addressed in the report's findings, these do not specifically address gender equality or human rights. The report includes multiple sub-recommendations that address GEWE issues.	

<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><u>Definition at criterion level:</u> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i><u>Definition at overall report level:</u> 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><u>Definition at criterion level:</u> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i><u>Definition at overall report level:</u> 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><u>Definition at criterion level:</u> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>