

Evaluation title	Evaluation thématique sur les questions de genre dans les interventions du PAM en République centrafricaine 2014-2018	Evaluation report number	DE/CFCO/2018/023
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	
Approaches requirements: 50%		Meets requirements: 7 points	
<p>The Evaluation thématique sur les questions de genre dans les interventions du PAM en République centrafricaine 2014-2018 approaches requirements. The overview of the evaluation subject and the description of the context do not provide a sufficient level of depth and analysis. Similarly, while the methodology deploys a mix of methods, it could have been further developed to allow for a more robust assessment of gender equality issues. Findings could also have been strengthened through an expansion of the evidence base and conclusions are too broad and not well linked to the findings and analyses. Nevertheless, the focus on 'Gender and protection' in the recommendations derives from the findings in the field and addresses the evaluation's purpose and objectives, and GEWE dimensions are well integrated in the objectives, evaluation questions and indicators. Qualitative information collected through interviews and focus groups highlights the critical importance of the protection of women when benefitting from WFP's programmes.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
While the report summary includes most of the basic information on the evaluation purpose and objectives, type, questions, period, and scope, important information, such as the rationale for the choice of data collection methods and limitations is not adequately presented. Findings could have also been better summarised to improve accessibility and conclusions could have been better linked to findings. Moreover, only the headlines of the recommendations in the report are included in the summary, contributing to a significant loss of information. Nevertheless, the length and the structure of the summary make it accessible to read and key findings are listed by evaluation question.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially
There are several shortcomings in relation to the scope and depth of the information provided on the overview of the evaluation subject. In particular, a broader analysis of the subject and adaptations to the design of the subject made during implementation are missing. The achievements expected from the gender approach are also not analysed beyond the broad objectives of WFP regarding gender. Despite these shortcomings, the overview provides some information on the evaluation subject, its purpose, main partners' and the projects under scrutiny with limited information on their activities and expected results.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Partially
The description of the context would have benefited from a more balanced and in-depth understanding of challenges and opportunities for promoting gender equality, with less emphasis on factors outside the control of WFP (i.e. political crises, causalities of conflicts and food security). While the information provided on the crises and conflicts in CAR provides useful background, it does not clarify how these may have influenced the results of the WFP's gender equality approach in the country. Nevertheless, relevant information on the situation of women, humanitarian issues and security and logistical issues is provided.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Approaches
The evaluation covers the evaluation criteria indicated in the ToRs, and these are consistently applied across the report. The methodology details the evaluation questions (and sub-questions), sources and data collection methods. It has also been tailored to the security context with its corresponding logistical challenges, with limitations clarified and mitigated by the use of interviews. Ethical safeguards have been taken into consideration. Despite these strengths, many aspects of the method could have been further developed. For example, the evaluation matrix could have provided a more rigorous framework of indicators and more differentiated data-collection tools. Analytical tools could have been described in greater depth with reference to the extent that the data has been triangulated. Indicators are also mostly qualitative with no baseline; they look for changes with no benchmark or other success criteria.		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Partially
<p>While all of the evaluation questions are addressed, the links between the questions and the analysis is often weak and the evidence base is limited. The information presented often relies on individual cases or resorts to general descriptions of contextual/cultural challenges. Achievements related to gender equality are generally analysed as women gaining access to something, rather than as the effect of that access on gender equality and are not clearly assessed against targets. Little focus is placed on considering reasons for underachievement. Nonetheless, findings are structured around the five main evaluations questions and essential findings are highlighted, as well as good practices (in boxes). Examples from the field visits and interviews are often quoted to support main findings, as well as secondary sources.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Partially
<p>Conclusions are too broad and do not clearly reflect and summarise the key findings and evidence gathered on the subject matter. Achievements regarding gender equality are not at the core of conclusions, which are more focused on the generalities of WFP activities in CAR and the issues faced when attempting to gather evidence. Boxes labelled 'lesson learned' mainly present essential findings or good practices from other United Nations agencies. They are not adequately justified or contextualised. Nevertheless, conclusions are grouped by evaluation criteria and reflect both positive and negative findings.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
<p>Gender equality and women's empowerment dimensions are well addressed and integrated in the objectives, evaluation questions and indicators. WFP's policies and instruments in relation to gender equality are analysed. The GEWE dimensions are integrated into the methodology as a whole as well as into the mix of methods applied. Recommendations address GEWE integration and ethical standards have been applied throughout the process. The evaluation, however, does not describe the unintended effects of the WFP activities under review. Moreover, equity and human rights' dimensions are not addressed by the evaluation, and the analysis is not differentiated by social groups.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
<p>Recommendations address the evaluation's purpose and objectives. They are specific, actionable and identify responsible actors (WFP country and regional offices). The focus on 'Gender and protection' derives from the findings in the field and is well justified. The link between the recommendations and the rest of the evaluation (findings and conclusions) is weak, with the exception of those related to the 'Gender and protection' cluster. Nevertheless, most recommendations call for capacity building in WFP and with its partners, while it is not clear that proposed actions take WFP's constraints, particularly financial resources, into consideration. The proposed time-schedule of the recommendations, most of which should be actioned in the short-term, is also not realistic.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The language used in the report is easily accessible and the tone of the report is appropriately balanced. Various formatting techniques, including boxes and bold, are used to highlight the essential messages. However, the findings from interviews and focus groups could have been more clearly sourced.</p>		

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

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports	
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator	
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