

Evaluation title	Évaluation thématique sur les questions de genre 2016-2018, Burkina Faso	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized – Thematic	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The Thematic Evaluation on Gender Issues in Burkina Faso (2016-2018) presents credible and reliable findings that can be used with confidence by decision makers. The evaluation effectively mainstreams gender equality and women's empowerment considerations into its scope, methods, and findings. The mixed-methods approach ensured that there was a diverse range of data sources and analysis processes to guarantee inclusion, accuracy, and credibility of data. Moreover, the report provides a clear, accurate, and complete presentation of the context and overview of the integration of gender considerations in all WFP processes and projects implemented in Burkina Faso. Conclusions highlight progress and limitations in the integration of gender in the area of food security and nutrition, and lessons learned are useful for guiding WFP in integrating a gender transformative approach in the 2019-2023 Country Strategic Plan. However, the report also does not explicitly discuss unanticipated effects, nor does it consider performance and results against International Humanitarian Principles which would appear to have been relevant particularly given the inclusion of Malian refugees in some of the interventions. Conclusions should also have been pitched at a more strategic level to identify the implications of the findings for the future of gender equality integration in WFP-supported interventions in Burkina Faso. While quite numerous and detailed, recommendations contribute towards the fulfilment of the evaluation purpose/rationale and objectives, especially the learning objective.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary provides a good overview of the thematic issues and interventions related to gender equality in Burkina Faso. The key evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations are also clearly and quite succinctly presented. However, there are a few elements missing from the summary, specifically the stakeholders, users, and use of the evaluation, as well as a description of the country context.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The overview of the country context presents detailed information on all major development issues, including poverty, the food security and nutrition situation, and gender. The subject of the evaluation, its geographic coverage, implementation period and main partners are clearly identified. However, a description of the theory of change was not included in the report, which would have been important for understanding the expected results and interlinkages among development interventions related to this thematic. Expected results of the targeted projects are also not mentioned in the overview.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents a clear and complete overview of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. Main users and stakeholders are identified as well as the expected use of this evaluation. Considering the transformative and formative nature of this thematic evaluation, the objectives were focused on the process of implementing gender equality considerations through the targeted projects. Human rights considerations are not explicitly mentioned in the objectives but are implicitly mainstreamed.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design and data collection methods were relevant and allowed for unbiased answers to the evaluation questions. The formative and transformational approach that was used is relevant for assessing how gender was integrated in WFP processes and projects in Burkina Faso. The evaluation matrix incorporated the six standard OECD DAC criteria, as well as two additional criteria (gender consciousness and do no harm), integrating dimensions of transformative evaluation with their corresponding assumptions. Ethical standards were applied throughout the evaluation. The evaluation used a diverse range of data sources and processes to guarantee inclusion, accuracy, and credibility of data. Methodological limitations and mitigation strategies are well described. While data</p>		

analysis methods for each evaluation sub-question are identified in evaluation matrix in the Annex, it would have been useful to include a brief overview of the data analysis methods in the methodology section of the main report.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
All findings are balanced, impartial and address all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions, based on a strong analysis of primary and secondary sources available. Strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation subject are presented with weaknesses explained in a constructive manner. Findings rely on qualitative data triangulating the voices of WFP staff, government, civil society organizations, and community members, and the presentation of the perspectives of different stakeholders is well balanced. However, given that refugees from Mali form part of the targeted groups within the projects examined in the evaluation, performance against International Humanitarian Principles could have been assessed. Moreover, the report does not explicitly identify positive or negative unanticipated effects related to human rights and gender equality in the targeted projects.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
Conclusions are balanced, summarizing the strengths and weaknesses identified in the findings. However, they do not draw on evidence from across findings to discuss their implications for the future of WFP's work on gender. For example, the conclusions analyse the level of integration of gender considerations in WFP projects' diagnosis, monitoring and evaluation tools and activities, without discussing the implications of the impact it had during project implementation. Moreover, while GEWE dimensions are considered in the conclusions, wider equity and inclusions dimensions are not addressed. The lessons presented have wider relevance, contributing towards organizational learning for WFP and its partners.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The recommendations effectively capture the most important areas for improvement at different levels and divisions of the WFP country office (program unit, human resources, monitoring and evaluation, etc.). They are realistic, taking into consideration the limitations faced by WFP (human and financial resources, operational, and contextual), and explicitly targeted at specific CO actors or divisions. While the recommendations are grouped under five operational and strategic dimensions staff management, organizational and financial, relationship with the beneficiaries, coordination with other cooperation stakeholders, incorporation of gender problematic into WFP resilience theory), they are numerous (25 in total) and not prioritized (high/medium) or specified as short, medium, or long term which, combined with their large number.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
The report is well written, using clear and precise language. Sources are provided for all data and quotes. Visual aids are used where relevant, and key messages are summarized and appropriately highlighted for enhanced readability of the report. There is also a clear linkage between the various sections of the report, with proper cross-referencing within the report of information contained in the annexes.		

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	
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets requirements: 9 points
As the subject of the evaluation, GEWE considerations are fully integrated into this report. The background section of the report presents progress on gender equality but also challenges in achieving gender equality in the different areas of WFP intervention in Burkina Faso. All relevant normative instruments, WFP and government policies related to gender equality are clearly presented. Moreover, all evaluation criteria included gender equality considerations and the evaluation questions and sub-questions focused on the process for integrating the gender equality dimension in the various targeted interventions. The evaluation used a diverse range of data sources and the report clearly identifies ethical standards adhered to throughout the evaluation process. The "Do no harm " principle in WFP projects in Burkina Faso was applied through the lens of the protection of men's and women's human rights. All the recommendations address GEWE issues within the processes and interventions managed by WFP and other implementing partners.	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<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.
Satisfactory	<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.
Partly Satisfactory	<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.
Unsatisfactory	<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.