

Evaluation title	Evaluation of the EU MADAD Project: "Strengthening safety nets in Lebanon to support the most vulnerable Lebanese and Syrian refugees: February 2019 - February 2025"	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 83%	
<p>The Evaluation of the EU MADAD Project: "Strengthening safety nets in Lebanon to support the most vulnerable Lebanese and Syrian refugees: February 2019 - February 2025" can be used by decision makers with confidence. The evaluation employs a robust theory-based methodology, and a diverse mix of data collection methods appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. The report presents a clear overview of the evaluation context, objectives, and methodology. Its findings are balanced and draw on triangulated evidence from multiple sources. The conclusions flow logically from findings and provide strategic insights that inform the recommendations. The report is well structured, professionally written, and makes good use of visual aids. It could, however, have been strengthened by more systematically using the reconstructed theory of change (ToC) to frame findings, and more consistently quantifying the extent to which planned outcomes were achieved across project components. It could also have provided a deeper analysis of the WFP's relative contribution to results compared with other actors and differential impacts across diverse groups. Finally, some of the redundancies within the findings could have been avoided and the recommendations could have articulated more clearly specific changes rather than maintaining existing practices.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary can serve as a standalone overview of the evaluation to support decision-making. It effectively presents the key features of the evaluation, outlines the context and subject, and appropriately summarizes the main conclusions and recommendations. However, the summary could have been strengthened by incorporating one or two visual aids from the main report to illustrate project performance more clearly, and by including a brief summary of selected lessons learned highlighted in the main report.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a detailed and relevant overview of key contextual features and developments and offers a thorough description of the evaluation subject. It clearly identifies disadvantaged groups pertinent to the Lebanese and Syrian refugees and mentions intersecting factors - such as age and disability - that contribute to their marginalization.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly and concisely presents the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. It explicitly notes that gender equality was mainstreamed across the dual objectives of accountability and learning. However, the report could have benefited from further elaboration on how gender equality was mainstreamed in the evaluation purpose and objectives.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's theory-based methodology and diverse data collection and analysis methods are appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. The evaluations questions are coherent, manageable, and clearly operationalized through related sub-questions, indicators, data sources, and data collection and analysis methods. The report identifies the limitations encountered and mitigation strategies applied. The evaluation consistently applied WFP and UNEG ethical standards and norms. However, the methodology section could have been strengthened by incorporating insights from the evaluability assessment on the availability and quality of data on gender equality. In addition, it could have more explicitly articulated how the reconstructed theory of change and contribution analysis were used within the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory

The report presents clear findings on all evaluation questions, drawing upon evidence from multiple data sources. The findings impartially capture both the strengths and weaknesses of the project. They triangulate data across stakeholder groups and appropriately consider gender equality and broader equity issues where relevant. However, findings related to "impact" could have been strengthened by elaborating on differences among beneficiary groups, and by more systematically using the reconstructed theory of change (ToC). The report also could have benefited from more consistent quantification of progress towards planned outcomes across project components, as well as greater detail on the relative contribution of WFP compared with other actors. While not required in the terms of reference, the evaluation could have assessed the project's adherence to humanitarian principles.

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

The report presents well-articulated conclusions that connect findings across evaluation questions and outline strategic implications for accountability and decision-making. The conclusions avoid major gaps and do not introduce new information. They also integrate consideration of gender equality and include practical lessons learned with potential for wider application. However, the conclusions could have been strengthened by more fully reflecting gender and equity dimensions. In addition, the lessons learned could have been more effective by focusing more clearly on articulating what was learned, rather than blurring into prescriptive recommendations.

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

The five recommendations presented are forward-looking and logically derive from the findings and conclusions. Overall, they are realistic, feasible, and actionable, with most assigning clear responsibility to lead actors. However, the recommendations could have been further strengthened by articulating more explicitly the specific change each one aims to achieve, ensuring they directly address areas for improvement identified in the findings, and providing greater specificity to enhance their actionability. Additionally, prioritizing and categorizing the recommendations more clearly would have improved their usability for decisionmakers.

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

The report is logically structured, internally consistent, and written in a clear, concise, and professional language, free from grammatical or stylistic errors. It appropriately cites all data sources and makes effective use of footnotes, cross-referencing, and signposting. It also employs visual aids such as tables, figures, and textboxes to present information clearly, and highlights key messages through strategic use of bolding and textboxes. However, the readability of the findings section could have been enhanced by avoiding redundancies across subsections.

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

The evaluation effectively integrated GEWE considerations into several evaluation questions and applied a mixed-methods approach that captured a broad range of stakeholder perspectives. The report clearly explains how gender issues were addressed during data collection and analysis, consistently triangulates the views of different social groups, and disaggregates quantitative data where appropriate. One of the recommendations explicitly focuses on gender equality. However, the evaluation could have been further strengthened by elaborating on the availability and quality of gender-related information, and by analyzing how multiple and intersecting vulnerabilities may compound disadvantages for specific groups. Additionally, a more explicit examination of unanticipated effects – positive or negative - and their implications for gender equality and human rights would have enriched the analysis.

Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard

UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Meets requirements
---	--------------------

The evaluation TOR and evaluation questions consider disability inclusion. The sampling approach aimed to include persons with disabilities; however, it is not clear to what extent this intention was fully realized during data collection. The report provides some quantitative information on the prevalence of disability among beneficiaries and in the broader context, and disability inclusion is discussed in the conclusions as well as in one recommendation.

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.