

Evaluation title	Mali: Une évaluation du portefeuille du PAM (2013-2017)	Evaluation report number	OEV/2017/005
Type	Country Portfolio Evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Centralised
Global/region or country	Mali	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category - Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 64%		Approaches requirements: 6 points	
<p>The evaluation of WFP’s portfolio in Mali between 2013-2017 transparently responds to the given purpose and objectives and presents findings, conclusions and recommendations in a well-balanced and accessible report. The evaluation is presented in the context of wider humanitarian issues and interactions with relevant actors. The report could have been strengthened by a more detailed description of the logical framework of the portfolio. Arguably, an extension of the scope of the evaluation to explicitly address the coverage, sustainability and connectedness of the response would have enhanced its quality.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Partially
<p>The report summary is excessively long including an extensive description of the context and of the key findings, although the latter are presented unevenly (some are brief, and some are described in more detail). As a result, limited space has been given to conclusions, with only some being summarised, and key learning is not described. Furthermore, the conclusions include some new information not present in the report conclusions. The description of the evaluation subject and methodology is also brief and does not provide a full overview of methods used. Main users of the evaluation are not explicitly listed, and the key stakeholders are only partially listed. On the positive side, all recommendations are provided in full.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>A high-level overview of the evaluation subject is provided, including geographical areas of operation, activities and resources, along with a description of changes implemented in response to the evolving political and security situation. The information sources cited appear relevant and reliable. However, beyond the description of the core activities and intended beneficiary numbers, neither the logical framework nor the wider results are presented or discussed.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>Core elements of the evaluation, including the purpose, rationale, period evaluated and intended users are provided. Contextual information on key humanitarian issues, beneficiaries, distribution and main areas of intervention is relevant and up to date. The report would have benefited from further detail on the evaluation objectives, including a discussion of the balance between accountability and learning.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Approaches
<p>Evaluation criteria are not explicitly listed and their application in the context of the evaluation is not discussed in the methodology section, while limitations and mitigation strategies for data gaps as well as application of ethical safeguards are only partially discussed. More rigorous referencing to data sources and triangulation would have strengthened the report. On the positive side, evaluation questions and sub-questions are well-defined and relevant to the subject of the evaluation, although some would have benefitted from further clarification. Nonetheless, the evaluation matrix comprises all core elements, including well described data collection methods and references to previous evaluations, which are cited as data sources and linked to specific evaluation sub-questions.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
<p>WFP contributions to results in terms of technical expertise and logistics are well presented along with a detailed description of contributions provided by other actors (e.g. donors, partners, government agencies) in the country. Findings are also provided in a balanced manner, presenting both positive and negative aspects. Enabling and constraining factors are also discussed. However, whilst some assessment of utilisation of WFP resources is evident, this is not linked with an assessment of the quality of WFP operations, as per the proposed methodology.</p>		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
Conclusions reflect key findings, largely flow logically from the findings and analysis and are presented in a balanced way. However, some conclusions statements appear to introduce results that have not been clearly substantiated within the main body of the report.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
The report presents only a brief and high-level overview of findings related to gender and although specific target groups, including women, were identified as vulnerable throughout the report, they were not systematically addressed in the analysis, nor into conclusions and recommendations. Furthermore, conclusions provide limited detail on equity dimensions. There is scope for further mainstreaming, and greater specificity, of both equity and gender considerations within the recommendations. On the other hand, the methodology clearly outlines ethical standards, including respect for confidentiality, and establishes focus group discussions for women only to ensure women’s voice is heard.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
Recommendations derive logically from conclusions, appear broadly realistic and actionable and are presented with a clear timeframe for their implementation. Whilst recommendations are relevant to the evaluation purpose and objective, they could have been pitched at a more strategic level given the evaluation's role in informing the future country strategy.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report is logically structured and uses clear language, visual aids, and an appropriately balanced and objective tone throughout. Key messages are often summarised within each sub-section, but this is not done consistently, with implications for the overall clarity and use of the report.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI score	6

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
Meets requirements: 60–74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements