

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Rapport final del'évaluation conjointe FAO/PAM du projet "Appui à la résilience des populations vulnérables au nord du Mali"	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	DE/MLCO/2017/001
<b>Type</b>	Thematic evaluation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Mali	<b>PHQA date</b>	March 2019
<b>Overall category – Quality rating</b>		<b>Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating</b>	
<b>Meets requirements: 61%</b>		<b>Meets requirements: 7 points</b>	

The joint evaluation of FAO and WFP’s Support for the Resilience of Vulnerable Populations in North Mali meets requirements. The report presents well the context, purpose and scope and includes a comprehensive, well detailed methodology. Gender dimensions are integrated in specific findings, conclusions and recommendations, with the latter being relevant and consistent with the analysis. Suggested areas of improvement include greater triangulation of evidence, as well as the inclusion of better substantiated conclusions.

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The summary is succinct, readable and provides a good overview of the key findings, conclusions and recommendations. It lists all the evaluation questions without omissions and provides details on the period being evaluated, the scope and the main users of the evaluation. The section would have benefitted from more details on the analysis methods and on major limitations encountered.		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Partially</b>
The overview of the evaluation subject omits key elements such as information on transfer amounts and delivery modalities. Providing greater detail on programmatic adaptations or why some activities have not progressed as planned would have been useful, as well. Finally, a critical reflection on the theory of change (ToC) would have helped the reader to get a better understanding of the logic and design of the programme. Nevertheless, the overview draws on relevant sources of information and discusses the main partners in detail.		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
Contextual information provided is comprehensive, covering also gender and equity dimensions. Relevant humanitarian issues, as well as Government policies, priorities and institutional capacity are well described in the section. Key elements such as the purpose, rationale for the timing, and period being evaluated are all stated. The objectives are linked to the wider evaluation purpose and the balance between learning and accountability is made explicit. More information on the sources and on how the context affected the results of the intervention would have further strengthened the section.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The methodology clearly presents the evaluation criteria, framework, methods and sampling approach. A well detailed evaluation matrix is provided in the Annexes and the application of triangulation principles and analytical methods are well described in the narrative. However, evaluation questions are not explicitly listed and more information on limitations and mitigation strategies in relation to the lack of quantitative data would have strengthened the section.		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Approaches</b>
Findings heavily rely on beneficiary opinion with not enough triangulation from other sources of data. Furthermore, they do not consider how recommendations from previous evaluations have been addressed. Providing more detail on why some issues occurred and whether the programme might have mitigated or prevented them from occurring would have strengthened the section. Nevertheless, it presents in a well-structured table the enabling and constraining factors, as well as unintended benefits for young beneficiaries.		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Approaches</b>
Conclusions are brief and would have benefitted from further substantiation. They are not balanced, either, with negative findings being given more prominence. Furthermore, the lessons learned are not significant and their applicability to other contexts is questionable. Nevertheless, conclusions flow logically from the findings and analysis.		

<b>CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
Gender dimensions are well integrated in the methodology and gender-specific findings, conclusions and recommendations are included in the report. However, they could have been improved by providing more analysis of different social groups and paying more attention to equity dimensions.		
<b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The recommendations are succinct and follow logically from the findings and conclusions. They are also clearly grouped and prioritised. Yet, specifying actors more explicitly would have helped the reader better identify who within WFP and FAO should take these recommendations forward.		
<b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The report is logically structured and meets the length requirements. There is also good use of tables; however, a greater number of maps and graphs would have helped the reading. In addition, information is not always properly cited.		

<b>Gender EPI</b>	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
<b>Overall EPI score</b>	<b>7</b>

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