

<b>Evaluation title</b>	<b>« Projet lait » au sein du programme d'alimentation scolaire du PAM dans la région du Sahel, Burkina Faso, de 2017 à 2019</b>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	<b>Decentralized - Activity</b>	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory: 79%</b>	
<p>The findings from the evaluation of the « Projet lait » (Milk project) within the WFP school feeding programme in the Sahel region, Burkina Faso (2017 to 2019) can be used with confidence for decision making. Evidence is explicitly sourced, and findings rely on a strong analysis of primary and secondary sources, presenting the strengths and weaknesses of the project in a balanced manner. Findings are supported by strong sex-disaggregated data and a methodological design, data collection and analysis methods which integrate gender equality and women's empowerment considerations. Recommendations are clearly aligned with the evaluation rationale and objectives, and are realistic, targeted, specific, and actionable. However, conclusions could have discussed the implications of findings at a more strategic level and the inclusion of the project logic model or reconstructed theory of change would have clarified the logic of intervention. Moreover, given the security context in Burkina Faso, the report would have benefited from an assessment of performance against the International Humanitarian Principles, as well as a more detailed presentation of the country context relevant to the project.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The summary clearly reflects the main components of the report, presenting relevant information on the evaluation features, context, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, the summary could have been more concise, notably with a more succinct summary of the findings.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>While the brief description of the context provides relevant data on demography, food security, basic education and gender and equity considerations, the context should have included more details on national policies and strategies, WFP work in the region, and features of international assistance. Similarly, while the project overview includes relevant and clear information on the intervention's objectives, expected results, related activities, and beneficiaries and partners, it does not include a logic model or a reconstructed theory of change to better highlight the causal links between the different levels of results and underlying assumptions and risks.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report outlines the evaluation's accountability and learning objectives and scope. The main users and stakeholders are also clearly identified. However, the rationale for the evaluation could have been explained, including the timing of the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report presents a sound methodology, including a comprehensive evaluation matrix, which is relevant and enabled the evaluation questions to be answered. A diverse set of data analysis processes, including triangulation, comparative analysis, and validation of the primary results with the WFP country office, was used to ensure the accuracy and credibility of the findings and conclusions. The sampling frame comprised a diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, including women entrepreneurs and vulnerable women producers in the milk supply chain. The methodological limitation and mitigation strategies adopted, and the ethical standards applied are also described. While an analysis of the quality and validity of data, and discussion of the sampling frame and rationale are included in the annex, it would have been useful to briefly summarize these elements in the methodology section of the report.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Findings are transparently generated without bias, presenting the strengths and weaknesses of the project, based on solid evidence. They address all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions and clearly highlight the contributions of WFP interventions to outcome-level results of the project. The analysis of actual versus planned outcomes is relevant and takes into account the implementation context. Findings also explicitly and transparently triangulate the voices of different social groups, including women entrepreneurs and girls. A summary of findings is presented at the end of each sub-section. However, the report does not specify how recommendations from the pilot project evaluation in 2016 were or were not addressed through the intervention design and implementation and could have more clearly assessed project performance against the International Humanitarian Principles. Moreover, the findings could have described and analysed more extensively the positive and/or negative unanticipated effects of the project.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions logically flow from the findings and do not present information not included in the findings. However, while some conclusions discuss implications of the findings from a strategic perspective that can be useful for decision making, many conclusions summarize the findings, rather than look across the different evaluation criteria, questions and / or themes (e.g. the two themes prioritized in the recommendations section – sustaining the benefits and replication of the intervention) to identify the implications of the findings for the future of the intervention. Moreover, while some of the lessons learned reported can contribute to organizational learning for WFP and its partners, others are formulated as conclusions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report's recommendations are realistic, targeted, specific, and actionable, taking into consideration the contextual limitations faced by WFP and leaving room for implementers and users to fine-tune the implementation approach where needed (e.g., recommendation 2 on the revision of quality control procedures presents various options). Recommendations are also grouped by theme with a clear timeframe identified for implementation (short, medium, or long term). However, they could have been made more concise and a lead entity should have been identified where more than one responsible actor was targeted for implementation of the recommendation. It would also have been useful to classify the recommendations as either strategic or operational and to specify the level of priority (high/medium).</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report uses clear and professional language, without jargon and is free from grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors. Graphs and tables are used to convey key information consistently throughout, and relevant information is adequately signposted to other parts of the report where applicable. Key messages are also summarized and highlighted in the text for ease of reading. All data and quotes are adequately sourced.</p>		

**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: 7 points
<p>GEWE considerations are well integrated into this report. An analysis of gender in the Burkina Faso context is presented, identifying the major limitations, constraints and challenges faced by women compared to men in the different areas of intervention of the project. The evaluation matrix includes specific questions and sub-questions on gender equality corresponding to the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability criteria while human rights considerations are mainstreamed throughout. A gender responsive approach was used at all stages of the evaluation, including systematic data collection and analysis disaggregated by sex. This was facilitated for example through distinct focus groups organized for men and women, ensuring that their different perspectives were reflected in the analysis. The direct impact of the project on women's empowerment and gender equality is clearly presented. Moreover, two recommendations address the need for strengthening the management and economic planning capacities of women involved in the project and promoting the role of women entrepreneurs within the milk value chain. However, the report does not specifically include unintended effects on gender equality, and it only partially assesses whether sufficient information on gender was collected during the programme implementation period.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.