

Evaluation title	Évaluation des programmes intégrés de cantines scolaires financés par l'Ambassade des Pays Bas (provinces Bubanza, Bujumbura rural et Cibitoke) et par l'Union européenne (province Gitega) et mis en œuvre par le PAM au Burundi 2016 à 2018	Evaluation report number	DE/BICO/2018/021
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Country	PHQA date	January 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 73%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The « Evaluation des programmes intégrés de cantines scolaires financés par l'Ambassade des Pays-Bas et par l'Union européenne et mis en œuvre par le PAM au Burundi 2016 à 2018 » meets requirements. The report is well structured and easy to read, making findings and analyses accessible to its intended audience. The methodology is fit for the purpose, with an adequate mix of methods and a sampling rationale appropriate for the evaluation. The evaluation matrix is robust and well-structured around each evaluation question, with realistic indicators and sources of verification. Findings are clearly explained, concisely presented and based on a large body of descriptive evidence which is generated transparently through the systematic use of quotes and extracts from interviews. The evaluation demonstrates a clear awareness of the importance of the gender dimensions relevant to the programme. Nevertheless, there are a few areas which could have been improved. Equity dimensions are not considered. Conclusions are overly descriptive and could have provided insights at a more strategic level and recommendations, while specific and actionable, could have given greater consideration to financial constraints, prioritisation and a timeframe for action.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The report summary is comprehensive and succinct, providing a clear and accessible overview of the main results of the evaluation. All conclusions and recommendations are concisely presented. The balance between the sections supports the understanding of essential messages, and the overall credibility of the evaluation process. Additional detail on the methodology and the evaluation users could have further strengthened the summary.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>The overview is well structured, easy to read and presents important information on the two interventions under review. The evaluation questions are presented and are consistent with the purpose of the evaluation. An assessment of the quality of the logical framework of the two projects is provided including weaknesses at the indicator level. However, a more in-depth description of the analytical background of the evaluation subject could have been provided.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>The discussion of context provides relevant and important facts and figures. The picture of child nutrition is clear, particularly for girls. The link with access to education (number of dropouts) is highlighted. Up to date information is provided and the scope of the evaluation is explicitly described. While gender dimensions are discussed, this section could have been strengthened by providing more in-depth targeted analysis of the gender dimensions of the subject matter.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The methodology is well structured, using a comprehensive mix of methods (document review, data collection and treatment, interviews, and field observation) which are appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation. The sampling strategy is well justified and provides a good analytical foundation for the evaluation. The evaluation matrix is structured by well-designed evaluation questions, each with a set of indicators clearly linked to the subject. Triangulation of evidence sources is explained, ethical safeguards are considered, and their implementation is explained. However, the methodology does not include a description of the anticipated and unanticipated risks that arose during the evaluation and any mitigation measures that may have been taken.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
Findings are derived from a comprehensive set of data-collection tools/approaches and systematically referenced. They are well presented and triangulated from different sources, with the right balance between positive and negative issues. The evaluation is orientated towards effectiveness. Contextual factors are also considered and provide a good basis for developing useful conclusions and recommendations. While the findings and analysis exceed requirements, the interpretation of the efficiency evaluation criteria could have been more aligned with the best use of available resources.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
The conclusions comprehensively summarize the evidence in a concise manner without any notable omissions or gaps. Evidence is presented in a concise manner, with no unsubstantiated judgements. The tone is professional and balanced. Nevertheless, the conclusions mainly summarise the findings and could have provided more insights at a strategic level. In addition, lessons learned mainly repeat common knowledge rather than innovative aspects that have been inferred from the evaluation of the two interventions and are therefore of limited added value to wider organisational learning in WFP.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
Strong consideration of Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (GEWE) is evident in the evaluation methods and reporting. Although GEWE is not included as a stand-alone criterion nor clearly mainstreamed in other evaluation criteria, it is mainstreamed in the evaluation objectives. Disaggregated data is used and the different viewpoints of girls and boys, women and men are reflected. Unintended effects are also explored and identified in relation to gender equality. The GEWE analysis is addressed through a dedicated recommendation. Where the evaluation falls short in terms of gender and equity, is in the integration of equity dimensions, which are not addressed in the report. There is no discussion of what was done to ensure the inclusion of diverse groups, nor does the evaluation explicitly triangulate the voices of different social groups beyond gender.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches
While recommendations are clearly and concisely presented, specific and actionable, several aspects could have been further strengthened. Recommendations do not address the management and implementation of the two interventions. Greater consideration could have also been given to the resource constraints of WFP and the Government of Burundi. Finally, the main recommendations are not prioritised and no clear timeframe for action is provided. Nevertheless, strategic recommendations are differentiated from operational ones. They derive logically from the findings, and rightly address the evaluation purpose and objectives.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The evaluation is well structured, easy to read, and makes the findings and analyses accessible to the intended audience and beyond. Essential messages are highlighted by a concise summary at the end of each evaluation question. The tone of the evaluation, systematic use of quotes and referencing of sources all contribute to the credibility of the results. The accessibility of the evaluation could be improved with the inclusion of graphs and diagrams to illustrate quantitative analyses and reasoning.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	2
Overall EPI score	8

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