

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Évaluation du Programme de Traitement de la Malnutrition Aiguë Modérée dans les Provinces de Cankuzo, Kirundo, Ngozi et Rutana, Burundi	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized – Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>Overall, this is a well written evaluation report that presents a satisfactory assessment of the Programme for Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition in the provinces of Cankuzo, Kirundo, Ngozi and Rutana in Burundi. The evaluation findings can be used by decision makers with confidence as they are based on a strong analysis of primary and secondary sources, providing the perspectives of different stakeholders in a balanced manner. Relevant contextual information is provided, as well as some of the key details on the programme. The mixed-methods approach was relevant for this evaluation, allowing for triangulation of data sources and methods and unbiased answers to evaluation questions. Conclusions and recommendations flow logically from the findings and gender equality and women’s empowerment considerations are well-integrated. However, several areas could have been further strengthened, including the overview of the programmes expected results (outputs, outcomes) and related activities, and the assessment of WFP’s contribution to the overall objective of the Moderate Acute Malnutrition programme. In addition, some of the conclusions could have been more strategic, discussing the implications of the findings in terms of the future of the program, and recommendations could have been prioritized.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary presents succinct information on the evaluation features and the context is clearly described. The key findings for all evaluation questions are included, as are the conclusions and recommendations. However, the summary should have identified the evaluation type and presented more clearly the evaluation rationale and scope.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents relevant contextual issues which are necessary to inform an understanding of the programme, related to geography, refugees, and humanitarian protection, as well as the malnutrition and food security in the targeted provinces in Burundi. Policies related to food security are also presented as well as the features of international assistance. While there are relevant details on the evaluation subject, some important information is not clearly described, including the results (outputs, outcomes) and activities of the programme, the modalities of intervention (e.g., capacity strengthening, service delivery, etc.), and the key assumptions (related to the theory of change) of the programme. Changes in the external and internal environment that may have affected the evolution of the programme are also not specified, nor is WFP work in the area or in the country.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents an overview of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. Human rights and gender equality are effectively mainstreamed. However, the scope should have included information on target groups, and the specific activities or dimensions covered by the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The mixed-methods approach was relevant for this evaluation, allowing for triangulation of data sources and methods and unbiased answers to evaluation questions. The limitations of the methodology are explained, including how they were addressed. Ethical standards were considered throughout the evaluation, ensuring that all stakeholder groups were treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality. However, the report should have specified if sufficient information was collected on results indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality. It also could have explained why the sampling was based on Health Units and not on the diversity of stakeholders.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Findings rely on a strong analysis of primary and secondary sources. Different perspectives are well balanced, and the strengths and weaknesses of the programme are clearly presented. The findings address all the main evaluation questions, evidence is</p>		

explicitly sourced, and the triangulation of data ensured diverse voices of both males and females, especially pregnant women and girls and lactating women and girls, were heard and considered. The validity of the data informing the evaluation questions is discussed and there is no internal inconsistency among the findings. Positive unanticipated effects (e.g., increased participation of beneficiaries in other health services) and negative unanticipated effects (e.g., overload of health staff) are clearly presented. However, the contributions of WFP interventions towards outcome-level results are not clearly articulated, including an analysis of actual versus planned outcomes for the programme.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

Conclusions logically flow from the findings and provide a relevant synthesis of findings on each evaluation criterion. Nevertheless, many of the conclusions, with the exception of those on efficiency and sustainability, do not go beyond the synthesis of the findings to discuss their implications at a strategic level in terms of the future of the program. There also could have been a clearer distinction between some of the conclusions and lessons learned.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The recommendations flow clearly and logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions and are aligned with the evaluation objectives of learning and accountability, capturing the most important areas for improvement. Each recommendation is justified, with specific actions for its operationalization and responsible actors clearly identified. Recommendations could have been prioritized and grouped either as strategic or operational, and as short, medium or long term.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report is well written, using clear and professional language, without jargon or excessively complex sentences. Visual aids, such as maps, graphs, and tables, are used to convey key information consistently throughout, and relevant information that can be found in other parts of the report is adequately signposted. The accessibility and clarity of the report could have been further enhanced in a few areas. Key messages could have been better highlighted in the text for ease of reading, and the titles of tables and figures could have been more clearly presented.

**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**

<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 9 points
--	------------------------------

GEWE considerations are fully integrated into this report. The background includes discussion of the relevant normative instruments, action plans, strategies, and policies related to human rights and gender equality as pertinent to Moderate Acute Malnutrition in Burundi. The methodology ensured that data collected was disaggregated by sex and age when possible. Gender and human rights considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation matrix. While the evaluation does not include an objective specific to the assessment of gender equality, gender is well mainstreamed through the evaluation criteria and questions. A mixed methods approach ensured that the diverse perspectives of both males and females were captured. Moreover, the findings triangulated the voices of men and women from different social groups. The positive and negative unintended effects on the targeted beneficiaries, including vulnerable women and girls, are discussed. The report specifies that gender equality dimensions were not considered in the design of the programme although the programme targeted women and young children. The report includes one specific recommendation that directly addresses GEWE issues.

**Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels**

<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>

<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i><u>Definition at overall report level:</u> 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>
	<i><u>Definition at criterion level:</u> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>