

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Évaluation de la réponse d'urgence du PAM aux crises prolongées au Sahel et dans d'autres pays d'Afrique de l'Ouest et centrale 2018-2023	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - Corporate Emergency Evaluation (CEE)	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 94%	
<p>The report of the <i>Évaluation de la réponse d'urgence du PAM aux crises prolongées au Sahel et dans d'autres pays d'Afrique de l'Ouest et centrale 2018-2023</i> presents credible and useful findings that can be used with a high degree of confidence. The report provides relevant insights about the context of countries within the scope of the evaluation. It describes the reconstructed theory of change, including a description of WFP's goals across a variety of thematic areas. It explicitly and comprehensively draws upon multiple sources of information across primary and secondary data to substantiate its findings. The evaluation's conclusions are balanced, pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction than findings and serve to connect them across different evaluation questions. The recommendations are clearly and logically derived from findings and conclusions. They are realistic, precise, actionable, and time-bound. In terms of areas for improvement, the report's context section would have benefitted from including relevant information on the internal WFP events that affected the emergency response in the Sahel, West and Central Africa. Moreover, the report would have benefitted from including information on sampling criteria that informed the selection of communities/beneficiaries consulted through focus group discussions. Finally, it should have provided more information on how it integrated a gender-sensitive approach in the evaluation methodology.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The summary concisely presents the evaluation's context, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Graphics and charts from the main report add value to the narrative. While there is a brief overview of the evaluation's conclusions and recommendations, the summary would have benefitted from including key findings of the evaluation. Moreover, it should have included a brief information on the evaluation objectives, stakeholders, and methodology.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report uses up-to-date data sources to provide insights on several trends and external events of the countries under evaluation. It would have benefitted from including relevant information on the context within WFP related to the emergency response. The overview of the subject outlines five "directions of change" that underpin the reconstructed theory of change. Data on targeted beneficiaries, budget and funding is presented. The report would have benefitted from providing information on linkages between the subject of the evaluation and WFP policies or strategies related to GEWE.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report identifies the evaluation's dual objectives of learning and accountability, and clearly presents the rationale/purpose and intended users of the evaluation. However, it would have benefitted from inclusion of information on the scope of the evaluation, including geographic, temporal and programmatic scope.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report includes an assessment of the intervention's monitoring data that informed the evaluation. The methodology section and annexes provide information on almost all required elements, and a rich summary of the evaluation process. The report includes key information on data collection methods, data sources (documents and persons), and analytical methods applied, noting limitations and mitigating strategies as well. However, it would have benefitted from including more information on sampling criteria for the selection of focus group participants. Additionally, the report would have benefitted from providing more information on how it integrated a gender-sensitive approach in the evaluation methodology, e.g., in ensuring the collection sex-disaggregated data.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report explicitly and comprehensively draws upon multiple sources of data collected to substantiate its findings, with data sources appropriately identified. Findings are explicitly grouped according to evaluation questions and sub-questions, with clear answers provided to each. Furthermore, the report provides information on key internal and external factors that enabled or limited performance. Detailed information on the intervention's unintended results, both positive and negative, is clearly presented in table form.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The evaluation's conclusions are pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction than the findings, and serve to connect findings across different evaluation questions. They are balanced and reflect both positive and negative aspects. The conclusions clearly synthesize the main insights derived from the findings but would have benefitted from a more explicit discussion of the strategic implications for the future of the interventions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The recommendations are clearly and logically derived from findings and conclusions. They are realistic and take into consideration limitations related to the implementation context - main recommendations are preceded by key contextual factors and considerations. All recommendations and sub-recommendations are sufficiently targeted and precise to be actionable, and they identify specific WFP units responsible for their implementation. All recommendations are prioritized as either high or medium and sub-recommendations are assigned specific deadlines. Recommendations address WFP's approach to programming and operations, and partnerships, in pursuing its cross-cutting aims, including GEWE.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>This report is well written, and free from jargon or excessively complex sentences. It uses precise and professional language, with no spelling, grammar or punctuation errors noted. It contains cross-references to annexes and specific sub-sections to direct readers to relevant information. Findings are referenced in the main conclusion statements, which serves to enhance the ability of the reader to draw connections between findings and conclusions. The report includes almost all mandatory annexes but would have benefitted from inclusion of the evaluation timeline, data collection tools, and list of people interviewed.</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>	<b>Meets requirements: 7 points</b>
<p>GEWE was mainstreamed despite there not being a specific evaluation objective or criterion dedicated to this dimension. The evaluation employed a mixed methods approach that was appropriate for evaluating GEWE considerations. Data sources and processes ensured the involvement of a diverse range of stakeholders in the evaluation. The report, however, would have benefitted from providing more information on how it integrated a gender-sensitive methodological approach, and from including information on sampling criteria that informed the selection of communities/beneficiaries consulted through focus group discussions. The report includes citations of interview data which notes the country and stakeholder category, and this serves as a means through which the evaluation explicitly triangulated the voices of different social groups. The main report includes detailed information on the unintended results, both positive and negative, of the intervention on human rights and gender equality issues. The evaluation includes a recommendation focused on addressing GEWE issues. The report would have benefitted, however, from an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the intervention.</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.