

Terms of Reference

DECENTRALIZED FINAL EVALUATION of WFP'S DFID Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme in Uganda WFP Uganda Country Office

Table of Contents

1. Introduction....	1
2. Reasons for the Evaluation	1
2.1 Rationale.....	1
2.2 Objectives	2
2.3 Stakeholders and Users	2
3. Context & subject of the Evaluation	4
3.1. Context.....	4
3.2. Subject of the evaluation	5
4. Evaluation Approach	6
4.1 Scope	6
4.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions.....	7
4.3 Data Availability	9
4.4 Methodology	9
4.5 Quality Assurance.....	10
5. Phases and Deliverables.....	11
6. Organization of the Evaluation.....	12
6.1 Evaluation Conduct.....	122
6.2 Team composition and competencies	122
6.3 Security Considerations.....	133
7. Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders	144
8. Communication and budget	155
8.1 Communication	155
8.2 Budget	155
9. Annexes	Error! Bookmark not defined.6
Annex 1 : Evaluation Schedule	Error! Bookmark not defined.6

1. Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) are for the final evaluation of the World Food Programme (WFP) Public Works component of the DFID funded Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme (ERKP) in Uganda. This evaluation is commissioned by WFP Uganda Country Office and will cover the period from 2013 – 2016.
2. These TOR were prepared by the programme unit, WFP-Uganda Country Office based upon an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders and following a standard template. The purpose of the TOR is twofold. Firstly, it provides key information to the evaluation team and helps guide them throughout the evaluation process; and secondly, it provides key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation.

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1. Rationale

3. This evaluation is being commissioned for the following reasons:
4. The programme seeks to strengthen the resilience of moderately food insecure households with labor capacity through the provision of conditional food/cash transfers linked to the construction and rehabilitation of community-level productive assets. Guided by the WFP/UNICEF/FAO Joint Resilience Strategy, this evaluation is expected to provide evidence of what worked in the past and programmatic recommendations for joint operational planning under the resilience programme.
5. Under the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations 200852 (2016-18), WFP will continue to target severely food insecure populations in the north eastern Karamoja region, through the provision of a predictable safety net under WFP FFA modality of cash and food for assets. WFP plans to increase its coverage to 87,000 food insecure households across Karamoja. Productive asset creation will support soil and water conservation, water production and agricultural assets, as part of a broader watershed catchment development for crop and livestock increased productivity. Additional activities, e.g. nutrition-sensitive capacity development, household income generation, etc. are also planned for the conditional assistance in order to increase the coverage of vulnerable households.
6. WFP is implementing PWP in the framework of the Government of Uganda's Second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2). This programme is part of the International Climate Fund endorsed Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja programme (ERKP) of DFID. The public works programme establishes an important link between social protection, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. Sustainability is an important consideration, and the grantees are expected to work to support government and community ownership.

7. In the evaluation plan agreed between with the key donor, DFID, WFP commits to conducting a final evaluation to measure performance of the programme, for accountability and learning purposes. For this reason, WFP is commissioning an evaluation at the final-point of project implementation.

2.2 Objectives

8. The main objective of this evaluation is to assess and report on the performance and results achieved (intended or unintended, positive and negative) of DFID support to WFP Public Works Programme in Uganda since 2013 to 2016. The Evaluations will serve the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning.
 - **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the DFID support to WFP PWP Programme in Uganda since 2013 to 2016.
 - **Learning** – The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain results occurred or not to draw lessons, derive good practices and pointers for learning. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. Findings will be actively disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson sharing systems.

2.3 Stakeholders and Users

9. **Stakeholders** A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of WFP have interests in the results of the evaluation and some of these will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process. Table 1 below provides a preliminary stakeholder analysis, which should be deepened by the evaluation team as part of the Inception phase.
10. **Accountability to affected populations**, is tied to WFP's commitments to include beneficiaries as key stakeholders in WFP's work. As such, WFP is committed to ensuring gender equality and women's empowerment in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation by women, men, boys and girls from different groups.

Table 1: Preliminary Stakeholders' analysis

Stakeholders	Interest in the evaluation and likely uses of evaluation report to this stakeholder
INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS	
Country Office (CO) Uganda	Responsible for the country level planning and operations implementation, it has a direct stake in the evaluation and an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries and partners for performance and results of its operation.

Regional Bureau (RB) Nairobi	Responsible for both oversight of COs and technical guidance and support, the RB management has an interest in an independent account of the operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings to apply this learning to other country offices.
WFP HQ	WFP has an interest in the lessons that emerge from evaluations, particularly as they relate to WFP strategies, policies, thematic areas, or delivery modality with wider relevance to WFP programming.
Office of Evaluation (OEV)	OEV has a stake in ensuring that decentralized evaluations deliver quality, useful and credible evaluations. OEV management has an interest in providing decision-makers and stakeholders with independent accountability for results and with learning to inform policy, strategic and programmatic decisions.
WFP Executive Board (EB)	The WFP governing body has an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of WFP operations. This evaluation will not be presented to the EB but its findings may feed into annual syntheses and into corporate learning processes.
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS	
Beneficiaries	As the ultimate recipients of food assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women and men from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought.
Government, National and county levels	Both district and national Government have a direct interest in knowing whether WFP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonised with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. For PWP the government has the overall ownership of the NUSAF II programme, and shares the interest in learning lessons for design of future programmes, including transition to cash models. The key line Ministry is the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; specifically, the Expanding Social Protection Secretariat (ESP) oversees the implementation of Social Protection Programmes in Uganda, of which PWP is considered one component. At the district level, district technical officers include: Production Officers, Water Officers, Agriculture Officers and the administrative unit: Chief Administrative Officer (CAO).
UN and Development Partners	FAO and UNICEF as joint implementing partners of the ERKP program. The Uganda United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) should contribute to the realisation of the government developmental objectives. Uganda United Nations Country Team (UNCT) has therefore an interest in ensuring that WFP operation is effective in contributing to the UN concerted efforts. WFP implements the programme within a wider UN system of support to government priorities. The partner agencies are interested in learning to what extent WFP interventions are contributing to the overall outcomes committed to the UNDAF particularly UNICEF, FAO, UNDAF thematic working groups, the Social Protection Task Force and Sector Donors Groups, The World Bank.

NGOs [Action Contre Faim, Danish Refugee Council, Samaritans Purse, Caritas Kotido, World Vision]	INGOs are WFP's cooperating partners for the implementation of PWP activities while at the same time as having their own interventions. The results of the evaluation might affect future implementation modalities, strategic orientations, coordination and partnerships.
Donors [DFID]	WFP PWP programmes is funded by DFID. Other donors implementing PWP programs in Uganda, including The World Bank, Danida and EU will also have an interest in knowing whether WFP's work has been effective and contributed to social protection strategies in Uganda.

3. Context and subject of the Evaluation

3.1. Context

11. Despite economic growth of 6-7% annually over the last five years, Uganda ranks 163th of 188 countries in the 2014 Human Development Index and 122nd in the gender inequality index.¹ The population has increased by 130 percent in two decades to 37.78 million in 2014.² Poverty and income inequality remain high: it is estimated that up to 37.8 percent of Ugandans live below the poverty line despite the vigorous growth in recent years.³ With increasingly unpredictable and severe weather patterns and a rapidly growing population, the country remains food-deficient, depends on food imports and is vulnerable to shocks. Poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition are particularly severe in the arid and semi-arid land (ASALs) region of Karamoja, which covers 13.5 per cent of Uganda's land area, contain 7 of its 10 poorest districts, and comprise 3.5 per cent of the population. In Karamoja, 82 per cent of the population live in poverty compared to the national average of 31 per cent.⁴
12. Karamoja spans 27,000 square kilometres, and is one of the driest and poorest regions in Uganda. It is home to approximately 1.3 million people with mainly agro-pastoral livelihoods. While 8 per cent of the population is severely food insecure and an additional 78 per cent is moderately and marginally food insecure.⁵ The region suffers from severe environmental degradation, poor infrastructure, poor health and sanitation conditions, and the high prevalence of diarrhoea and other preventable diseases among children. Literacy levels are as low as 20 per cent.

¹ United Nations Development Program (2015). "Human Development Report 2015: Uganda". Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/UGA.pdf

² World Bank (2014). *World Databank: World Development Indicators*. Available at: <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=2&country=UGA&series=&period>

³ United Nations Development Program (2015). "Human Development Report 2015: Uganda".

⁴ World Food Programme (2015). "Uganda—Resilience Context Analysis: Resilience to food insecurity in Karamoja". Available at: <https://www.wfp.org/content/uganda-resilience-food-insecurity-malnutrition-karamoja-april-2015>

⁵ World Food Programme (2015). "Food Security and Nutrition Assessment Karamoja Region" Available at <https://www.wfp.org/content/uganda-food-security-and-nutrition-assessment-june-2015>

13. A nutrition survey implemented at the peak of lean season in July 2015 found that severe acute malnutrition (SAM) prevalence rates exceed the World Health Organisation (WHO) emergency thresholds in all Northern Karamoja districts. The overall rate of SAM for the Karamoja Region was 3.7 per cent, while Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) was 14.1 per cent which is at the alert threshold. The stunting rate of children under 5 is 32.7 per cent, reflecting the problem of chronic hunger and insufficient access to food.⁶
14. Climate change aggravates the vulnerability of the already precarious livelihoods, compounding and exacerbating the underlying issues of poverty and food insecurity. Cyclical droughts, erratic rainfall, and poor soil fertility render the region chronically food insecure, producing an interrelated set of humanitarian and development challenges. Moreover, frequent and often armed disputes over water, wood, and livestock showcase the links between conflict, resource scarcity, and food insecurity.
15. As part of the multi-stakeholder effort to manage and reduce risks as well as to build resilience to recurrent shocks in vulnerable households and communities, WFP has been implementing its public works programme, which includes a livelihoods component, in Karamoja for the past 4 years. The Karamoja Productive Assets Programme (KPAP), was launched in 2010 and was subsequently integrated into the Government Framework of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2). This transition reflected the strategic shift of WFP from food aid to food assistance. Since its onset the programme has been supported predominantly by DFID.
16. Public Works Programmes are outlined as a component of the Government of Uganda's Social Protection Strategy⁷. A number of programmes with public works components have been implemented in Uganda in parallel to the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF). These programs have focused particularly in Northern Uganda and Karamoja, and include: Karamoja Livelihoods Improvement Programme, Community-Driven Development Programme and Agricultural Livelihoods Recovery Programme. The objectives of the public works programs have included creation of community assets, provision of food items to households affected by famine and transfer of cash to poor households with labour capacity.

3.2. Subject of the evaluation

17. WFP has been implementing its public works programme, in the Karamoja region for the past 5 years. The Karamoja Productive Assets Programme (KPAP), was launched in 2010 and was subsequently integrated into the Government

⁶ World Food Programme (2015). "Food Security and Nutrition Assessment Karamoja Region"

⁷ National Social Protection Policy, Uganda 2015.

Framework of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2). This transition reflected the strategic shift of WFP from food aid to food assistance. Since its onset the programme has been supported predominantly by DFID. The next phase of the Government Framework of the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 3) from 2015 – 20 will be funded by The World Bank.

18. WFP supports approximately 33,058 moderately food insecure households in four districts of Karamoja with a conditional food transfer for participation in seasonal public works activities. 50 Kg of maize is transferred to participating beneficiary households following a work cycle of xx days. 3 seasonal transfers are provided each cycle to support households during the lean periods.
19. WFP implements Household Income Support projects in 4 districts. Tools and training are provided to targeted households to help them diversify livelihoods and increase household incomes. These activities are focused primarily on staple crop production and utilizing community assets (demonstration gardens, cassava multiplication plots, soil and water infrastructure).
20. WFP also prioritises capacity development of the District Government to manage and extend the PWP programme in Karamoja.
21. WFP implements its PWP programme in close collaboration with OPM and the District Local Governments in respective districts of implementation. An annual joint work plan is formulated, and regular meetings at district levels are organized to coordinate activities. Activities are aligned to respective district development plans. At the county level, WFP coordinates implementation with the Office of the Prime Minister. The activities are monitored as part of WFP's regular monitoring and through joint monitoring missions with District Local Governments.

4. Evaluation Approach

4.1 Scope

22. The evaluation will be of DFID-supported PWP activities implemented from 2013 to 2016 under the EKRPP Program.
23. The evaluation will cover the Karamoja region where these activities were implemented during the above mentioned period.
24. It is expected that the evaluation will review the WFP partnership strategies, modalities of implementation, and monitoring and reporting systems through this timeframe
25. The final evaluation will use the internationally agreed criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. The evaluation will put greater emphasis than the Mid Term Evaluation on the effectiveness, impact and

sustainability of the program. The evaluation is thus focused on accountability (against intended results) and learning (for the continuance of the PWP in Uganda).

26. The evaluation will assess the impact of the program against the following objectives:

- Adequate seasonal employment opportunities for the targeted moderately food insecure households with labour capacity
- Rehabilitated land for productive use,
- Enhanced livelihood opportunities, Reduced disaster risks, Enhanced ability of communities to adapt to climate change
- Improved local capacity for the implementation of pro-poor public works programmes to facilitate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation

27. The evaluation will take into consideration the reduced regional geographical coverage between 2013 and 2016.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

28. **Evaluation Criteria:** The evaluation will apply the international evaluation criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Gender Equality and the Empowerment of women (GEEW) should be mainstreamed throughout.

29. **Evaluation Questions:** Allied to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation will address the following key questions, which will be further developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim at highlighting the key lessons and performance of the WFP's DFID Public Works programme support (2013-2016), which could inform future strategic and operational decisions.

30. Below are the key criteria and broad questions to be evaluated:

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	Areas for analysis will include the extent to which the objectives, targeting, choice of activities and of transfer modalities: Were appropriate to the needs of the target population; Were coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector policies and strategies and seek complementarity with the interventions of relevant development partners Were coherent with WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance

	Were aligned with partner UN agency and donor policies and priorities?
Effectiveness	<p>Has the PWP Programme achieved its stated outputs, objectives and outcomes? What were the major factors (Both internal and external) influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outputs, outcomes/objectives of the intervention?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How effective has WFP's public works programme been in building soil and water conservation, water production and agricultural assets? 2. How effective has WFP's public works programme been as a safety net mechanisms for the targeted households? 3. How relevant have the community assets and the food assistance been to the targeted households? 4. How efficient is the WFP public works model in delivering conditional safety nets vis-à-vis other potential programmes? 5. How has the WFP public works programme aligned with global best practices for similar programmes? <p>Why and how did the operation produce the observed results? The evaluation should generate insights into the main internal and external factors that caused the observed changes and affected how results were achieved. The inquiry is likely to focus, amongst others, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Internally (factors within WFP's control): the processes, systems and tools in place to support the operation design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation and reporting; the governance structure and institutional arrangements (including issues related to staffing, capacity and technical backstopping from RB/HQ); the partnership and coordination arrangements; etc. ▪ Externally (factors outside WFP's control): the external operating environment; the funding climate; external incentives and pressures; etc.
Efficiency	<p>Were activities cost-efficient? Were the activities implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? What were the external and internal factors influencing efficiency of the program (attainment of the planned outputs, cost factors, logistics and pipeline performance)?</p>
Impact	What were the short- and medium term effects of the programme on beneficiaries' lives?

	<p>Did any negative effects occur for beneficiaries?</p> <p>What were the gender-specific impacts, especially regarding food security and nutrition?</p> <p>What are the main drivers of positive impacts? (Partnerships, capacity, ownership, etc.)</p> <p>What were the intended and unintended impacts of the program</p>
Sustainability	<p>To what extent is the country / districts / community taking ownership of the programme? (e.g. demonstrated commitment and contribution to the programme);</p>

4.3 Data Availability

31. The following are the main sources of data. The evaluation

- Baseline and mid-term evaluation reports
- WFP strategic Results framework
- Uganda Country Programme (2014-2018) project document and log frame
- Uganda Country Programme (2009-2014) project document and log frame
- National Public Works Guidelines
- WFP FFA strategy and policy
- 2013 to 2015 Standard Project Reports (SPRs).
- M&E monthly monitoring reports
- Government of Uganda National Social Protection Policy 2015
- External Evaluation of WFP's Cash Transfer to Schools Pilot Project (March 2013- March 2015
- Food-for-Assets impact evaluation of 2013⁸;
- WFP Country Portfolio Evaluation of 2014⁹;
- Seasonal livelihoods programming consultations in seven districts in 2013;
- Results of the periodic Karamoja Food Security and Nutrition Assessments;
- Uganda Social Protection Sector Review;
- July 2014 internal review¹⁰ of the WFP/NUSAF2 activities.

4.4 Methodology

32. The methodology will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ the relevant evaluation criteria above [relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability]

⁸ Evaluation of the Impact of Food for Assets on Livelihood Resilience in Uganda, 2013.

⁹ November 2014.

¹⁰ The review involved WFP staff and all Cooperating Partners (CPs) implementing public works.

- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) The selection of field visit sites will also need to demonstrate impartiality.
 - Using mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative, participatory etc.) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.
 - Apply an evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints;
 - Ensure through the use of mixed methods that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholders groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used;
 - Mainstream gender equality and women's empowerment, as above;
33. The Final Evaluation will take a programme theory approach based on the results framework. In its execution, the evaluation will draw on the existing body of documented data as far as possible. The evaluation will use mixed methods and triangulate information from different methods and sources to enhance the reliability of findings. In particular, the evaluation will combine qualitative and quantitative approaches to collect field-level data and information from Karamoja using appropriately sampled communities and stakeholders. Separate questionnaires will be applied to the different primary sources of information, focusing on community assets created, targeting, enrolment and participation, attendance, district engagement in the programme.
34. The qualitative component of the evaluation will use participatory methods where relevant to highlight lessons learned and case studies representative of the interventions. In particular, the methodology will involve focus group discussions and key informant interviews drawn from relevant stakeholders. This component will employ relevant interview schedules as a key data collection method which will be collated to provide general impressions of the programme.

4.5 Quality Assurance

35. OEV's Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) defines the quality standards expected from this evaluation and sets out processes with in-built steps for quality assurance, templates for evaluation products and checklists for the review thereof. It is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (DAC and ALNAP) and aims to ensure that the evaluation process and products conform to best practice and meet OEV's quality standards. EQAS does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team.
36. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the directive on disclosure of information.
37. EQAS should be systematically applied to this evaluation and the evaluation manager will be responsible to ensure that the evaluation progresses in line with its process steps and to conduct a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their submission to WFP.

38. OEV has developed a quality assurance checklist for its decentralized evaluations. This includes checklists for feedback on quality for each of the evaluation products. These checklists will be applied to ensure the quality of the evaluation process and outputs. In addition, a post-hoc quality assessment of the final decentralised evaluation report will be conducted by OEV.
39. Concerning the quality of data and information, the evaluation team should systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data.

5. Phases and Deliverables

40. The evaluation will proceed through the 5 following phases. The evaluation schedule annex provides a detailed breakdown of the proposed timeline for each phase over the full timeframe. A summary of the deliverables and deadlines for each phase are as follows:

Figure 1: Summary Process Map



41. **Preparation phase (May 2016):** The evaluation manager will conduct background research and consultation to frame the evaluation; prepare the TOR; select the evaluation team and contract the company for the management and conduct of the evaluation. The TOR will be shared with USDA for comments and or inputs.
42. **Inception phase (23th June – 4th July):** This phase aims to prepare the evaluation team for the evaluation phase by ensuring that it has a good grasp of the expectations for the evaluation and a clear plan for conducting it. The inception phase will include a desk review of secondary data and initial interaction with the main stakeholders. The inception report will be shared with USDA for comments and or inputs. (**deliverables: inception report**).
43. **Evaluation phase (15th July – 30th July):** The fieldwork will span over a period of two weeks and will include visits to project sites and primary and secondary data collection from local stakeholders. A debriefing session will be held upon completion of the field work. (**deliverables: field work debriefing**).

44. **Reporting phase (15th August – 5th September):** The evaluation team will analyse the data collected during the desk review and the field work, conduct additional consultations with stakeholders, as required, and draft the evaluation report. The draft evaluation report will be submitted to the evaluation manager for quality assurance. Stakeholders will be invited to provide comments, which will be recorded in a matrix by the evaluation manager and provided to the evaluation team for their consideration before report finalisation. (***deliverables: draft and final evaluation reports***).
45. **Follow-up and dissemination phase:** The final evaluation report will be shared with the relevant stakeholders. The management responsible will respond to the evaluation recommendations by providing actions that will be taken to address each recommendation and estimated timelines for taking those actions. The evaluation report will also be subject to external post-hoc quality review to report independently on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation in line with evaluation norms and standards. The final evaluation report will be published on the WFP public website. Findings will be disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into other relevant lesson sharing systems.

6. Organization of the Evaluation

6.1 Evaluation Conduct

46. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and in close communication with the WFP evaluation manager. The team will be hired following agreement with WFP on its composition and in line with the evaluation schedule in Annex 2.
47. The evaluation team will not have been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of evaluation or have any other conflicts of interest. Further, they will act impartially and respect the [code of conduct of the evaluation profession](#).

6.2 Team composition and competencies

48. The Team Leader should be a senior evaluator with at least 10 years of experience in evaluation with demonstrated expertise in managing similar multidisciplinary and mixed quantitative and qualitative method evaluations. Complemented with a good understanding of WFP FFA food-for-asset (FFA) approaches and familiarity with the Uganda context is an advantage. Experience in the evaluation of large scale public works preferably in the context of arid and semi-arid lands
49. The Team leader will also have expertise in designing methodology and data collection tools and demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations. She/he will also have leadership and communication skills, including a track record of excellent writing and presentation skills. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i)

defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team; iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception report, exit debriefing presentation and evaluation report in line with EQAS.

50. The team must include strong demonstrated knowledge of qualitative and quantitative data and statistical analysis. It should include both women and men and at least one team member should be familiar with WFP's FFA work and with DFID M&E Policy.
51. The team will be multi-disciplinary and include members who together include an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in the following areas:
 - Social Protection
 - Food security
 - Gender
 - Capacity development
52. All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills, evaluation experience and familiarity with Uganda or the Horn of Africa.
53. The team members will bring together a complementary combination of the technical expertise required and have a track record of written work on similar assignments.
54. Team members will: i) contribute to the methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s).
55. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the Code of Conduct for evaluators (Attached to individual contracts), ensuring they maintain impartiality and professionalism

6.3 Security Considerations

56. **Security clearance:** where required is to be obtained from WFP Uganda office.
 - As an 'independent supplier' of evaluation services to WFP, the evaluation company is responsible for ensuring the security of all persons contracted, including adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. The consultants contracted by the evaluation company do not fall under the UN Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel. Consultants hired independently are covered by the UN Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel which cover WFP staff and consultants contracted directly by WFP.
 - Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance for travelling to be obtained from designated duty station and complete the UN system's Basic

and Advance Security in the Field courses in advance, print out their certificates and take them with them.¹¹

57. However, to avoid any security incidents, the Evaluation Manager is requested to ensure that:

- The WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground.
- The team members observe applicable UN security rules and regulations.
- The WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground.
- The team members observe applicable UN security rules and regulations – e.g. curfews etc.

7. Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders

58. **The Country Office.** The CO management will be responsible to:

- Comply with the evaluations policy's provisions and safeguards of impartiality at all stages of evaluation process: planning, design, team selection, methodological rigor, data gathering, analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Assign an evaluation manager for the evaluation.
- Form an Internal Evaluation Committee comprising of the Deputy Country Director/Head of Programme, the Evaluation manager and the technical Unit in charge of the PWP Programme. This groups will comment on the TORs, inception report and the final evaluation report.
- Form an External Reference Group comprising of donors and partners who will oversee the transparency and impartiality process of the evaluation
- Provide the evaluation manager and team with documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; facilitate the team's contacts with local stakeholders; set up meetings, field visits; provide logistic support during the fieldwork; and arrange for interpretation, if required.
- Organise security briefings for the evaluation team and provide any materials as required
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results and in various teleconferences with the evaluation manager and team on the evaluation products.
- Organise and participate in two separate debriefings, one internal and one with external stakeholders.
- Prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations

¹¹ Field Courses: Basic <https://dss.un.org/bsitf/>; Advanced <http://dss.un.org/asitf>

59. The Regional Bureau. The RB management will be responsible to:

- Assign focal point for the evaluation.
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results. In particular, the RB should participate in the evaluation debriefing and discussions with the evaluation manager and team, as required.
- Provide comments on the TORs, inception report and the evaluation report.

60. Headquarters. Some HQ divisions might, as relevant, be asked to discuss WFP strategies, policies or systems in their area of responsibility and to comment on the evaluation TOR and report.

61. The Office of Evaluation (OEV). OEV will advise the Evaluation Manager and provide support to the evaluation process where possible and where requested.

8. Communication and budget

8.1 Communication

62. To enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders. These may for example take place by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders.

63. Communication with evaluation team and stakeholders should go through the Evaluation manager.

64. As part of the international standards for evaluation, WFP requires that all evaluations are made publicly available. Following the approval of the final evaluation report, the report will be made available through the WFP Uganda Country Office website and via external debriefing sessions with key stakeholders in the country.

8.2 Budget

65. Budget: The evaluation will go through a tender, using WFP Procurement procedures and therefore the budget will be proposed by applicants.

Please send any queries to WFP Uganda's Procurement Unit at Kampala.Procurement@wfp.org

Annex 1 Evaluation Schedule

	Phases, Deliverables and Timeline	Key Dates
	Phase 1 - Preparation	
	Desk review, first draft of TOR and quality assurance	
	Circulation of TOR and review to (list key stakeholders)	
	Identification and recruitment of evaluation team	
	Final TOR	2 nd half May
	Phase 2 - Inception	
	Briefing core team	June 23 rd
	Review documents and draft inception report including methodology.	
	Submit draft inception report to (list key stakeholder)	June 30 th
	Quality assurance and feedback	
	Revise inception report	
	Submit revised inception report to (list key stakeholder)	July 4 th
	Sharing of inception report with stakeholders for information	
	Phase 3 – Data collection and analysis	
	Briefing	3 rd and 4 th week of July
	Field work	
	Debriefing	
	Aide memoire/In-country Debriefing	
	Phase 4 - Reporting	
	Draft evaluation report	
	Submit Draft evaluation report to (list key stakeholder)	August 15 th
	Quality feedback	
	Revise evaluation report	
	Submit revised evaluation report to (list key stakeholder)	August 25 th
	Share evaluation report with stakeholders (working level)	
	Consolidate comments	
	Revise evaluation report	
	Submit final evaluation report to (list key stakeholder)	September 5 th
	Phase 5 Dissemination and follow-up	

Note: Dates might be subject to revision.