

Evaluation title	Évaluation décentralisée conjointe finale du Programme National d'Alimentation Scolaire Intégré (PNASI) au Bénin - 2017 à 2021	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Joint	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 69%	
<p>This is a satisfactory evaluation report, including solid and reliable findings that can be used with confidence for decision making. It is well written and sourced and demonstrates critical analysis, particularly of quantitative data in relation to the school feeding component. The theory-based approach used in the evaluation methodology and mixed data collection methods are clearly stated and described and the evaluation adhered to ethical standards. The report is comprehensive in assessing and reporting on the results of the program in alignment with the six OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, referencing the three program components and making connections to relevant evaluation questions. The conclusions are generally well-balanced and connect findings across the six evaluation criteria, rendering them strategically relevant and useful. While the recommendations include a number of actions that are directly aligned with the main findings, some of the statements are not connected to the corresponding sub-recommendations, are too specific, or are not realistic in terms of their timelines. Moreover, the description of the Logical Framework and Theory of Change could have been improved by clarifying some of the assumptions underpinning the expected results of the program. Finally, the report does not integrate a gender and social inclusion lens throughout.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary is well written and structured in accordance with the six key evaluation criteria and three program components. The section that dissects the strengths and weaknesses related to each criterion is well done and lays a good foundation for the presentation of conclusions. However, not all the recommendations capture issues that are outlined in the conclusions section. While the summary includes a number of references to GEWE, most are quite general, e.g., the need to be gender sensitive or the absence of gender-disaggregated data. Except for reference to female chefs and children as being a vulnerable population, there is no reference to other vulnerabilities.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of the country context, including background information relevant to the PNASI program. It also includes a good description of the program, including its specific objectives and key activities by component. However, the analysis of the program's Theory of Change could have been improved, for example, by further developing assumptions about the potential for school feeding to reduce gender disparities in education. Assumptions about the potential for school feeding to reduce gender disparities in education are unrealistic if not connected to other interventions targeting other sources of inequality and the analysis should have acknowledged the need for multiple interventions, some of which are independent of PNASI's activities. While there is a strong description of the chronological evolution of the program, there is limited reference to changes in the external environment beyond referencing changes in the number of partners or increases in financial resources.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale and objectives are well articulated, with explicit integration of gender and human rights. Some key elements of the scope of the evaluation are also well elaborated, namely the timeframe and thematic activities covered as well as gender. However, there is no reference to mainstreaming human rights and social inclusion in the evaluation scope which is incongruent with the objectives noted. This absence is also evident in the articulation of main users and stakeholders which could have been more comprehensive by including beneficiaries and partners, e.g., NGOs.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory

The report includes an assessment of project monitoring data available to inform the evaluation methodology. The evaluation matrix is comprehensive and GEWE is mainstreamed across the evaluation criteria and explicitly mentioned in eight evaluation sub-questions. The theory-based approach used in the evaluation methodology and mixed data collection methods are clearly stated and described. The report includes a standard reference to considering ethical standards. While there are general references to considering GEWE in the methodology, no details are provided on how this would be done concretely and there is no reference to specific measures to identify and accommodate other vulnerable populations. The report claims that gender has been addressed in a comprehensive manner. However, a cross-verification of the interview guide does not confirm this. Despite promising equitable coverage of women and men in the ethical standards section, only 25% of female participated in interviews and no detail is provided as to measures to accommodate their specific needs, e.g., to accommodate household/reproductive responsibilities.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The findings related to the school feeding component are supported by significant quantitative data that is sourced correctly in the footnotes. This section is well organized in terms of examining the strengths and weaknesses of the program with respect to each of the six main criteria and individual sub-questions. The report also notes the role of WFP and its contributions and includes some references to GEWE and to vulnerable populations, although it is specifically focused on children (migrants and located in rural areas). It also refers to findings from previous evaluations while noting strengths and weaknesses associated with different dimensions and components of the project. The analysis of gender is more detailed than in other sections with a focus on children but continues to be limited given that the project includes local production that should have considered the level of participation of women and other vulnerable populations, for example. The focus on vulnerable populations is limited to cooks and children rather than proposing an examination of a broader list of vulnerable groups located in Benin.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

Many of the conclusions make reference to the relevant sub-questions. They are clearly articulated, reflect in-depth analysis, and are connected to a number of key findings. The conclusions are well-balanced and connect findings across the six evaluation criteria. There is some discrepancy in a few conclusions between the key statement in bold and the analysis below it while some conclusions appear to be either too specific or too general and would have benefited from more clarification. For example, conclusion 8 calls for PNASI to adapt to deal with geographic disparities but does not provide more detail on what this would entail. Moreover, most conclusions related to GEWE are very general and would have benefited from clarification of what the term "gender transformative" entails and providing more detail on its significance in the context of the evaluation.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The recommendations section includes a limited number of recommendations with sub-recommendations that provide more details on actions that would need to be taken. The recommendations are well organized in a table that covers all of the required areas, e.g., priority, timeline, key stakeholders. However, a few of the sub-recommendations do not connect to wording contained in the main recommendation. Some of the recommendations have unrealistic timelines whereas some are either unclear or too specific.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
---	---------------	---------------------

Overall, the report follows the WFP template and stays within the allocated word count for a French report. Except for missing page numbers in the annexes (Annex 3 onwards), the report is easy to read, includes the proper citations and is adequately signposted. Several graphs, tables and visual aids are included in the annexes but including them in the main report would have enhanced its readability.

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

Approaches requirements: 5 points

While the evaluation objectives included reference to considering gender and human rights, it is not evident in the report that sufficient steps were taken to do so in the evaluation. The analysis on social inclusion does not demonstrate an effort at a comprehensive analysis to identify the broad spectrum of vulnerable groups, some of which would have been relevant to this program, e.g., teenage girls who fall pregnant or are forced into early marriage. There is no reference to addressing the deep-seated cultural and patriarchal norms, which are key drivers, or that other documents speaking to gender were analyzed and interview guides had only a few gender-related questions. While there are a few specific examples of gender inequalities and specific concrete responses in the findings, conclusions and recommendations, gender issues tend to be addressed in a general and superficial manner.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<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>
Satisfactory	<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>
Partly Satisfactory	<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>
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>