

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of UNHCR/WFP's Joint Action for Multipurpose Cash Assistance under ECHO in Lebanon	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 84%	
<p>The evaluation of UNHCR/WFP's Joint Action for Multipurpose Cash Assistance under ECHO in Lebanon includes credible evaluation findings that can be used with confidence for decision-making. It includes all the necessary elements with useful complementary information provided in the annexes. The context and overview sections are comprehensive and contain critical information about the country, WFP work and the challenges faced by some vulnerable groups and the Cash and Voucher Assistance programme. The methodological design is best described as mixed method approach that would enable some level of triangulation of data. Findings are balanced, well-organized and respond to all evaluation questions. This section includes the Gender and Social Inclusion (Vulnerability) analysis to address the specific questions. However, gender and social inclusion considerations could have been more consistently integrated in all relevant areas of the evaluation. The evaluation objectives and scope should also have been outlined more clearly. Conclusions and recommendations are well presented. The recommendations are mostly concrete and actionable, although they should have been more direct and consistent in terms of responsibility for their implementation. It would have been helpful to include more details on the role of other stakeholders and to consider referencing them in the recommendations section. The evolution of the programme could also have been more succinctly summarized. The report is well written, structured, and easy to navigate. Overall, the report could have been shortened to enhance accessibility.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary is well written. It makes good use of a table to summarize the evaluation conclusions and recommendations. However, the summary exceeds the maximum length requirements. The findings should have been presented more concisely, while the context could have included more details about the refugee situation disaggregated by gender and social inclusion.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The context provides critical information about the country and important socioeconomic features, but fails to discuss the nutritional situation. It also includes a good analysis of the challenges faced by women but does not present disaggregation to describe other vulnerabilities. The overview of the evaluation subject presents a detailed description of UNHCR's and WFP's work related to and connected to the programme under review.. However, there is no reference to the logic of the intervention, the information on planned and actual transfers is scarce and it does not include gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the subject of the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report outlines the evaluation purpose but the specific objectives are poorly described, only referencing that the evaluation was conducted to strengthen programme design. Furthermore, the scope of the evaluation is not well described and there is also no reference to how gender and human rights were to be considered or integrated into the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design demonstrates a mixed method approach that would enable some level of triangulation of data. However, several the evaluation matrix fails to detail the data collection methods to address each question, and some of the indicators that were identified appear difficult to quantify. Details on changes to the methodology are provided while noting that the approach stems almost exclusively from what was proposed in the evaluation terms of</p>		

reference. The Annex section includes critical information related to the use of mixed method approaches including questionnaires and a comprehensive bibliography. Limitations, mitigation strategies and the ethical considerations, risks and safeguards are comprehensive and well presented. However, the sampling strategy refers to beneficiaries without properly disaggregating them by gender and vulnerable populations. Similarly, the focus group discussions and telephone survey do not clearly demonstrate how gender and social inclusion considerations were explored. Finally, some of the information contained in the Annex could have been summarized in the main report to enhance accessibility and understanding.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The findings demonstrate a good balance in presenting strengths and weaknesses. The section is well organized, with the information presented and linked to the evaluation questions and sub-questions. There is a clear demonstration of triangulation of data that is well referenced, including the use of footnotes to cite secondary data. The use of multiple graphs and tables helps to further illustrate the findings. While there are sections specifically addressing gender and social inclusion, integration of these dimensions could have been done more consistently throughout the section.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The conclusions are well presented and structured, with clear links to the findings and to the evaluation questions. The conclusions enable the reader to gain a quick snapshot of key content found in the much longer findings section. They also offer opportunities for strategic decision making. Gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) is well reflected in relation to the specific questions on GEWE. While the gender questions are well presented, GEWE could have been more consistently integrated throughout the conclusions rather than in relation to specific questions.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The recommendations are clear and concise despite not meeting WFP length requirements. They are realistic, actionable and clearly note the conclusions to which they are linked. However, the recommendations should have consistently assigned responsibility for their implementation. They could also have been grouped more explicitly as either operational or strategic.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

The report is well written and organized and has no typos or grammatical errors. It is well sourced and signposted. It includes several helpful tables that complement the information provided. The only notable weakness in terms of accessibility is the length of the report which does not meet WFP requirements.

**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>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Approaches requirements: 4 points
--	-----------------------------------

The analysis on gender is much stronger in the findings section than in the previous sections where further detail would have been helpful, including on the different vulnerabilities of beneficiaries. The indicators in the evaluation matrix are insufficient to be able to consistently capture gender considerations, although the methodology section includes some good details on how gender and social inclusion were considered. It would have been advisable for the document review to include more comprehensive literature on gender and gender-based violence. Moreover, additional details on how gender sensitivities such as discussions about gender-based violence were accommodated would have been helpful. The findings section is particularly strong in providing good analysis of gender issues. Finally, the report includes two recommendations focused specifically on gender and social inclusion that are clear and concrete.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

<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>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

<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>