

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Syrian Arab Republic WFP Transitional and Interim Country Strategic Plans 2018-2025	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 87%	
<p>The Evaluation of Syrian Arab Republic WFP Transitional and Interim Country Strategic Plans 2018-2025 is a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with confidence. Recommendations are a key strength as they are relevant, prioritized, targeted and actionable and take contextual constraints into account, which is important given the ongoing crisis in Syria. The summary of the report is also strong and can serve as a standalone document. The report's findings draw on a range of data sources, including feedback from beneficiaries whose voices are clearly highlighted throughout the findings. The findings also consider adherence to International Humanitarian Principles and make clear reference to WFP contributions to results. The report's conclusions have strategic implications for future WFP programming in Syria and include reflections on gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) dimensions of the country programming. In terms of weaknesses, there is a lack of attention to gaps in monitoring data in the methodological design, which also does not specify the sampling frame for FGDs as it relates to the inclusion of the most vulnerable. The contextual overview leaves out important information from the main report which would be relevant to the Syrian context, such as climate change and agriculture.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report presents a very good synthesis of the evaluation which captures key features. There is an effective summary of the evaluation conclusions, and the evaluation recommendations are included as they are in the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The subject of the evaluation is clearly presented. There is a helpful overview of WFP programming in the country and references to relevant analytical work that informed the Interim Country Strategic Plan (ICSP) design and implementation. The main features of the ICSP's internal logic are also outlined. However, key contextual information such as basic data on agriculture is missing from the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the evaluation objectives, purpose, users, stakeholders and uses of the evaluation. Issues of gender and human rights were mainstreamed in the evaluation, yet gender equality was not included in the evaluation objectives nor were ICSP target groups identified.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed-methods approach is described in the main report and it is relevant to address evaluation questions. Gender equality is addressed through dedicated evaluation sub-questions and indicators. Evaluation activities were carried out in alignment with ethical standards. The required components of the evaluation matrix are clearly articulated and appropriate for the mixed-methods approach. However, there was no assessment of CSP monitoring data and no discussion of the adequacy of monitoring data to assess cross-cutting issues related to equity and inclusion. The sampling frame of participants at the community level could have considered more clearly the inclusion of the most vulnerable.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>All evaluation questions and sub-questions are addressed in the report's findings with supporting evidence presented transparently. WFP contributions to results are noted and many important contextual factors are highlighted. The findings also address how the ICSP design applied the International Humanitarian Principles in the context of the ongoing crisis in Syria. The voices of beneficiaries are included, but at times it is difficult to identify when information is sourced from different stakeholders. The findings could have also addressed how recommendations from previous evaluations were built into the current intervention design.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions reflect on the strategic implications of the evaluation findings for the future of the WFP programming in Syria, including both strengths and weaknesses. They do not introduce any new information and include reflections on GEWE dimensions. The conclusions could have more clearly highlighted links to national development goals or the sustainable development goals (SDGs).</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation includes five realistic recommendations that offer a good balance between being specific while allowing for changes depending on implementation context. These include GEWE and equity dimensions. A particular strength is the clear identification of external constraints which informed the recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>This report is accessible for the reader, is written clearly and is well formatted. The report follows the required template and includes all the required annexes. It makes good use of visual aids and there is very good use of summaries to communicate key information.</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	Approaches requirements: 6 points
<p>The report approaches requirements for GEWE considerations. It highlights the impact of food insecurity on internally displaced persons and on women in Syria. Although there is no specific evaluation objective on human rights and gender, this ICSP evaluation considered gender equality and women's empowerment in its methodology, including through evaluation questions and sub-questions. A gender-sensitive approach to data collection was used (e.g., separate FGDs by gender) and relevant ethical standards were observed. The findings make good use of disaggregated data to demonstrate findings related to gender. There is one recommendation that focuses specifically on gender mainstreaming pertaining to aid delivery and accountability to crisis-affected populations. However, unanticipated effects related to gender are not specifically addressed in the findings. The report does not clearly comment on the availability of monitoring data on GEWE-relevant indicators in the discussion of the methodology.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</p>
Satisfactory	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</p>
Partly Satisfactory	<p><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.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</p>

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>