EVALUATION QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Office of Evaluation
Measuring Results, Sharing Lessons

TERMS OF REFERENCE

STRATEGIC EVALUATION OF WFP'S SUPPORT FOR ENHANCED RESILIENCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Over the past decade, humanitarian need has grown at a staggering rate. The number of people who rely on humanitarian assistance has more than tripled while the cost of responding has increased six-fold. Every indication suggests that this growth will continue. Our answer cannot be more of the same. We need to change, to take a longer view, and to more effectively use our collective resources, if we are to truly strengthen resilience and ensure communities are better prepared for the threats they face."[1]

1. Background

1.1 Introduction

1.   These Terms of Reference (TOR) have been prepared for the strategic evaluation of WFP's support for enhanced resilience. Strategic Evaluations (SEs) commissioned by the Office of Evaluation (OEV) are forward-looking and focus on strategies, systemic or emerging corporate issues and/or programmes and initiatives with global or regional coverage. The selected topics for SEs in 2017 take account of the findings and recommendations from the Evaluability Assessment[2] of WFP's Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (completed early in 2016), issues emerging from the subsequent discussions on WFP's Strategic Plan 2017-2021 and associated instruments, and areas identified for continued organizational strengthening.[3]

2.   The TOR was prepared by Deborah McWhinney, the Evaluation Manager from the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV), following a document and data review, as well as consultations with a number of stakeholders.

3.   The purpose of the TOR is to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and specify expectations that the evaluation team should fulfil. The TOR are structured as follows: Chapter 1 provides introduction and information on the context; Chapter 2 presents the rationale, objectives, stakeholders and main users of the evaluation; Chapter 3 presents an overview of WFP's approach to resilience and the initiatives underway to implement it, and defines the scope of the evaluation; Chapter 4 spells out the proposed evaluation questions, approach and methodology; Chapter 5 indicates how the evaluation will be organized.

4.   The evaluation is scheduled to take place from June 2017 to November 2018. It will be managed by WFP's Office of Evaluation (OEV) and conducted by an independent evaluation team. The evaluation report will be presented to the WFP Executive Board in the second session of November 2018 along with the Management Response. An Internal Reference Group (IRG) and the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) will be formed.

1.2 Context

5.   The theme of 'resilience' is not new to the field of development or humanitarian assistance. It has been linked to the areas of disaster risk reduction, climate change, conflict and, more recently, the humanitarian-development nexus. WFP has articulated its position in relation to these various themes through a series of policies over the past decade and has worked to incorporate a gender equality perspective.

6.   The First World Conference on Natural Disasters in 1994 led to the endorsement of the *Ten Principles of the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World*. The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction was created in 1999 to lead the efforts of the UN system in this area. The Second World Conference in 2005 marked a shift in emphasis from 'natural disasters' to 'disaster risk reduction' and resulted in the *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015:*

---

[1] IFRC. One Billion Coalition for Resilience. http://media.ifrc.org/1bc/
[2] Evaluability assessments assess the extent to which reliable and credible evaluation is possible, considering: clarity and rationality of design (objectives, targets and indicators); demand from stakeholders; adequacy of indicators and relevant data, and provides advice on how limitations can be overcome/reduced.
[3] Described in 'Strategic Utilization of WFP's PSA Equalization Account', WFP/EB.A/2015/6-D/1, and WFP's Management Plan 2016-2018, Critical Corporate Initiatives.

Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. WFP's *Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction*[4] was approved in 2009 and included a commitment to preventing hunger through disaster preparedness and other risk reduction measures by: strengthening capacities of governments to prepare for, assess and respond to hunger arising from disasters; and, assisting communities to build resilience to shocks." It was replaced by a new policy in 2011 focusing on *Disaster Risk Reduction and Management: Strengthening Food Security and Resilience*, which addressed priority areas in the Hyogo Framework for Action related to food security and nutrition. The Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2015 resulted in the *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.* Among the four identified priorities was the investment in disaster risk reduction for resilience; and, enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to "Build Back Better" in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, including social protection systems.

7.   WFP presented a paper to the Executive Board in 2011 titled, *Climate Change and Hunger: Towards a WFP Policy on Climate Change.* At the time, it had engaged in broad consultations in an effort to develop a new Climate Change Policy, which was to complement a new Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction. It was understood that there were strong interlinkages and important distinctions between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaption (CCA): "DRR tackles the risks of geophysical hazards such as earthquakes, while adaptation does not; and CCA considers the long-term adjustment to changes in mean climatic conditions, including the resilience building and development opportunities this can provide, while DRR addresses hazardous extremes."[5] As was noted above, the WFP policy on DRR went ahead and was approved by the Executive Board in 2012; however, the policy on climate change was finalized and presented to the EB in 2017.

8.   WFP's first *Climate Change Policy* was approved in February 2017. WFP's policy goal is for vulnerable people, communities and governments to be able to address the impacts of climate on food security and nutrition and to adapt to climate change. To achieve this goal within its corporate Strategic Plan 2017-2021, WFP will work with governments and other partners to: i) support the most vulnerable people, communities and governments in managing and reducing climate-related risks to food security and nutrition and adapting to climate change; ii) strengthen local, national and global institutions and systems to prepare for, respond to and support sustainable recovery from climate-related disasters and shocks; and, iii) integrate enhanced understanding of the impacts of climate change on food security and nutrition into local, national and global policy and planning, including South–South cooperation, to address the impacts of climate change on food security and nutrition.

9.   In 2014/15, WFP repositioned its work on food security and climate change to focus on building the resilience of the most food insecure people and countries against increasing climate risks. Within this context, WFP's approach included "the provision of technical support and guidance to help UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Parties address the impacts of climate change on food security and nutrition, with an emphasis on resilience, adaptation, and risk reduction in developing countries with high levels of food insecurity; engaging as an active partner in a comprehensive Rome-based Agency (RBA) and UN-system approach; positioning WFP as a leading innovator and implementer of food security-related climate change adaptation and risk management programmes; and, taking a long-term view on key policy issues aiming towards the post-Kyoto agreement of 2015 and beyond by planning ahead and technically engaging with UNFCCC Parties."

10.   FAO, IFAD and WFP finalized a paper outlining their collaborative work on resilience in April 2015 - *Strengthening resilience for food security and nutrition: A Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership among the Rome-based Agencies.* The

---

4 This document takes risk to mean the combination of people's exposure (vulnerability) to a hazard/shock with their means to reduce the negative consequences of the event. Reducing disaster risk both lessens human vulnerability (prevents impact) and strengthens resilience.
5 Mitchell, T. and van Aalst, M. 2008. *Convergence of Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. A Review for DFID.* London, Department for International Development (DFID) as quoted in Climate Change and Hunger: Towards a WFP Policy on Climate Change (2011), p. 12

framework provides a way for the agencies to seek and build complementary alignment across existing agency-specific approaches to support the resilience of food-insecure people rather than develop new approaches, thereby ensuring that RBA collaboration is cost-effective. "The common focus of RBA work is to strengthen the resilience of rural poor, vulnerable and food insecure people's livelihoods and production systems. The emphasis is on situations where the capacities of supporting structures and institutions – notably government systems, national and local institutions and farmers' organizations – are not in a position to offset or buffer the impacts of shocks and stressors."[6] Stated principles and practice for resilience, food security and nutrition include: local and national ownership and leadership; multi-stakeholder approaches; combining humanitarian relief and development; focus on the most vulnerable people; mainstreaming risk-sensitive approaches; and, aiming for sustained impact. The capacities targeted are absorptive, adaptive and transformative.

11.   In 2015, WFP built on the collaborative approach defined with the RBA by finalizing a *Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition*. This document acknowledged that many of WFP's operations already included elements of resilience building and emphasized that the, "fundamental shift that is being made is in how programming is designed, implemented and managed. A resilience-building approach starts with the way strategies and programmes are conceived, with resilience at the center of the programme cycle. Enhancing capacities to absorb, adapt and transform in the face of shocks and stressors requires a significant level of collaboration over a prolonged period."

12.   As stated in the WFP *Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition,* cross-cutting policies contribute to WFP's resilience-building approach, including the gender, nutrition and school feeding policies.[7] "The WFP *Gender Policy 2015-2020* stresses that risks and crises have different impacts on the food security and nutrition of women, men, girls and boys. Programme design and implementation should include considerations of: gender equality, women's empowerment, how risks affect women, and what opportunities exist for enhancing their resilience. The WFP *Nutrition Policy* highlights the importance of addressing all forms of malnutrition, particularly undernutrition – a risk magnifier – by supporting nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programming and developing the capacities of national institutions delivering nutrition services, from both the health and the food systems perspectives. The school feeding policy emphasizes the importance of access to education, nutrition-sensitive programming and building capacities to run national school feeding programmes."

13.   The commitments made in September 2015 by governments and organizations to Agenda 2030 and the related Sustainable Development Goals represented a sea change in development assistance. The inclusion of almost all countries in the world as signatories to the Agenda marked a contrast with the Millennium Development Goals, which had only targeted "developing nations". The articulation of seventeen goals was ambitious and posed a serious challenge to development organizations to work collaboratively with partners to ensure success. WFP chose to focus primarily on two of the seventeen goals – SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) and 17 (Partnership for the Goals). Further, it cut its previous Strategic Plan period by one year in order to develop a new Strategic Plan 2017-2021 that aligned itself fully with these two global goals.

14.   WFP developed its Strategic Plan 2017-2021 along with three other key framework documents – i) the Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CSPs); ii) the Financial Framework Review (FFR); and, iii) the Corporate Results Framework (CRF). The Policy on Country Strategic Plans includes a commitment by WFP to support government-led National Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews as the starting point for the positioning and articulation of WFP's longer-term programming in a given country. The CSPs are meant to be the strategic and

---

6 FAO, IFAD and WFP. *Strengthening resilience for food security and nutrition: A Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership among the Rome-based Agencies* (2015), p. 1.

7 WFP/EB.1/2009/5-A/Rev.1; WFP/EB.1/2012/5-A; WFP/EB.2/2009/4-A.

programmatic instrument for multi-year planning and programming of a portfolio of assistance, replacing previous programme categories and project documents. The FFR has articulated a new approach to results-based budgeting through the Country Portfolio Budgets, which provide a holistic view of WFP's portfolio of assistance in a country. The CRF combines indicators from the previous Management and Strategic Results Frameworks to guide the planning, implementation and monitoring of WFP's programmes towards the objectives identified in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021.

15. The World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016, despite not being an inter-governmental conference, was important for WFP. The organization aligned itself with several of the priorities articulated as part of the Agenda for Humanity, which was the Summit outcome document. Core Responsibility 3 is to 'Leave No One Behind' and includes the commitment to empower and protect women and girls and to include the most vulnerable. Core Responsibility 4: Change people's lives – from delivering aid to ending need includes the commitment to reinforce, rather than replace, national and local systems; to anticipate, rather than wait, for crises; and to deliver collective outcomes by transcending humanitarian-development divides. Multi-stakeholder initiatives that were borne from the Summit to fulfil this Core Responsibility included a Commitment to Action on New Way of Working; One Billion Coalition for Resilience; an Inclusion Charter; Global Risk Platform; and, Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation, among others. WFP also committed its support to a number of elements related to Core Responsibility 5: Invest in humanity – in particular, investing in local capacities; investing according to risk (fulfilment of commitments made in the Sendai Framework for DRR, Paris Agreement and Addis Ababa Action Agenda to increase support to countries vulnerable to disaster risks in order to adapt to the negative consequences of climate change and prevent humanitarian crises); and, investing in stability. The primary multi-stakeholder initiative identified to fulfil this commitment was the Grand Bargain: 51 commitments to making emergency aid finance more efficient and effective in order to better serve people in need.

16. The Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system was also concluded in 2016. There are many elements of the QCPR that relate to WFP's work, including the necessity for gender transformation and the recommendation to strengthen coherence: the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus. As was stated,

> "Sustainability of development efforts is strictly linked to building resilience, sustaining peace and reducing disaster risk, particularly in the most vulnerable country contexts, and vice versa. However, development, humanitarian and peacebuilding efforts are often carried out in silos. And while there have been efforts at cross-fertilization, given their interlinked nature, a step change is needed. Many of today's crises and reversals of development gains are a result of the compounding effect of different vulnerabilities and root causes that could have been reduced or prevented if the development action had been more risk-informed or coherent…For the system to **move from delivering aid to ending need**, it is essential to develop a **new way of working** together across institutional divides.

17. This "new way of working" requires a focus on collective outcomes, working over multi-year timeframes, based on specific comparative advantages of different actors within and beyond the United Nations system.

18. The Report of the Secretary-General on *Repositioning the UN development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda – Ensuring a Better Future for All* responds directly to the commitment by the UN system to 'leave no one behind'. Operationalizing the New Way of Working "will require strengthening the role of the UN development system…with the right skillsets and tools to anticipate risks…To enable more coherence on the ground, a change in

conceptual thinking, organizational culture and in working methods across Agencies, Funds and Programmes...will be required."[8]

19.   Several of WFP's evaluations have assessed topics that relate to resilience in the past number of years, including:

- A 2011 strategic evaluation of WFP's role in social protection and safety nets stated that, "WFP contributes to social protection and safety nets in ways that range from the implementation of transfer programmes to helping to design food components of national social protection systems or advising governments on related policy. WFP's work in social protection and safety nets was seen as relevant and effective and as having the potential to go beyond life saving towards building resiliency and promoting livelihoods, especially when traditional WFP instruments are combined with new approaches – such as school feeding linked to local or national agricultural production or take-home meals, the establishment of rice banks or grain reserves, and food- and cash-for-work projects that develop capacity for disaster resilience – and when projects are well targeted, of sufficient duration and linked to government priorities."[9]

- A recent mapping and synthesis of evaluative evidence was commissioned by the Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group (one of the Interest Groups created by the United Nations Evaluation Group) on The Humanitarian-Development Nexus: What do evaluations say about it?[10] The authors defined the 'nexus' as "encompassing efforts to ensure that programming is more directly targeted to addressing the overall landscape of risk and vulnerability...Positioning of a given organization with in the nexus is a major concern and can be seen as being related to bringing together both 'doing the right thing' and 'doing things right'.[11] The authors found that, "unless explicitly tasked with analyzing resilience...the majority of evaluations in the sample are exceedingly weak in applying a resilience lens... This could be interpreted as indicating that...the terms has often remained more of a label than a conceptual framework (much less a paradigm)."[12] The report also notes that the "linearity associated with resilience in many evaluations is directly at odds with how resilience is framed in the academic discourse, i.e., that calls for resilience should embrace an acknowledgement that volatility cannot always be managed without acute interventions to respond to inevitably recurrent risks."[13]

- The Synthesis Report of the Evaluation Series of WFP's Emergency Preparedness and Response (2012 – 2015) found WFP's emergency preparedness and response activities to be "highly relevant and contributed to positive results at the country level... Improved advance financing was critical in enabling WFP to respond early and scale up quickly. Some improvements were observed in information management, and WFP developed a more coherent, cross-organizational approach to emergency preparedness and response. Some progress was made in national capacity development and preparedness. Areas requiring further attention included human resources, which remained a major concern despite some improvements. Relationships with and capacities of partners were also found to require more investment. Inconsistencies occurred in national capacity development and

---

8 Report of the Secretary-General on Repositioning the UN development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda – Ensuring a Better Future for All, p. 15.
9 WFP Office of Evaluation. *Summary Report of the Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets (2011)*, p. 3.
10 Christoplos, Ian, Collinson, Sarah, Kuol, Luka and Kisic, Pasko. Draft Report - *The Humanitarian-Development Nexus: What do evaluations say about it?*, 2017.
11 Ibid, p. 22.
12 Ibid, p. 35.
13 Ibid, p. 36.

preparedness initiatives...WFP's expressed commitment to cross-cutting issues, including gender and accountability to affected populations, was found to have little influence on operations, and there were gaps in monitoring, analysis and knowledge management."[14]

- In 2014, an Impact Evaluation of Food for Assets was undertaken[15], evaluating the former Food or Cash for Work programmes (F/CFW) approach[16] against long-term transformational change as envisioned by FFA to confirm whether WFP was on the right track. "The theory of change that guided the evaluations in the series predicted impacts to address short term, medium term and long term objectives. The evaluations found that in the short term, WFP [using a F/CFW approach] was effective in providing food and employment to people in under-served communities in periods of both civil unrest and natural disaster and in the process, useful assets were built. There was evidence of some of the expected medium and longer term positive impacts; however, improvements in longer term food security were limited." These findings are significant considering that, except for Ethiopia, none of the programmes evaluated were operationally oriented towards achieving resilience objectives, although stated goals were broadly aligned.

  Thus, the evaluation findings confirmed the appropriacy of FFA as a mechanism to contribute to delivery of WFP's 2011 corporate policy on disaster risk reduction and management and the Strategic Plan (2014-2017) with its focus on resilience. The directions set in the 2011 FFA Guidance manual are in line with the evaluations' findings concerning factors important for achievement of impacts, but more needs to be done to ensure that this guidance is consistently applied."[17] The evaluation also raised concerns about the impacts on women and recommended a further study, which is reaching completion. The FFA guidance was updated in 2015 as per the recommendations of the evaluation, and released in 2016,

- The 2015 Annual Evaluation Report noted "the increasing ambition and range of WFP's work require a knowledge-driven organization to: manage the continuous innovation demanded by today's complex context; support its partnerships; and underpin its comparative advantage, especially in rapidly evolving fields such as nutrition, resilience and assistance modalities."[18] It also identified several good practices "in WFP's engagement with national counterparts, particularly in strengthening EPR, contingency planning and food management. These examples illustrate the importance of strengthening national systems and capacities for emergency preparedness, to move beyond immediate response towards disaster risk reduction and resilience."[19]

- The 2016 Annual Evaluation Report reported on lessons from the Ebola responses, including that the response was gender-blind and that, "links to existing development-focused country operations could have been confirmed earlier, and the transition process to a non-emergency reporting framework could have been defined

---

14 WFP Office of Evaluation. *Synthesis Report of the Evaluation Series of WFP's Emergency Preparedness and Response (2012 – 2015)*, p. i.

15 Case studies were carried out in Senegal, Guatemala, Nepal, Bangladesh and Uganda.

16 In line with moving from Food Aid to Food Assistance, in 2011 WFP made a strategic shift away from the former Food or Cash for Work programmes (F/CFW), to Food Assistance for Assets (FFA – using food or cash-based transfers) with the release of the FFA Programme Guidance Manual. The key change from F/CFW to FFA is the shift in emphasis away from the conditionality of labour in F/CFW to one of community selection and ownership of the assets by communities, the planning, design, and technical support provided to communities to build these own assets, and asset creation as a context-specific, complementary programme to other initiatives and partnerships which is the basis of FFA.

17 WFP Office of Evaluation. *Impact Evaluation Synthesis - Synthesis Report of the Evaluation Series on the Impact of Food for Assets (2002 – 2011) and lessons for building livelihoods resilience* (2014), Executive Summary, p. iii.

18 WFP Office of Evaluation, Annual Evaluation Report 2015, p. 1.

19 Ibid, p. 7.

better to enable measurement of results related to resilience and non-life-saving assistance."[20] Positively, WFP's 'care, contain and protect' framework in its Ebola response "was found to be highly effective and proved fundamental to successful scale-up and later scale-down."[21] The same report noted that "some activities for refugees and internally displaced persons, such as in Burundi, did not make sufficient links to resilience or livelihood approaches."[22]

- The South Sudan Country Portfolio Evaluation in 2017 noted that there were operational synergies with FAO on resilience-related programme but "mixed results in building livelihoods and resilience. While beneficiaries valued the FFA assets, particularly the dikes, feeder roads and training, the quality of some, especially the tertiary roads, was limited. Most FFA activities remained short-term with little evidence of the complementary layering of multi-sectoral actions over a sustained period needed to establish resilience to shocks and trends that affect food security."[23] Recommendations from this evaluation include strengthening humanitarian-development synergies by "partnering with other agencies to reinvigorate and refine an inter-agency approach to building resilience that is distinct from FFA activities, that layers multi-annual interventions from different agencies for progressive replication and rollout as conditions permit."[24]

20.   In addition to WFP, there are a number of global actors working in the field of resilience, including: bilateral donors such as Department for International Development (DFID), Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), USAID and Global Affairs Canada (GAC); UN agencies like the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), UN Development Programme (UNDP), and OCHA; private donors such as the Rockefeller Foundation; international financial institutions, such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the International Climate Fund (ICF); normative agencies like the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC); international NGOs like Oxfam and CARE International; and, academic/research institutes like the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the Overseas Development Institute, among others.

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1 Rationale

21.   Responding to the compelling confluence of global discourse, need and opportunities for knowledge generation, OEV has re-activated earlier plans for a strategic evaluation of WFP's support for enhanced resilience in 2017[25], rather than wait until a policy evaluation of the 2015 Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition[26] becomes due in 2019. The evaluation will be forward-looking and formative in nature given that resilience programming is still quite new in WFP and a focus on performance and results achievement would be premature. Its selection as a topic for a strategic evaluation has been influenced by the following factors, as elaborated on in the Context section above:

- growing importance of the topic of resilience globally, as highlighted in the June 2017 Report of the Secretary-General, and importance for WFP to review its positioning;

---

20 Office of Evaluation, Annual Evaluation Report 2016, p. 7.
21 Ibid, p. 5.
22 Ibid, p. 12.
23 Office of Evaluation, South Sudan Country Portfolio Evaluation Summary Evaluation Report
24 Ibid, p. 17-18.
25 OEV Work Plan 2017-2019.
26 WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C (27 April 2015).

- the enhanced prominence of resilience as one of three focus areas in the Integrated Roadmap 2017-2021 – specifically, the Policy on Country Strategic Plans and Financial Framework;
- emergence of resilience as a common theme in recent Country Portfolio Evaluations and the volume of resilience-related programming in new Country Strategic Plans;
- recent global dialogue and shifting emphasis towards 'ending needs' rather than only 'meeting needs', with implications for preparedness, prevention and resilience-building;
- current debates and concern on the number of protracted crises, where humanitarian and development needs intersect;
- programming challenges faced in fragile contexts with mass-influx of refugees (e.g. Syria +5);
- the emphasis on nutrition-sensitive programming and gender equality as cross-cutting issues;
- importance of partnership dimensions inherent to the new ways of working;
- implications of gender equality and equity dimensions of the 'no one left behind' commitments; and,
- data revolution related to the monitoring of progress on all SDGs.

2.2 Objectives

22. This evaluation will serve the dual objectives of learning and accountability.

Learning – Analyze WFP's readiness to deliver on resilience outcomes; assess the extent to which WFP's resilience work is relevant and equitable and if the organization is 'fit for purpose' to deliver on the resilience agenda as defined in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021; assess WFP's resilience programming principles, including its capacity to meet the conceptual and operational challenges identified in the New Ways of Working; identify whether WFP Country Offices are able to access, analyze and use relevant and accurate data to inform their resilience programming and measure results.

Accountability – Assess whether WFP and its partners adequately support efforts to enhance resilience, including for different groups, particularly in protracted crises. Reflect on the early performance of the broad range of WFP's resilience-related programme activities, programme approaches and programme packages[27].

23. Findings will be actively disseminated and OEV will seek opportunities to present the results at internal and external events as appropriate. Lessons will also be incorporated into OEV's lesson sharing system.

2.3 Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

24. There are various groups of stakeholders in this evaluation: the members of the Executive Board, WFP senior management and country-level programme colleagues are the primary audiences for this evaluation. Key internal stakeholders and users with varied normative, technical and programming perspectives are, at HQ level: the Policy and Programme Division (OSZ), specifically the following units involved in resilience activities or initiatives: Asset Creation and Livelihoods (OSZPR); Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction (OSZIR); Purchase for Progress (OSZSF); Emergency and Transitions (OSZPH); Market Access (OSZIC); Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (OSAZF); Safety Nets and Social Protection (OSZIS); the Brasil Centre of Excellence (BRA); the African Risk Capacity (ARC); the Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service (OSZI); the Emergency

---

27 This includes nutrition programming, home-grown school feeding, safety nets, climate change-related programmes, food assistance for assets, credit/savings, insurance, P4P, PPP, Smallholder Access to Market Support, C-Adapt, FoodSECuRe, ARC, etc.

Preparedness and Support Response Division (OSE) specifically, the Emergency Preparedness branch (OSEP); the Nutrition Division (OSN); the Rome-Based Agencies Division (PGR); the Gender Office (GEN); and at the decentralized level: WFP Regional Resilience and Programme Advisors (RBs) and colleagues working on a range of different programmes at the country-level(COs).

25.   Potential global stakeholders and users of the evaluation will include humanitarian and development actors, academics, consortia and networks working on issues related to resilience (e.g. IASC, United Nations agencies in the humanitarian and development spheres – the Rome-based Agencies, in particular - the World Bank and regional development banks, donor countries and/or their aid/development agencies, national/international NGOs, national governments, regional entities, universities and research institutions).

26.   Local community members/leaders where resilience initiatives are being implemented, as well as beneficiaries of these initiatives, are key stakeholders.

27.   WFP colleagues from the various Divisions and offices listed above will be asked to be members of the Internal Reference Group. External experts from academia, research institutes, donor organizations, international NGOs and foundations with a focus on resilience programming will be invited to be members of an Expert Advisory Panel. Attention will be paid to ensure gender balanced reference groups/Advisory Panel.

28.   The inception report will include a more in-depth stakeholder analysis. The evaluation team will be asked to further deepen the stakeholder analysis through the use of appropriate tools, such as gender-sensitive accountability maps, power-to-influence or stakeholder matrices.

29.   It is expected that the results (findings, conclusions and recommendations) of the evaluation will be used to strengthen the understanding and quality of resilience and resilience-related programming in the Country Strategic Plans and contribute to the development of WFP's policy and strategic frameworks in the area of resilience. It also aims to improve planning, implementation performance and quality of WFP's approaches to resilience. This is particularly critical given the centrality of resilience in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021.

3. Subject of the Evaluation

3.1   WFP's Support for Enhanced Resilience

30.   As outlined in the Context section of these TORs, WFP has been committed to strengthening the resilience of individuals, households and communities who are at risk of disaster, climate and/or conflict-related risks for many years. It has also been increasingly focused on system strengthening and capacity building. Further, WFP has made recent commitments to an equity agenda to ensure that 'no one is left behind'. WFP's work to support enhanced resilience will be the subject of this strategic evaluation. The WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021 states that, "WFP works to strengthen the resilience of affected people in protracted crises by applying a development lens in its humanitarian response."[28] The SP further states that, "WFP's mandate allows it to apply development tools and perspectives to its humanitarian responses, providing communities with early recovery and development-enabling interventions that help build resilience and contribute to productive opportunities over the long term...working collaboratively across institutional boundaries at the humanitarian–development and peace-building nexus, in line with the policy on WFP's role in peace-building in transition settings, while ensuring that it does not deviate from the primacy of humanitarian principles."[29]

---

28 WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021, p. 2.
29 Ibid, p. 6.

31.   The evaluation will be grounded in WFP's current reality as articulated in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021 and associated policy documents. It will examine the way that WFP has articulated its approach to resilience on conceptual and operational grounds, as it relates to climate, disaster and conflict-related shocks and in contexts of prevention, crisis response, transition/recovery and capacity strengthening.

32.   The Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) 2017-2021 highlights that the CSPs are meant to "enable a multi-sector approach to recovery programming, addressing risk and building resilience for food security and nutrition, which requires wide consultation and long-term collaboration. In each context, all aspects of the programme cycle will be examined through a resilience lens to determine how actions can best be integrated with national government strategies and partner-supported programmes."[30]

33.   The evaluation will integrate a gender equality perspective throughout. It will also be utilization-focused, which includes a clear identification of users from the start of the process and ensuring that user needs and perspectives are sought and considered at all stages of the evaluation process.

3.2   Scope of the Evaluation

34.   The evaluation will cover the WFP support for enhanced resilience through activities, programmes, initiatives and policies from 2014 to 2017. It will analyze WFP's conceptual approach and programmes in the context of disaster risk reduction, crisis response, transition/recovery and capacity strengthening. The non-linearity and multi-stakeholder nature of resilience work will be central. WFP's work on system strengthening will also be included. The *Policy on Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition* will be an important framing document but will not be the sole reference point for this strategic evaluation.

35.   On-going and deactivated L2 and L3 emergencies will included in the scope of this evaluation as a way of capturing lessons related to WFP's corporate emergency response, as well as to gain lessons from the emergency response with a resilience lens, particularly as countries shift from L3 to L2 status and beyond.

3.3   Overview of WFP activities and approaches in the area of resilience

36.   WFP support to resilience-building is not ascribable to a single initiative, but rather to a plurality of programme activities, programme approaches, programme packages, functions, and initiatives. Desk reviews and consultations with HQ programme units identified stand-alone programme activities with a resilience-building aim, including Food Assistance for Assets (FFA), Home-grown School Feeding (HGSF), Purchase for Progress (P4P), Nutrition and Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA), each with their own specific technical guidance to ensure standards and quality. Programme approaches include safety nets, disaster risk reduction, climate change. Programme packages for resilience are those that combine specific activities, such as the Rural Resilience Initiative (R4) that combines FFA, savings, credit and insurance schemes.

37.   The evaluation will also look retrospectively at the programming carried out since 2014 with a focus on Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations[31] as they most closely represent the 'nexus' between humanitarian and development programming.

38.   The largest concentration of resilience-related programming in WFP is in Food Assistance for Assets activities overseen by the Assets Creation and Livelihoods Division. FFA's main intended benefits include:

---

30 WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans 2017-2021, p. 14.
31 Those from 2015 to 2017, in particular.

- Empowering local communities and vulnerable groups through participatory planning;

- Improving access to food for the most vulnerable and food-insecure people in times of need;

- Reducing disaster risks, building resilience to shocks, and adapting to changing climate;

- Contributing to long-term environmental and livelihood benefits;

- Promoting gender equality, women's empowerment and improved nutrition; and,

- Strengthening local and national institutional capacities to ensure sustainability of the investments made.

39.   Other climate change-related resilience programming includes collaboration with Oxfam on the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative, which is a "comprehensive risk management approach that helps communities be more resilient to climate variability and shocks through a combination of four risk management strategies: improved resource management through asset creation, insurance, livelihoods diversification and microcredit, and savings."[32] WFP also supports the African Union's Africa Risk Capacity (ARC) mutual insurance initiative that aims to improve current responses to climate-related food security emergencies by providing member countries with rapid funds in the event of natural disasters. Other climate resilience initiatives include the Climate Adaptation Management and Innovation Initiative (C-ADAPT), which carries out analysis on food security and climate change, adaptation planning and identifies good practices in food security adaptation programming; and the Food Security Climate Resilience (FoodSECuRE), which is a facility established to trigger action before climate shocks occur and that provides predictable, multi-year funding for post-climate disaster resilience. WFP also implements activities funded through the UN Framework for Climate Change Convention Adaptation Fund.

40.   WFP is also working on 'systemic food assistance' – leveraging food assistance for improved food system performance. It uses its position between commercial markets (for food and food system services) and the public interest (as captured by food assistance) to strengthen food system performance while also combining 'hard' supply chain and 'soft' programming interventions to address hunger and food insecurity. The evaluation will assess the extent to which systemic gender inequalities are being addressed in this context, as well as looking at ways that WFP offices are working to enhance national capacities and systems.

41.   WFP has been implementing nutrition interventions for a number of years and has recently increased its focus on "nutrition-sensitive approaches" – that is, "women's empowerment, agriculture, food systems, education, employment, social protection, and safety nets—they can greatly accelerate progress in countries with the highest burden of maternal and child undernutrition and mortality."

42.   The collaborative work with FAO and IFAD, as well as other key partners, will also be examined given the critical importance of complementarity in the field of resilience. On-going joint programmes will be assessed, as will new initiatives to roll-out the RIMA resilience measurement tool in specific countries.

43.   An analysis of WFP's overall data system architecture indicates that WFP implemented programmes with a resilient-building component in 72 countries in 2016. There may also be a number of programmes being undertaken that contribute to resilience but are not labelled as such. The number of reported beneficiaries (not sex-disaggregated) varied considerably across countries and across programmes (see Table 1).

---

32 WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021, p. 26.

Table 1: Number of beneficiaries by Programme type (2016)

Programme	Beneficiaries
FFA	10,193,560
HGSF	6,766,723
P4P	1,600,000
PAA	62,040

44.   Various tools are used by WFP staff for situation analysis, programme design and results measurement. The identification of areas showing the current status of food insecurity and vulnerability to shock is informed by the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) developed by FAO, WFP and partners, where available. It is intended to be a "fact-based, harmonized analysis of the food security situation to enable informed decision-making through consensus."[33] However, the IPC is not available in all countries. In addition to the IPC, WFP uses other assessment data generated from the vulnerability analysis mapping (VAM) unit, such as the Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA), Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analyses (CFSVA's), regular Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS), and other Government led assessments and analyses (e.g. the Vulnerability Assessment Committee's – VAC's of Southern Africa, or the Cadre Harmonize of the Sahel, etc.). These analyses however are time-bound as they provide current and short-term projected food insecurity. Along with the periodic, single country, comprehensive food security analyses, the VAM Unit in HQ has developed the Shock Impact Simulation Model (SISMOD), which provides early assessments of the impact of a simulated shock on the households' food security level, giving an estimation of the capacity of the household to resist and absorb the shock. VAM is also part of a FAO-led technical team, which is testing the application of a Resilience measurement indicator, called RIMA-II.

45.   A multi-sectoral team at WFP developed a 3-Pronged Approach (3PA) to inform longer-term integrated programme design, particularly for, but not limited to, resilience building. The 3PA is composed of (i) a national level Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) that overlays historical trends of recurring food insecurity (from the IPC's, FSMS's, EFSA's, VAC's, etc.) and exposure/risk to natural shocks, mapping out geographical areas where these converge to inform where long-term response investments are justified, bringing together combinations of Safety Nets, DRR, Preparedness, and Early Warning Strategies; (ii) the sub-national Seasonal Livelihood Programming (SLP) consultations to populate the programme strategies identified through the ICA with activities, using temporal, livelihood, and gender lenses to identify context-specific integrated programme complementarities and the partnerships to deliver them; and (iii) and community-based participatory planning processes (CBPP) that place affected populations at the center of their local level planning. To date, the 3PA has been primarily, but not solely, used by FFA with governments and partners, whilst other programming divisions are using the 3PA to varying degrees.

46.   With the Strategic Plan 2017-2021, organization- wide measurement of and reporting on resilience against corporate indicators is changing. In the 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework, the resilience-related Strategic Objectives (SO) are SO 2 and 3[34]. Indicators include: Food Consumption Score (FCS), Community Asset Score (CAS), Coping Strategy Index (CSI) Daily average dietary diversity (DD) and Proportion of targeted communities with

---

33 FAO. Integrated Food Security Phase Classification: Technical Manual Version 2.0, Foreword.
34 SO2: Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies; SO3: Reduce risk and enable people, communities and countries to meet their own food and nutrition needs.

improved capacities to manage climate shocks. In OEV's 2016 *Evaluability Assessment of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017,* the resilience indicators were found to be "difficult to use to capture changes in resilience" and issues around the relevance and meaningfulness of these measures were raised. Difficulties on reporting resilience indicators were confirmed in the 2016 Annual Performance Report, especially for the CAS.

47. The new Corporate Results Framework 2017-2021 includes resilience under SO3 (Achieve Food Security)/Strategic Results 4 (Food Systems are sustainable), but does not have a resilience-specific Strategic Objective. However, resilience is one of the "focus areas" around which strategic outcomes formulated at country level are being framed. In addition to the keeping the previous SRF indicators, the CRF also introduces new resilience-related measurements, mainly related to climate change: proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihoods asset base; food expenditure share; proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting environmental benefits; and, proportion of targeted communities where there is evidence of improved capacity to manage climate shocks and risks. Among the non-mandatory indicators, the CRF includes also the Asset Benefit Indicator (ABI), which is meant to measure the benefits obtained from assets created with WFP's support, and 'minimum dietary diversity for women' and 'minimum acceptable diet' to measure progress towards nutrition-related outcomes. Based on people's perceptions, it will report on the percentage of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihood asset base. There is also a footnote stating that "all person-related data will be disaggregated by sex and age", which is a first for WFP. The performance against SRF indicators appears in Standard Project Reports (SPRs), COMET and Annual Performance Reports (APR). Table 2 shows the number of operations that reported on Resilience indicators in 2016.

Table 2: Number of operations reporting on resilience-related indicators in 2016

Strategic objective	Outcome	Indicator	No of Operations reporting on Indicator
SO 2	2.1: Adequate food consumption reached or maintained over assistance period for targeted households	2.1.1 Food consumption score (FCS), disaggregated by sex of household head	31
		2.1.2 Daily average dietary diversity (DD), disaggregated by sex of household head	31
		2.1.3 Coping strategy index (CSI), disaggregated by sex of household head	16
	2.2: Improved access to assets and/or basic services, including community and market infrastructure	2.2.1 Community asset score (CAS)	22
SO 3	3.1 Improved access to livelihood assets has contributed to enhanced resilience and reduced risks from disaster and shocks faced by targeted food-insecure communities and households	3.1.1 Community asset score (CAS)	38
		3.1.2 Food consumption score (FCS), disaggregated by sex of household head	50
		3.1.3 Daily average dietary diversity (DD), disaggregated by sex of household head	45
		3.1.4 Coping strategy index (CSI), disaggregated by sex of household head	42

Strategic objective	Outcome	Indicator	No of Operations reporting on Indicator
		3.3.2 Proportion of targeted communities where there is evidence of improved capacity to manage climatic shocks and risks supported by WFP	19

48.   The main corporate tool for country-level monitoring of programme implementation is COMET, whose roll out was completed at the end of 2016. COMET is a single database combining operational data and providing quality evidence on programme performance. The system does not have a dedicated platform for resilience, but it allows for the extraction of data on resilience-building programmes and beneficiaries, as well as on resilience-building indicators performance at outcome and output levels. Some programmes, like R4 and PAA, have developed informal reporting systems with country/project-specific indicators and M&E frameworks that are not integrated into the corporate reporting systems. Information from the corporate reporting system can be found in in SPRs and APR narratives.

49.   In terms of resources allocated to resilience, the new budget architecture introduced by the Financial Framework Review presents funds allocations by Strategic Outcome and Focus Area. A preliminary screening of the approved and draft I/CSPs and T-ICSP indicates that 85% of WFP countries allocated or plan to allocate budget for activities under the resilience focus area.

4. Evaluation Approach, Questions, and Methodology

4.1 Overview of Evaluation Approach

46.   This evaluation will be formative in nature and will focus on organizational learning. It recognizes that resilience building in WFP is still in its infancy but can benefit from a clearer understanding of the inter-connectedness and complementary of approaches required to reduce risk and enhance resilience among individuals, families and in communities, as well as through national systems.

47.   This evaluation will follow OEV's Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) guidance for strategic evaluations. To maximize the evaluation's quality, credibility and utility, a mixed methods approach will be used with triangulation of evidence to ensure transparency, impartiality and minimize bias. The evaluation questions and sub-questions will be systematically addressed to meet both the accountability and learning goals. A sampling strategy to ensure coverage of all aspects of WFP's resilience approach will be developed.

48.   During the Inception Phase, the evaluation team will conduct two inception missions to WFP Country Offices to deepen their understanding of the context of different types of resilience programming (climate-related, economic and conflict), gather information on data availability and quality and test data collection instruments. There will be a validation workshop following these missions as an integral part of the inception phase. The inception report will include a constructed theory of change, a detailed evaluation matrix and a description of the proposed methodological approach. An assessment of gender and equity-related data gaps will be included in the evaluation approach.

4.2 Evaluability Assessment

49.   A common approach to undertaking an evaluability assessments highlights three key elements that are essential for determining whether an evaluation should proceed: data, demand, design. Additional key elements include the existence of a theory of change (TOC) and/or logical framework for an organization's work in a particular area.

50.   A challenge in resilience work generally is the fact that the term 'resilience' is familiar to many, is often considered to be a panacea and, as a result, may be overused. Further, WFP's resilience policy refers to 'building resilience for food security <u>and</u> nutrition'. Understanding how resilience is defined, monitored, measured and analyzed will be a central component of this evaluation. There is no lack of data to draw from – both internally and externally. It will be a question more of determining whether there is an adequate and appropriate understanding of resilience and accompanying clarity of definition, measurement tools and analytical frameworks.

51.   Several Units/Divisions developed Theories of Change in late 2015/early 2016, including Food Assistance for Assets (FFA), Social Protection and Country Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance (CCSTA). Whereas there is not a "resilience TOC", these TOCs provide useful information related to WFP's work in these areas, as well as the expected impact pathways.

52.   In terms of the demand, there are different perspectives on the timeliness of this evaluation. While many senior WFP colleagues have indicated that this evaluation is a timely and strategically important one, others believe that resilience work is too new to evaluate outcomes. A formative approach to the evaluation that looks at design and relevance issues rather than an assessment of results achieved has been taken as a result.

4.3 Evaluation Questions

53.   The evaluation will address the following questions and associated sub-questions, which will be detailed further in an evaluation matrix to be developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim to generate evaluation insights and evidence that will help WFP colleagues to develop equitable, appropriate, context-specific resilience programming that meets the goals set out in WFP's Strategic Plan and the related SDGs.

54.   **Question 1: How relevant is WFP's resilience work and for whom** (is it doing the right things)?

  1.1   Does WFP have conceptual clarity on the topic of resilience?
      1.1.1   Is there a common understanding of resilience as a topic, programme activity, programme approach or programme package in WFP?
      1.1.2   Has WFP articulated its approach on conceptual and operational grounds relating to climate, disaster and conflict-related chocks, prevention, crisis response, transition/recovery and capacity building?
      1.1.3   How is resilience built and for whom?
      1.1.4   Is WFP able to contribute to a shared understanding of resilience, including sustainability and vulnerability, as part of the 'New Ways of Working' in the UN system?
      1.1.5   What is the applicability of the conceptual framework on risk and resilience to be considered by the High Level Panel on Programmes to WFP's work in the context of the IRM?
      1.1.6   How are donor definitions of resilience influencing WFP's conceptualization of the term?
      1.1.7   Is WFP's resilience work aligned with regional and national resilience policies/frameworks?
      1.1.8   How do national partners understand resilience and WFP's role in this area?
          1.1.8.1   How is WFP working to integrate resilience programming into national systems (at central or local levels)?
  1.2   Does WFP have a comparative advantage in doing resilience work? If so, in what specific areas? Is this recognized by partners?

1.3   How consistently are the new CSPs framing their resilience work?

55.   Question 2: Is WFP engaged in the right partnerships to enable strong resilience outcomes?

2.1   Is there potential to broaden partnerships in order to strengthen WFP's work to ensure a complimentary package of interventions to strengthen resilience?

2.2   Is WFP equipped to meet operational goals as part of the New Ways of Working, including improved joint planning and programming, and effective leadership for collective outcomes?

2.3   Has WFP used the guidance in the RBA Collaboration on Resilience paper to inform its resilience-related programming? If so, how and to what end?

     2.3.1   How well is WFP working collaboratively with FAO and IFAD, as well as other UN partners, in country to maximize resilience-related outcomes?

2.4   Has WFP prioritized the strengthening of partnerships with and capacities of national and local governments as part of resilience-related programming?

2.5   Are the resilience-related outcomes defined by WFP complementary to those of its partners and/or other agencies working on related issues? If so, how was this complementarity ensured? If not, why not?

2.6   Are there any innovative resilience-related partnerships that can be identified as having a broader applicability or failures that would enhance learning?

2.7   How has the adoption of the 3PA enabled partnerships with government and local partners?

56.   Question 3: Is WFP 'fit for purpose'[35] to implement appropriate, equitable, effective and coherent resilience programming in the context of the Strategic Plan 2017-2021 (is it doing them right)?

3.1   Are WFP programming modalities sufficiently flexible to adapt to different and fluid contexts and to meet the differentiated needs of men and women?

     3.1.1   How is the 3-Pronged Approach to programming being used by different Divisions/units/ programmes?

          3.1.1.1   How is the 3PA being applied in the various contexts (emergency, transition, fragile contexts, etc.) in which WFP is working?

     3.1.2   How deep is the IRM "toolbox" and how flexible is the use of it for both programme design and monitoring/reporting?

          3.1.2.1   Has appropriate and clear guidance on resilience been provided to country-level staff (policy, implementation, tools)?

          3.1.2.2   If so, has it been provided in different UN languages and in a user-friendly format?

     3.1.3   To what extent do the new programming modalities as defined in the Policy on CSP and other IRM documents encourage the integration of resilience principles (national/local ownership and leadership, multi-stakeholder approaches, linking humanitarian response to development), inter-linkages between programmes (e.g. FFA, social protection and social safety nets, home-grown school feeding, insurance), strategies (DRR, prevention,

---

35 "Fit for Purpose" is defined as having all of the organisational elements needed to successfully implement a programme, including clear policy direction, guidance/tools and systems (financial, HR) that enable good performance.

mitigation) and targeting of interventions (individual, households, communities, national systems);

    3.1.4   Is WFP equipped to meet operational goals as part of the New Ways of Working, including pooled data, analysis and information, and financing modalities to support collective outcomes?

3.2   What is needed to shift the organizational culture to include longer-term development planning?

3.3   Does WFP have the right mix of staff competencies and skills to conduct successful resilience programming?

    3.3.1   Has there been sufficient attention given to training and capacity enhancement for WFP staff in this area?

3.4   In what ways are donors influencing WFP's operational approaches to resilience?

    3.4.1   To what extent does donor support and funding enable or inhibit WFP's programming on resilience?

57.   Question 4: Does WFP have a clear and consistent approach to measuring outcomes related to resilience and are WFP COs able to access, analyze and use (relevant, accurate, timely and sex disaggregated) data to make informed decisions related to resilience-related programming?

4.1   To what extent did the Strategic Results Framework (2014-2017) enable appropriate, robust and consistent measurement of resilience-related outcomes in the context of both food security and nutrition?

    4.1.1   Do the indicators and expected results in the Corporate Results Framework address any gaps or weaknesses identified from the SRF?

    4.2 How well will WFP be able to report on work to support enhanced resilience given the commitments to SDG2 as articulated in the Corporate Results Framework?

4.3   Are Country Offices using other tools or systems to measure resilience-related outcomes?

4.4   How are COs using data to make evidence-based programming decisions?

4.5   What are the areas of weakness with regard to data accessibility, analysis and use?

4.6   Are COs reporting accurately and meaningfully on FFA when they are part of a "programme package"?

58.   Question 5: What emerging lessons can be identified regarding the most successful approaches in terms of resource mobilization, enhanced partnerships, joint planning, design and implementation of resilience-building programmes?

4.4 Methodology

59.   The evaluation team will be expected to take a rigorous methodological approach in order to maximize the quality, credibility and use of the evaluation. The evaluation methodology will systematically address the evaluation questions and sub-questions (in section 4.3 above) in a way that meets the dual purposes of accountability and learning. A theory of change will be constructed in order to ground the evaluation in a clear results-based framework. This will be drafted by the external evaluation team and validated through consultation with key stakeholders in the inception phase. Attention will be paid to ensuring that a gender analysis is mainstreamed throughout this process, including in the evaluation questions and indicators.

60.   The evaluation will include the following country studies/missions:

Phase	Type of study	Number of countries
Inception	Inception visit	2
Data collection	Field visits	6
	Desk review	6

61.   During the Inception Phase, the evaluation team will elaborate the evaluation matrix (as per Section 4.3 above) test and complete the methodology including data collection instruments details as agreed by the Evaluation Manager. As mentioned earlier, the evaluation team will be required to develop strong qualitative data collection methods to inform some of the evaluation questions. The evaluation will follow the OEV's Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) which provides details on the elements to be included in the methodology, including attention required to gender equality and the empowerment of women.

62.   Given that work to strengthen the resilience of individuals and communities requires integrated approaches with multiple causal pathways, the evaluation team will be asked to consider using theory-based approaches to understand what works, for whom, in what contexts and why? The evaluation will adopt a mixed method approach combining qualitative and quantitative data and will acknowledge the complexity inherent in any work to strengthen the resilience of individuals to withstand shocks. The methods to be considered include a detailed document and data review, key informant interviews with a range of WFP's resilience partners and a survey of key stakeholders.

63.   A substantial document review will be required to assess the ways in which resilience has been conceived of, measured and reported on throughout the organization in the past three years. The documents to be consulted include all related WFP policies and their respective approaches to resilience, all centralized evaluations and corresponding management response that have been published since 2014, country-level and corporate reporting on resilience-related programming, including to donors and the Executive Board, as well as audit reports.

64.   A literature review will include academic work on the topic of resilience, as well as reporting on the measurement and outcomes of programmes and initiatives to strengthen resilience. There are a considerable number of 'lessons learned' documents by international NGOs and other actors working in this field that will be drawn upon.

65.   Country case studies will be used along with a theory based approach, relying on various information and data sources to demonstrate impartiality, minimize bias and optimize a cross-section of information sources. The criteria to select WFP offices to be visited and the stakeholders to be interviewed should be confirmed in the Inception Report following a discussion and validation process in the inception phase. A long list of proposed countries has been identified based on a review of relevant criteria. The long list has been included in Annex 3 of these TORs and includes: population, score on the human development index, size of CO, income level, planned budgets for resilience in new I/CSPs, presence of specific programmes (e.g. FFA, nutrition-sensitive, home-grown school feeding, gender transformation programme), existing or active or recently de-activated L2/L3 emergencies, countries visited by the internal audit of FFA programming, indicators related to resilience and the presence of large, multi-agency programmes on resilience that WFP may not be directly involved in (e.g. the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative, Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative or the Global Resilience Partnership). These criteria and long list will be validated during the inception phase of the evaluation.

66.   Tools and approaches used by other international organizations will be examined to gather lessons and enhance learning. The policy positions, definitions and directives of donors to resilience work will also be examined. Gender and diversity-balanced consultations with

beneficiaries (focus groups), national governments, UN agencies, donors, NGO partners, WFP staff and outside experts to obtain a range of views on WFP's resilience work. Other quantitative and qualitative evaluation tools/methods may be used, such as surveys and/or participatory data gathering methods.

67.   Findings will be defined following the triangulation of evidence from different sources of evidence. The sources of evidence will be presented along with the evaluation questions in a detailed evaluation matrix, which will be developed by the evaluation team and included in the Inception Report.

68.   The evaluation will take a participatory approach – integrating feedback from global, regional and country-based actors.

4.5 Quality Assurance

69.   WFP's evaluation quality assurance system is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (ALNAP and DAC). It sets out processes with steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products. It also includes quality assurance of evaluation reports (inception, full and summary reports) based on standardized checklists. EQAS will be systematically applied during this evaluation and relevant documents provided to the evaluation team. There will be two levels of quality assurance used in the evaluation process. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team, rather it ensures the report provides the necessary evidence in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.

70.   The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.

5. Organization of the Evaluation

5.1   Phases and Deliverables

Table 3 Proposed timeline summary of key evaluation deliverables

Phases	June-July '17	Aug. '17	Sept-Dec. '17	Jan-March '18	April – Aug. '18	Sept-Nov. '18	Deliverables
Phase 1 (Preparation) Preparation of CN/ ToR Stakeholder consultation Identify and hire evaluation team	x x	x					• Concept Note • ToR
Phase 2 (Inception) HQ Briefing eval team Document review Inception mission			x				• Inception Report
Phase 3 (Data collection) Data collection Analysis workshops Debriefings				x x x x			• Debriefing presentations • Aide-memoire • Analysis reports
Phase 4 (Reporting) Draft reports Comments and revisions					x x x		• Drafts • Stakeholders' wkshop • Final Evaluation Report
Phase 5 (Presentation) Exec. Board **EB.2/2018 (Nov)** + Management response						x	• Draft Summary Evaluation Report (SER) • Final SER

5.2 Evaluation Component

71.   A team leader and team members with appropriate evaluation and technical capacities will be hired to conduct the evaluation. Within the team, the team leader bears ultimate responsibility for all team outputs, overall team functioning, and client relations. The team leader requires strong evaluation and leadership skills, experience with evaluation of strategic

themes that are broad and cross-cutting in nature. His/her primary responsibilities will be (a) setting out the methodology and approach in the inception report; (b) guiding and managing the team during the inception and evaluation phase and overseeing the preparation of working papers; (c) consolidating team members' inputs to the evaluation products; (d) representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders; (e) delivering the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports (including the Executive Board summary report) and evaluation tools in line with agreed EQAS standards and agreed timelines.

72.   The team will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of any resilience-related programming for WFP or any of its key collaborating partners nor have any conflicts of interest. The evaluators are required to act impartially and respect the evaluation code of conduct.

73.   The team should have strong capacity in conducting global, thematic evaluations that incorporate country level case studies and the use of mixed methods in evaluation. The team will be required to have a strong experience of evaluating resilience concepts, programmes and monitoring, evaluation and learning systems, including analysis and synthesis of both qualitative and quantitative data and information. They will understand WFP and global UN policy architecture. It will be multi-disciplinary including an appropriate balance of extensive knowledge, skill and expertise in evaluating climate change, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian-development nexus, organizational change, quantitative indicators and measurement, technical assistance and capacity strengthening. The evaluation team should ensure a gender equality and equity focus in all phases of its implementation. The team itself should comprise men and women of mixed cultural backgrounds. Should there be country case studies, core team members should be complemented by national expertise. The team members should be able to communicate clearly both verbally and in writing in English. The team should also have additional language capacities (e.g. French and Spanish). Office support in data analysis will be required to support the evaluation team members.

74.   The evaluation team members should contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise; undertake documentary review prior to fieldwork; conduct field work to generate additional evidence from a cross-section of stakeholders, including carrying out site visits, collect and analyze information; participate in team meetings with stakeholders; prepare inputs in their technical area for the evaluation products; and contribute to the preparation of the evaluation report.

75.   Support will be provided by OEV to collect and compile relevant documentation, not available in public domain, facilitate the evaluation team's engagement respondents and provide support to the logistics of field visits.

5.3 Roles and Responsibilities

76.   This evaluation is managed by OEV. Deborah McWhinney has been appointed Evaluation Manager responsible for the evaluation preparation and design, follow-up and first level quality assurance throughout the process following EQAS. Second-level quality assurance, including approval of the TOR, budget, full evaluation report and summary evaluation report will be carried out.

77.   The Evaluation Manager has not worked on issues associated with the subject of evaluation in the past. She is responsible for drafting the TOR; selecting and contracting the evaluation team; preparing and managing the budget; setting up the review group; organizing the team briefing in HQ; assisting in the preparation of the inception and field missions; conducting the first reviews of evaluation products; and consolidating comments from stakeholders on the main evaluation products. She will also be the interlocutor between the evaluation team, represented by the team leader, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth communication and implementation of the evaluation process. An OEV Research Analyst, will provide research support throughout the evaluation. A detailed consultation schedule will be presented by the evaluation team in the Inception Report.

78.   The Evaluation Manager and/or Research Assistant may participate in the inception or field missions at the discretion of the Director of Evaluation. OEV will ensure the independence of the evaluation, WFP staff will not participate in meetings where their presence could bias the responses of respondents.

79.   There will be a large Consultative Group, as well as an Internal Reference Group for this evaluation. The consultative group will be made up of senior WFP staff/Directors at the HQ and Regional Bureau levels. A smaller Internal Reference Group of subject-matter experts working on resilience programming will also be created.

80.   An Expert Technical Panel will also be struck for this evaluation. The Expert Technical Panel will be composed of individuals with technical expertise and experience with resilience and gender equality concepts and approaches from a climate change, disaster risk reduction or conflict perspective, including the RBAs, donors, EB members, research institutes, academics, though leaders, international/national NGOs, foundations and organizations dealing with 'big data'.

5.4 Communication

It is important that Evaluation Reports are accessible to a wide audience, as foreseen in the Evaluation Policy, to ensure the credibility of WFP – through transparent reporting – and the usefulness of evaluations. The dissemination strategy will consider from the stakeholder analysis who to disseminate to, involve and identify the users of the evaluation, duty bearers, implementers, beneficiaries, including gender perspectives.

81.   Emphasizing transparent and open communication, the Evaluation Manager will ensure consultation with stakeholders on each of the key evaluation phases. The evaluation ToR and relevant research tools will be summarized to better inform stakeholders about the process of the evaluation and what is expected of them. In all cases the stakeholders' role is advisory. Briefings and de-briefings will include participants from country, regional and global levels. Participants unable to attend a face-to-face meeting will be invited to participate by telephone. A more detailed communication plan for the findings and evaluation report will be drawn up by the Evaluation Manager during the inception phase, based on the operational plan for the evaluation contained in the Inception Report.

82.   OEV will make use of data sharing software (Dropbox) to assist in communication and file transfer with the evaluation teams. In addition, regular teleconference and one-to-one telephone communication between the evaluation team and manager will assist in discussion any issue.

83.   Main deliverables during the evaluation phase will be produced in English. Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation team will make the necessary arrangement and include the cost in the budget proposal. OEV will organize a stakeholder's workshop after field work to discuss the draft evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

84.   The Summary Evaluation Report together with Management Response will be presented to WFP's Executive Board in all official WFP languages in November 2018. OEV will ensure dissemination of lessons through the annual evaluation report, presentations in relevant meetings, WFP internal and external web links. The COs and RBs are encouraged to circulate the final evaluation report to external stakeholders.

5.5 Budget

85.   The evaluation will be financed from OEV's Programme Support and Administrative budget.

Annex 1 - Evaluation Timeline

	Evaluation of WFP's Work on Resilience	By Whom[36]	
Phase 1 - Preparation			**June – July 2017**
	Evaluability Assessment, including desk review – data, demand	EM	May-June 2017
	Draft Concept Note	EM	11/07/17
	Consultations	EM	11-20/07/17
	Draft TORs. OEV/D clearance for circulation to WFP staff	EM	21/07/2017
	Revise draft TOR based on WFP feedback	EM	08/08/2017
	Final TOR sent to WFP Stakeholders & LTA firms	EM	09/08/2017
	Analysis of bids and contracting evaluation team/firm	EM	08/09/17
Phase 2 - Inception			**Sept – Dec 2017**
	Team preparation prior to HQ briefing (reading Docs)	Team	September
	HQ briefing (WFP Rome)	EM & Team	25-29/09/17
	Inception Mission in country(ies)	EM+TL	October
	De-brief and Validation Meeting (Rome)	EM	late October
	Submit Draft Inception Report (IR) to OEV	TL	**06/11/2017**
	OEV quality assurance and feedback	EM	07-14/11/2017
	Submit revised draft IR (D1) to OEV	TL	14/11/2017
	OEV quality assurance	EM	15-17/11/2017
	Share IR with internal reference group for their feedback	EM	17/11/2017
	Deadline for IRG comments	IRG	01/12/2017
	OEV consolidate all comments in matrix and share them with team	EM	04/12/2017
	Submit revised IR (D2)	TL	**11/12/2017**
	Circulate final IR to WFP key Stakeholders for their information + post a copy on intranet.	EM	15/12/2017
Phase 3 - Evaluation Phase, including Fieldwork			**January – March 2018**
	Fieldwork & Desk Review. Field visits & internal briefings with CO and RB	Team	January - March
	Exit Debrief (ppt) after each country visit	TL	
	Overall debriefing with HQ, RB and COs Staff.	EM+TL	02/04/2018
Phase 4 - Reporting			**April – August '18**
Draft 0	**Submit draft Evaluation Report (ER) to OEV**	TL	06/04/2017
	OEV quality feedback sent to the team	EM	13/04/2017
Draft 1	**Submit revised draft ER to OEV**	TL	20/04/2017
	OEV to provide an additional round of comments	EM	30/04/2017
Draft 2	**Submit revised draft ER (D2) to OEV** based on OEV comments.	TL	11/05/2018
	OEV seeks OEV Dir. Clearance prior to circulating the ER to WFP Stakeholders. When cleared, OEV shares draft evaluation report with WFP and external stakeholders (IRG and ERG) for their feedback.	EM	18/05/2018 Comments due: 01/06/2018
	OEV consolidate all WFP's comments (matrix) and share them with team	EM	05/06/2018
	Stakeholders' workshop	EM	**19-20/06/2018**
Draft 3	**Submit revised draft ER (D3)**	TL	06/07/2018
	Submit draft SER	TL	20/07/2018
	Seek for OEV Dir.'s clearance to send the Summary Evaluation Report (SER) to Executive Management.	EM	28/07/2018
	OEV circulates the SER to WFP's Senior management for comments (upon clearance from OEV's Director)	EM	06/08/2018
	OEV sends and discusses the comments on the SER to the team for revision	EM	17/08/2018
Draft 4	Submit final draft ER (with the revised SER) to OEV	TL	24/08/2018
	Seek Final approval by OEV. Dir. Clarify last points/issues with the team	EM+TL	31/08/2018
Phase 5 Executive Board (EB) and follow-up			**Sept. - Nov '18**
	Submit SER/rec to RMP for MR + SER for editing and translation	EM	
	Tail end actions, OEV websites posting, EB Round Table Etc.	EM	
	Presentation of Summary Evaluation Report to the EB	D/OEV	
	Presentation of management response to the EB	D/RMP	12-16/11/2018

---

36 Note: TL=Team Leader; EM=Evaluation Manager; OEV=Office of Evaluation. RMP = Performance Management and Monitoring Division

Annex 2 – Proposed Initial Criteria for Country Case Study Selection

General Indicators
WFP CO size in 2017
Income Status
Resilience in CSPs ($)
Approved CSPs
Draft I/CSPs
T-ICSPs
WFP Operation Types
EMOP/PRRO/DEV/CP/SO
Programming Features
Activities
FFA activities
R4 activities
Smallholder Agricultural Market Support (P4P)
Home-grown School Feeding
RBA collaborative activities (Conceptual Framework doc 2015)
RBA collaborative activities (CDN $ RIMA project)
Gender Transformation Programme
Nutrition-sensitive programmes
African Risk Capacity engagement
L3 emergency response
L2 emergency response
Deactivated L3 response
Case studies
FFA IE case study
DRR Policy case study
Safety Nets Policy case study
FAO Resilience evaluation case study
FFA audit
Approach
3-Pronged Approach
FoodSECuRE
UN Delivering as One
Indicators/Measurement Tools
Food consumption score
Community asset score
Daily average dietary diversity
Coping Strategy Index
Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) roll-out
Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis
Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)
INFORM (Index for Risk Management); OCHA
C-ADAPT
Resilience-related initiatives (multi-agency, national, regional)
The Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative (AGIR)
Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)
Global Resilience Partnership (SIDA/USAID/Rockefeller Foundation)

Annex 3 – Long list of Proposed Countries for Field Missions

Region		Country	Potential Inception/ Data collection mission
RBB	1	Pakistan	Data collection
	2	Myanmar	Data collection
	3	Nepal	*Inception mission*
RBC	4	Sudan	Data collection
	5	Kyrgyzstan	Data collection
RBD	6	Chad	Data collection
	7	Niger	Data collection
	8	Senegal	Data collection
RBJ	9	DRC	Data collection
	10	Madagascar	*Inception mission*
	11	Malawi	Data collection
	12	Zimbabwe	Data collection
RBN	13	Ethiopia	Data collection
	14	Burundi	Data collection
	15	Uganda	*Inception mission*
RBP	16	Guatemala	Data collection
	17	Ecuador	Data collection
	18	Honduras	Data collection

Annex 4 – Reference/Consultative Groups

Name	Division Unit	Position
Amir Abdulla	Office of the Deputy Executive Director	Deputy Executive Director & COO
Ramiro Lopes da Silva	Operation Services Division	Assistant Executive Director
Stanlake Samkange	Policy & Programme Innovation Division, OSZ	Director
Kenn Crossley	Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service, OSZI	Deputy Director
Zlatan Milisic	Direct Implementation Programme Service, OSZP	Deputy Director
Mark Gordon	Asset creation and livelihood Unit, OSZPR	Chief
Scott Ronchini	Asset creation and livelihood Unit, OSZPR	Policy Officer
Steve Were Omamo	Food Systems Strategy, Policy and Support Service	Deputy Director
Bing Zhao	Purchase for Progress Coordination Unit	Director
Denise Brown	Emergencies Division	Director
Sheila Grudem	Emergencies Division	Deputy Director
John Aylieff	Human Resources	Director
Bekim Mahmuti	UN Humanitarian Response Depot Network Coordinator	Chief
Harriet Spanos	Executive Board Secretariat, PGB	Director & Secretary to the EB
Cyrill Ferrand	Global Food Security Cluster, OSE	Coordinator
Corinne Woods	Communications Division, PGM	Director
Mihoko Tamamura	Rome-based Agencies and Committee on World Food Security (CFS) Division, PGR	Director
Daniel Balaban	WFP Centre of Excellence against Hunger	Director
Arnhild Spence	Partnership, Coordination and Advocacy Division, PGC	Director
Marcus Prior	Partnership, Coordination and Advocacy Division, PGC	Programme Officer (NGOs)
Tahir Nour	Cash for Change Service, OSZIC	Director
Laura Santucci	Office of the Executive Director, OED	Director
Robert Opp	Innovation and Change Management, INC	Director
Chris Toe	Policy & Programme Innovation Division, OSZ	Consultant Programme Policy
	Policy & Programme Innovation Division, OSZ	Programme Policy Officer
Carola Kenngott	South-South and Triangular Cooperation, OSZ	Policy Programme Officer
Lauren Landis	Nutrition Division	Director
Nancy Aburto	Nutrition Division	Programme Advisor

Corinne Fleischer	Supply Chain Division, OSC	Director
Mahadevan Ramachandran	Cash-based Transfers, OSCT	OIC
Chris Kaye	Government Partnership Division, PGG	Director
Kawinzi Muiu	Gender Office, GEN	Director
Jacqueline Paul	Gender Office, GEN	Senior Gender Advisor
Regional Level		
David Kaatrud	Regional Bureau Bangkok, RBB	Regional Director
Parvathy Ramaswami	Regional Bureau Bangkok, RBB	Deputy Regional Director
Peter Guest	Regional Bureau Bangkok, RBB	Regional Programme Advisor
Yumiko Kanemitsu	Regional Bureau Bangkok, RBB	Regional Evaluation Officer
James Kingori	Regional Bureau Bangkok, RBB	Regional Nutritionist
Felicity Chard	Regional Bureau Bangkok, RBB	Regional Gender Advisor
Muhannad Hadi	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Regional Director
Carlo Scaramella	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Deputy Regional Director
Darlene Tymo	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Deputy Regional Director
Luca Molinas	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Regional Evaluation Officer
Muriel Calo	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Programme Policy Officer for Resilience and Livelihoods
Belal Jahjooh	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Regional Gender Advisor
Maria Tsvetkova	Regional Bureau Cairo, RBC	Programme Officer
Abdou Dieng	Regional Bureau Dakar, RBD	Regional Director
Peter Musoko	Regional Bureau Dakar, RBD	Deputy Regional Director
Margot Vandervelden	Regional Bureau Dakar, RBD	Deputy Regional Director
Volli Carucci	Regional Bureau Dakar, RBD	Sr. Regional Programme and Policy Advisor, Resilience and Livelihoods
Filippo Pompili	Regional Bureau Dakar, RBD	Regional Evaluation Officer
Aboubacar Koisha	Regional Bureau Dakar, RBD	Regional M&E Advisor
Lola Castro	Regional Bureau Johanesburg, RBJ	Regional Director a.i.
Sarah Longford	Regional Bureau Johanesburg, RBJ	Senior Regional Programme Advisor
Grace Igweta	Regional Bureau Johannesburg, RBJ	Regional Evaluation Officer
Silvia Biondi	Regional Bureau Johanesburg, RBJ	Regional M&E Advisor
Brian Bogart	Regional Bureau Johanesburg, RBJ	Externa Relations Officer
Billy Mwiinga	Regional Bureau Johanesburg, RBJ	Programme & Policy Officer
Valerie Guarnieri	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Regional Director
Vernon Archibald	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Deputy Regional Director

Ilaria Dettori	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Senior Regional Programme Advisor
Roberto Borlini	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Regional Evaluation Officer
Genevieve Chicoine	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Regional M&E Advisor
Kathy Derore	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Programme Officer
Ana Fernandez-Martinez	Regional Bureau Nairobi, RBN	Programme Officer
Miguel Barreto	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Regional Director
Alzira Ferreira	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Deputy Regional Director
Regis Chapman	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Regional Programme Advisor
Alessandro Dinucci	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Regional Resilience Advisor
Elena Ganan	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Regional Gender Advisor
Ivan Touza	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Regional Evaluation Officer
Rosella Bottone	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Regional M&E Advisor
Giorgia Testolin	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Programme Officer
Jennie Vanharen	Regional Bureau Panama, RBP	Programme and Policy Officer
Country level		
	Countries to be added as the evaluation progresses.	

Annex 5 - List of People Consulted

Name	Unit	Title
Mark Gordon	Food Assistance for Assets, OSZPR	Chief
Fabio Bedini	Climate Change Unit	Programme Advisor
Yvonne Forsen	Vulnerability and Analysis Mapping	Deputy Director
Jean-Martin Bauer	Vulnerability and Analysis Mapping	Programme Officer
Kenn Crossley	Policy and Planning	Deputy Director
Jacqueline Paul	Gender Office	Senior Gender Advisor
Giacomo Re	Purchase from Africa for Africans	
Monika Primozic	Asset Creation and Livelihoods Unit (OSZPR)	Junior CST
Enrico Cristiani	Purchase for Progress Coordination Unit (OSZSF)	M&E Officer
Jan Cherlet	Safety Nets & Social Protection Unit (OSZIS)	Consultant
Azzurra Massimino	Climate & Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes (OSZIR)	Programme Officer
Federica Carfagna	African Risk Capacity Division (ARC)	Vulnerability Analyst
Tobias Flaemig	Vulnerability Analysis Unit-VAM (OSZAF)	Market Analyst
Valerio Giuffrida	Vulnerability Analysis Unit-VAM (OSZAF)	Market Analyst
Joy Achayo	COMET Team -Strategy Implementation and Risk Management Branch (RMPS)	Consultant
Evelyn Nakirayi	Project Budget and Programming Service (RMBP)	Consultant
Nancy Aburto	Nutrition Division	Programme Advisor
Neal Pronesti	Rome-based Agency Collaboration and Committee on World Food Security	External Partnership Consultant

Acronyms

ALNAP	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action
CO	Country Office
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EB	Executive Board
EMG	Executive Management Group
EFSA	Emergency Food Security Assessment
EQAS	Evaluation Quality Assurance System
EAP	External Advisory Panel
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HQ	Headquarters
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IRG	Internal Reference Group
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
OEV	Office of Evaluation
PGR	Rome-based Agencies & Committee on World Food Security
RB	Regional Bureau
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SE	Strategic Evaluation
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
WFP	World Food Programme