

Evaluation title	Évaluation du plan stratégique de pays du PAM Burkina Faso 2019-2023	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 86%	
The evaluation report of the WFP Burkina Faso Country Strategic Plan (CSP) is well written. Relevant and detailed information is included on key aspects of the country context, although a discussion on relevant sectoral policies, such as agriculture and nutrition, is missing. A good overview of the CSP is provided, including its intervention logic and key strategic shifts, although the key assumptions underpinning the causal linkages between the different levels of results could have been added. Data collection and analysis methods are well described and sound, but the specific methodological approaches that were adopted are not presented. Evaluation findings strike a good balance between positive and negative aspects and are generally introduced in a transparent and impartial manner, addressing all evaluation questions and sub-questions. The report tells a story of how WFP interventions in Burkina Faso contributed to the six strategic outcomes specified in the CSP document, with a systematic comparison between actual results and planned targets. The evaluation draws clear and relevant conclusions and recommendations which are consistent internally, realistic and address gender equality and women empowerment (GEWE) issues as well.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly satisfactory
The summary report introduces the context of the evaluation and provides key evaluation features. Key findings are summarized under the five main evaluation questions and reflect specific GEWE-related findings discussed in the report. The conclusions of the evaluation are clearly summarized and follow logically from the key findings presented in the summary. The summary report reproduces the six recommendations as presented in the evaluation main report.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
The context provides relevant national and regional information, including national policies and development frameworks in relation to the SDGs, a reference to the 2019 Voluntary National Review Report and a discussion on gender inequalities and challenges facing women in Burkina Faso. However, this section does not discuss relevant sectoral policies such as on agriculture, nutrition, human rights, and gender equality. Moreover, the report should have been referenced past WFP's analytical work whose recommendations informed the design of the CSP. The key shifts in the strategic focus and intervention logic of the CSP are addressed, but there is no discussion of the key assumptions underpinning CSP results.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
The dual objective of the evaluation (accountability and learning) is clearly outlined, but the rationale and potential users are not presented. The evaluation does not have a specific objective focused on gender equality and human rights, but these considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation framework. The temporal and programmatic scope is well defined, but the geographic scope is not. The main users and potential uses of evaluation findings could have been clearly identified.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report provides a description of data collection and analysis methods, including for collecting GEWE-related data. However, it does not present a detailed description of the overarching methodological design and specific approaches that were adopted. An evaluation matrix is included, structured around the main evaluation questions, with clear data sources and methods of analysis. However, the indicators selected to assess each of the evaluation sub-questions are not appropriately formulated for the most part. Finally, the report does not provide an analysis of whether sufficient data was collected on specific indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions.		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
Evaluation findings strike a good balance between positive and negative aspects, address all evaluation questions and sub-questions and are presented in a transparent and impartial manner. The report discusses how WFP interventions in Burkina Faso contributed to the six strategic outcomes of the CSP, with a systematic comparison between actual results and planned targets. While the report discusses the CSP's contribution to gender equality, it does not provide a similar analysis of how the CSP performed on other dimensions of equity and inclusion. The evaluation identifies CSP's unintended positive effects and includes results on the CSP's humanitarian activities. However, it could have systematically assessed how the CSP performed against each of the International Humanitarian Principles .		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The evaluation draws 12 major conclusions which reflect GEWE-related and wider equity and inclusion aspects. Overall, conclusions derive from the findings but their logical links with findings could have been demonstrated more effectively. Conclusions could additionally have referred to the plausibility of the CSP's logic of intervention and its underpinning assumptions. They should have also consistently outlined potential implications of the findings for future decision making.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
Evaluation recommendations are consistent internally, realistic, and provide sufficient details to be actionable. They are well targeted, categorized into strategic and operational actions, and address GEWE issues. The linkages between conclusions and recommendations could have been improved by adding clear references to the findings from which the recommendations were derived.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report follows the WFP template for CSP evaluations; it is generally well written, uses professional language, and provides useful visuals through tables, figures, and graphs. Key findings and concluding statements are captured in boxes and highlighted in bold. However, both the main report and annexes exceed WFP maximum length requirements.		

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: 7 points
GEWE dimensions are mainstreamed in evaluation questions on relevance and effectiveness and the evaluation methodology included strategies to ensure that data was collected to evaluate GEWE considerations. The evaluation engaged a wide range of stakeholders (government, NGOs, etc.) including vulnerable categories such as women and, where relevant, the findings include disaggregated quantitative data. Finally, recommendations include one operational recommendation (see #4) addressing GEWE issues.	

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: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>
--	--