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WFP’s new evaluation function is framed by three foundational pillars:

- **The Evaluation Policy (2016-2021)**, approved by the Executive Board in November 2015, sets the vision, strategic direction and model for WFP’s evaluation function – to embed evaluation as an integral part of all our work and thereby, help strengthen WFP’s contribution to ending global hunger and achieve the Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.

- **The Evaluation Charter**, issued by the Executive Director in May 2016, confirms the mandate and governance of the evaluation function, and establishes the necessary staff authorities, roles and institutional arrangements to operationalise the policy.

- **The Corporate Evaluation Strategy 2016-2021**, endorsed by the Executive Management Group in April 2016. It sets out a phased implementation plan, comprising all the elements and activities required for building the model of a combined centralized and demand-led decentralized evaluation function that meets UN evaluation norms and standards, and achieves the Policy’s vision.

One of the salient new feature of the WFP evaluation function unpacked in these three documents is the adoption of a demand-led decentralized evaluation function complementing its already strong centralized evaluation function in line with the organization’s commitment to enhancing its evidence on and accountability for results.

All WFP’s evaluations are based on the UN evaluation principles of independence, credibility and utility. Application of these principles ensures evaluation quality, enhancing accountability and learning throughout WFP by increasing confidence in the evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons for continual improvement of WFP’s performance and results. The Office of Evaluation’s primary means of safeguarding these principles is the Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) - a set of tools and guidance covering all stages of the evaluation cycle and all types of evaluations.

For decentralized evaluations, WFP’s Office of Evaluation has developed a guidance package to support and guide Country Offices, Regional Bureaus and other HQ divisions when planning, commissioning and managing decentralized evaluations. The package of support and guidance for decentralized evaluations constitutes a specific EQAS for decentralised evaluations (DEQAS), to which this Process Guide forms a core part.

The process of developing the DEQAS began in 2015; the first version was piloted in 2016, with feedback from Regional Bureaus, Country Offices and Headquarters Divisions sought at different stages of the process to ensure that the final material serves the intended purpose. On the basis of feedback of the pilots to date, the guidance has been revised and finalized, taking into account the updated UNEG Norms and Standards issued in 2016.

Andrea Cook
Director of Evaluation
April 2017
# Table of Contents

## INTRODUCTION

*Background*  
What is a decentralized evaluation in WFP?  
Purpose and Structure of the Process Guide to DE  
Audience of the Process Guide  
Roles and responsibilities  
Key terms  
Other DE Guidance Materials  
How to use/navigate this Process Guide  
List of Symbols used in the guide

## PHASE 1: PLAN

*Introduction*  
When to plan for an evaluation?  
WFP's minimum evaluation coverage norms  
Process Map  
Step 1.1 Identify evaluation intended use, type and scope  
Intended use  
Type of evaluation  
Step 1.2 Estimate budget and timeline  
Step 1.3 Link with monitoring plan and Processes  
Step 1.4 Clarify provisions for impartiality and independence  
Step 1.5 Agree roles and responsibilities  
Summary

## PHASE 2: PREPARE

*Introduction*  
Step 2.1 Draft the Terms of Reference  
Step 2.2 Finalise provisions for impartiality/independence  
Step 2.3 Quality assure, consult and finalise the TOR  
Step 2.4 Select the evaluation team and finalise budget  
Step 2.5 Prepare a document library  
Step 2.6 Develop Communication and Learning Plan  
Summary

## PHASE 3: INCEPTION

*Introduction*  
Step 3.1 Conduct evaluation team orientation  
Step 3.2 Undertake desk review of documents  
Step 3.3 Conduct Inception Meetings  
Step 3.4 Prepare the draft Inception Report  
Step 3.5 Quality assure the Inception Report  
Step 3.6 Circulate, finalise and approve the Inception Report  
Summary

## PHASE 4: COLLECT DATA

*Introduction*  
Step 4.1 Prepare evaluation fieldwork  
Step 4.2 Conduct fieldwork and preliminary analysis  
Step 4.3 Present end of fieldwork debriefing(s)  
Summary

## PHASE 5: ANALYSE DATA AND REPORT

*Introduction*  
Step 5.1 Prepare the draft the evaluation report  
Step 5.2 Quality assure (QA) the draft evaluation report  
Step 5.3 Circulate the draft ER report to stakeholders (for comments)  
Step 5.4 Finalise the evaluation report
Step 5.5 Submit the final report for approval

Summary

PHASE 6: DISSEMINATE AND FOLLOW UP

Introduction

Step 6.1 Prepare management response and record in appropriate systems
Step 6.2 Publish Report and Management Response
Step 6.3 Disseminate and use evaluation results
Step 6.4 Track the implementation of follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations

Summary

List of Acronyms

List of Figures

Figure 1: WFP’s Evaluation Function framing documents
Figure 2: Evaluation types
Figure 3: Overall evaluation management Process Map – phases and steps
Figure 4: Phase 1 Plan - Process Map and Supporting Guidance
Figure 5: Phase 1 –Process map
Figure 7: Phase 2 – Process map
Figure 8: Phase 3 Inception – Detailed Process Map and supporting guidance
Figure 9: Phase 3 - Process map
Figure 10: Phase 4 Collect Data - Detailed Process Map and supporting guidance
Figure 11: Phase 4 –Process map
Figure 12: Phase 5 Analyse Data and Report– Detailed Process Map and supporting guidance
Figure 13: Phase 5 –Process map
Figure 14: Phase 6 Disseminate and Follow-up - Detailed Process Map and supporting guidance
Figure 15: Phase 6 –Process map

List of Tables

Table 1: Indicative Evaluation budgets by CO size
Table 2: Summary of responsibilities - Planning Phase
Table 3: Checklist for Planning Phase
Table 4: Example Evaluation Questions linked to Evaluation Criteria
Table 5: Summary of responsibilities – Preparation Phase
Table 6: Checklist Prepare Phase
Table 7: Summary of Responsibilities Inception Phase
Table 8: Checklist Inception Phase
Table 9: Summary of Responsibilities Collect Data Phase
Table 10: Checklist Collect Data Phase
Table 11: Summary of Responsibilities Report Phase
Table 12: Checklist for Report Phase
Table 13: Summary of Responsibilities Disseminate and Follow-Up Phase
Table 14: Checklist for Disseminate and Follow Up Phase

List of Boxes

Box 1: Characteristics of Decentralized Evaluations
Box 2: Note to users of this guide
Box 3: Key terms used in the process guide
Box 4: Structure of Guidance Package
Box 5: Minimum Coverage Norms for Decentralized Evaluations
Box 6: Country-level evaluation planning and budgeting
Box 7: Hint: Ways of reducing the costs of an evaluation
Box 8: Hint: Additional forms of data collection for certain types of evaluation
Box 9: Integration in this guide of the Policy provisions for impartiality/independence
Box 10: Skills and capabilities of the Evaluation Manager
Box 11: Engaging with donors on evaluations
Box 12: Content of TOR
Box 13: Key sources of data
Box 14: Notes on evaluation criteria
Box 15: Considerations for integrating gender equality and women’s empowerment dimensions in the evaluation
Box 16: Purpose and role of the Evaluation Committee
Box 17: Purpose and role of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)
Box 18: Outsourced DE Quality Support (DE QS) service: TOR Assessment
Box 19: Conflict of Interest
Box 20: Skill Set for Evaluators
Box 21: Questions to consider when selecting an Evaluation Team
Box 22: Purpose and content of Inception Meetings
Box 23: Contents of Inception Report
Box 24: Outsourced Quality Support service for DE: IR assessment
Box 25: Security arrangements for evaluation teams
Box 26: Measures to achieve impartiality and independence during the evaluation mission
Box 27: Recommended content of debriefing presentation
Box 28: Outsourced Quality Support service for DE: ER assessment
Box 29 Hint: Suggestions to ease the report review process
Box 30 Hint: Tips for stakeholders while reviewing the draft ER
Box 31: Formatting guidelines for Evaluation report
Box 32 Hint: Effective ways to disseminate, evaluation evidence and results
INTRODUCTION

Background

1. During the course of 2015/early 2016 WFP has demonstrated its renewed corporate commitment on evidence and accountability for results with its new Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), Evaluation Charter issued in April 2016 and Corporate Evaluation Strategy endorsed by the Executive Management Group (EGM) in May 2016 (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: WFP’s Evaluation Function framing documents

2. These three documents clearly outline WFP’s commitment to a demand-led decentralized evaluation function. The policy clarifies the corporate minimum coverage norms\(^1\) for decentralized evaluations which will mean an increased number of decentralized evaluations over the life of the Policy. These complement the Office of Evaluation (OEV)’s evaluations of policies, strategies, country portfolios and impacts of core activities. The phased implementation of the coverage norms over the life of the policy have been clarified in the Corporate Evaluation Strategy\(^2\).

3. Three evaluation principles of independence, credibility and utility underpin WFP’s Evaluation framing documents.

- **Independence** provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest, which could arise if policy-makers and managers had sole responsibility for evaluating their own activities. Independence requires impartiality, so that evaluations are free from influences that may bias their selection, conduct, findings, conclusions, recommendations and reporting. WFP is committed to safeguarding the independence and impartiality of all its evaluations.

- **Credibility** is the extent to which evaluation findings and conclusions are fair, impartial and complete. Credibility is determined by the independence, impartiality, transparency, methodological appropriateness and rigour applied in evaluations.

---

\(^1\) See WFP/EB-2/2015/4-A/rev.1, Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), Table 3 detailing coverage norms on decentralized evaluation.

Utility is the extent to which evaluations are useful to decision-makers and stakeholders, informing policies, strategies and programmes and meeting accountability requirements. WFP is committed to enhancing utility by planning and conducting evaluations with clear intent to use their results; undertaking them in a timely way to inform decision-making processes; and ensuring the accessibility of evaluation results, making reports publicly available.

4. These principles equally apply to all evaluations, have been incorporated in this Guide and are further explained in the Technical Note on Evaluation Principles.

5. OEV, in conjunction with the Performance Management and Monitoring Division (RMP), have produced an overall Guidance Package aimed at supporting WFP staff in selecting between, planning for and managing a decentralized evaluation or a review of WFP’s interventions. This Process Guide to Decentralized Evaluation (DE) forms one plank of the overall Guidance Package, based on WFP’s Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS), WFP’s Evaluation Policy, the Evaluation Charter and the Corporate Evaluation Strategy. Other elements include templates, quality checklists and technical notes.

6. The overall Guidance Package is part of the broader Decentralised Evaluation Quality Assurance System (DEQAS) which includes, among others, an Evaluation Learning Programme to support the use of this Process Guide, an outsourced quality support service and an independent post hoc quality assessment system for all final evaluation reports. DEQAS is informed by the Norms and Standards for evaluation developed by the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). The Norms are referenced in the detailed Process Maps at the beginning of each phase. Relevant norms and standards are set out and briefly explained in the Technical Note on Norms and Standards for Decentralized Evaluation.

What is a decentralized evaluation in WFP?

7. WFP adheres to the United Nations definition of evaluation: ‘An assessment that is as systematic and impartial as possible. It focuses on expected and actual accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality to understand achievements or the lack thereof. It aims to determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of WFP’s activities, operations, strategies and policies, and their contribution to the development and humanitarian processes of countries that receive WFP assistance’.

8. There are two main categories of evaluations in WFP: Centralized Evaluations (CEs) commissioned and managed by OEV; and, decentralized evaluations (DEs) commissioned and managed by Country Offices, Regional Bureaux or Headquarters-based divisions other than OEV. The key characteristics of DEs are identified in Box 1.

Box 1: Characteristics of Decentralized Evaluations

- They contribute to both objectives of accountability and learning;
- They may take place at the national or sub-national level, or cover several countries;
- They may be wholly managed by WFP, or conducted with WFP participation as part of a joint evaluation with partners;
- They apply international evaluation criteria, and the UN System Wide Action Plan (UNSWAP) standard on gender equality and women’s empowerment;
- They must be conducted by independent consultants or firms;
- Their findings must be publicly shared;
- They are not presented to the Executive Board.

9. Figure 2 explains the alignment of the types of various evaluations conducted in WFP to centralized and decentralized evaluation categories.
10. It is important to keep in mind that decentralized evaluations are different from other exercises that take place at Country Office (CO) level to meet different purposes. These follow their own approaches and guidance available in respective web pages in WFP intranet:

- **Baseline studies**
- **Needs assessment**
- **Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping**
- **Internal audit**
- **Review**
- **Monitoring**
- **Feasibility studies**
- **Country Strategic Review undertaken prior to the development of a Country Strategic Plan**

**Box 2: Note to users of this guide**

The decision tool titled *Making the Choice: Decentralized Evaluations or Review?* provides systematic guidance on deciding between decentralised evaluations and reviews to ensure that the choice of either a decentralized evaluation or a review is the appropriate one in view of the purposes, the objective pursued and expected use.
**Purpose and Structure of the Process Guide to DE**

11. This Process Guide maps out the six phases of a decentralized evaluation. It provides staff with a guide from initial planning, through preparation, inception, data collection and analysis, and reporting, to the dissemination of the evaluation report and utilisation of its findings.

12. The Guide is structured to follow the six main phases of a decentralized evaluation. These are:

1. Plan
2. Prepare
3. Inception
4. Collect data
5. Analyse Data and Report
6. Disseminate and follow up

13. Each phase is broken into a number of steps and guidance is provided on main tasks and deliverables within each step. Each Phase includes the following:

- A process map and supporting guidance;
- Main outputs of the phase;
- Short introduction;
- Key steps of the phase with the decisions points and key tasks under each step;
- Table with summary of responsibilities under each step;
- Checklist of activities to be completed during the phase.

**Audience of the Process Guide**

14. Main expected users are most likely to be at Country Office (CO) level, and thus this Guide is geared towards this context. It is intended for use by WFP staff who are managing decentralized evaluations. With minor adaptations it can be used also by Regional Bureaus (RBs) and Headquarters (HQ) divisions/units when managing and/or supporting decentralised evaluations. The Guide should also be used by the evaluation teams to facilitate adherence to DEQAS along the evaluation process.

**Roles and responsibilities**

15. This guide clarifies the roles and responsibilities as well as the institutional arrangements related to a DE management process primarily for the conduct of evaluations at CO level, including support roles beyond the CO\(^5\). These roles and responsibilities can easily be adapted for DE at RB or HQ units.

16. At CO level the key players and their main responsibilities throughout the six phases are:

- **CO management (CD/DCD)**\(^6\):
  a. Decide the evaluation type/scope;
  b. Comply with the Evaluation Policy’s provisions and safeguards for impartiality\(^7\);
  c. Include plans for evaluation in the design of interventions consistent with the Evaluation Policy’s coverage norms such that evaluation is factored into: management plan, office work plans, PACEs and reporting systems;
  d. Facilitate the evaluation process and provide access to required information for evaluation conduct;
  e. Ensure that the evaluation management is free from undue influence and reporting is unbiased and transparent;

---

\(^5\) The complete list of roles and responsibilities for DE are available in the Evaluation Policy and the corresponding authorities and institutional arrangements are developed in the Evaluation Charter.

\(^6\) CO Management main responsibilities identified in italic in this section are directly extracted from the “WFP Evaluation Charter”, Executive Director Circular OEV 2016/07.

\(^7\) See Evaluation Policy table 1.
f. Set up and chair an evaluation committee (chair role can be delegated to Deputy Country Director (DCD) under certain conditions – Technical Note Evaluation Committee) for each evaluation commissioned;
g. Set up and chair an evaluation reference group (chair role can be delegated to DCD under certain conditions – see Technical Note Evaluation Reference Group) for each evaluation commissioned;
h. Nominate the evaluation manager in line with guidelines (see step 1.5 of this guide);
i. Make decisions on evaluation budget, funds allocation and selection of the evaluation team;
j. Approve the Terms of reference (TOR), inception and evaluation report;
k. Ensure that all DEs are conducted by qualified independent consultants who sign the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN system;
l. Ensure that DE reports are publicly available;
m. Prepare management responses to the evaluation recommendations and ensure that they are publicly available;
n. Undertake and report on follow-up actions, and use evidence from DE in the revision and preparation of new strategies, programmes and other interventions.

• The evaluation manager (EM):
  Manages the evaluation process through all phases. As such the EM:
  a. Prepares the TOR;
b. Oversees the selection of the evaluation team;
c. Presents budget and evaluation team to Country Director (CD)/DCD for approval;
d. Is the main contact point in WFP for the evaluation team leader throughout the evaluation process;
e. Convenes, for the chair, the evaluation reference group and evaluation committee;
f. Consolidates library of information needed for the evaluation;
g. Takes responsibility for the administrative and logistical needs of the evaluation;
h. Comments on and quality assures the evaluation products in compliance with DEQAS. This includes submission to the DE quality support services;
i. Submits final, quality assured TOR, inception and evaluation report for approval of the CD/DCD;
j. May facilitate/support the development of a management response and dissemination of the evaluation report and its findings.

Members of the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) team are the primary candidates to take on the role of evaluation manager (see step 1.5 on evaluation management options).

• M&E team:
  a. Along with the Programme team, supports appropriate planning and budgeting for evaluations and provides advice to CO Management accordingly;
b. Provides the Evaluation Manager with relevant background information on performance indicators for measuring the achievement of the subject being evaluated and monitoring plans;
c. Supports in assessing the evaluability of relevant activity/intervention, also providing latest log frames/Monitoring materials;
d. Clarifies the type of information/evidence that monitoring systems and processes can provide and when the evaluation results would be most useful for decision-making and action;
e. Provides support and extends quality assurance to evaluations, particularly in preparing the terms of reference, in adherence to the Evaluation Policy, DEQAS and evaluation norms, standards and principles; and in assessing evaluation products;
f. Provides monitoring data, reports, and analysis as available to support the evaluation;
g. Provides other relevant information;
h. Supports the overall evaluation process.
i. Seeks clarity on requirements for ensuring impartial and credible evaluation;
• CO Programme team:
  a. Advises CO Management on evaluation needs/plan and makes provision for evaluation country strategic plans and interim country strategic plans;
b. Provides the evaluation team with relevant background info on activities/ interventions being considered for evaluation;
c. Ensures that baselines and monitoring data are available to enable evaluation;
d. Supports in assessing the evaluability of the activity/intervention to be evaluated, including clarifying the theories of change or helping to reconstruct them if they don’t exist;
e. Supports in estimating the budget;
f. Engages with the evaluation team as relevant and support the overall evaluation process;
g. Provides the evaluation team with relevant background information on activities/ intervention being considered for evaluation;
h. Contributes to the preparation of the management response, dissemination of findings and the follow up actions.

• Other CO units / Sub-offices:
  • Procurement team
    a. Advises CO management on the procurement options and implications on time and efforts required in order to enable estimation of evaluation timing;
b. Advises the Evaluation Committee on any implications of procurement options, referring to appropriate procurement manuals as well as the TN Options for Contracting Evaluation;
c. Provides Country Office management with relevant technical support and advice to usage of tendering and LTA options;
d. Reviews the draft evaluation report and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of procurement related data to ensure that they are factual;
e. Provides the staff responsible with inputs for preparing the management response to the recommendations.

• HR team
  a. Advises the Evaluation Committee on recruitment strategies, Terms of Employment, Terms of Reference, required clearances and alignment with HR manuals and DEQAS Process Guide;
b. Briefs the evaluation team on specific issues related to HR;
c. Provides availability for meetings/interviews with the evaluation team to discuss HR processes and systems;
d. Reviews the draft evaluation report and provide comments;
e. Discusses further with Country Office management any strategic/sensitive issues raised by the evaluation recommendations;
f. Contributes to the preparation of the management response (MR) as required.

• Finance/Resource management team
  a. Advises Country Office management on the budget available;
b. Contributes to the planning and budgeting processes;
c. Advises the Evaluation Committee on the availability of funds under the budget lines intended to fund the evaluation, in accordance with Technical Note on Evaluation Planning and Budgeting;
d. Provides finance related documents to be used in the preparation of the terms of reference;
e. Provides finance data and reports and any needed additional data/information or clarification.
f. Reviews the draft evaluation report and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of finance and resource management data to ensure that they are factual;
g. Contributes to the preparation of the MR as required.

- **Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) team**
  a. Provides the Evaluation team with relevant background information on food security and needs assessments reports for the activities/interventions;
  b. Clarifies the type of information that VAM can provide;
  c. Contributes to briefing the evaluation team, during Inception and Data Collection phases on food security assessment systems, processes and reports;
  d. Reviews the draft evaluation report and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of food security data;
  e. Contributes to the preparation of the MR as required.

17. Beyond the CO itself, the following stakeholders have a role to play in a decentralized evaluation commissioned by a Country Office:

- **The Regional Bureau:**
  i. The Regional Director:
   a. Requires application of the impartiality provisions for the DEs as per the Evaluation Policy;
   b. Ensures that plans for DE and CPE are included in the design of strategies and interventions and meet coverage norms;
   c. Ensure complementarity between decentralized and centralized evaluations and advises on possible synergies and collaborations on DE between COs;
   d. Embeds roles and accountabilities for evaluation in CD performance management system;
   e. Ensures that resources are budgeted to manage and conduct independent DEs;
   f. Oversees application of DEQAS;
   g. Ensures that all DE reports are publicly available;
   h. Requires that MR to DEs are prepared and made publicly available and that relevant follow-up actions are undertaken;
   i. Ensures that new programmes and strategies prepared in the region are based on evidence from evaluation.
  ii. Regional Evaluation Officers (REO):
   a. Supports the Regional Director in his/ her evaluation responsibilities, listed above
   b. Supports RB and CO Management to operationalize the impartiality provisions;
   c. Supports appropriate planning and budgeting for evaluations;
   d. Provides quality support to DEs, and technical support and solutions to the COs, acting as first port of call for advice/support to the EM during planning and conduct of the evaluation;
   e. Reviews the Management Response (MR) to DE’s in collaboration the Senior Regional Programme Adviser (SRPA) and other concerned RB colleagues, technical staff and facilitates RB management endorsement of the MR;
   f. Facilitates discussion and sign-off of the MR at RB level;
   g. Ensures that all DE reports and Management Responses are publicly available;
   h. Ensures that COs commissioning DEs are enrolled in the Evaluation Learning Programme.

---

8 Elements directly extracted from the Evaluation Charter are identified in italic
9 See Evaluation Policy Table 1
i. Ensures that Management Responses are periodically updated by COs and reports on status to the RB/CO Management.

j. Promotes use of evaluation findings into programme design and implementation.

iii. Other RB relevant technical staff may participate in DE evaluation reference groups and/or comment on evaluation products as appropriate.

**Office of Evaluation:**

a. Sets the normative framework for decentralised evaluations;

b. Develops and maintain the DEQAS;

c. Upon REO request, supports and advises the CO during evaluation planning and conduct;

d. Provides access to an outsourced quality support service providing real time expert feedback on draft TOR, inception and evaluation reports (See box 15);

e. Ensures an independent post hoc quality assessment of all final evaluation reports.

f. On behalf of CO, post the evaluation ToR, evaluation report and MR;

g. Promote use of evaluation findings in programme design and implementation.

**Other HQ Units:**

a. Provide technical support and advice on key policy, strategic and programmatic considerations, relevant to the subject of evaluation, to ensure they are understood from the onset of the DE, as required;

b. May participate in an evaluation reference group, in advisory capacity reviewing/commenting on draft evaluation deliverables and be interviewed as key informants;

c. Provide inputs to MR in the case recommendations are directed to these units;

d. Use DE findings for the development of guidance and strategies.

**External stakeholders:**

Outside of WFP, many stakeholders will have a direct or indirect interest in an evaluation and be key informants for the evaluation. Assessing their level of interest (stakeholder analysis) and planning for their involvement - such as beneficiaries, Government, other humanitarian and development actors such as national and international Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), donors and UN agencies and country teams - in the evaluation is one of the early steps to be undertaken. The degree of involvement will vary but, for some, is likely to include participation in an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG, see Box 17), contributing to preparation of terms of reference and reviewing and commenting on draft reports, as well as providing insights/information and follow-up on recommendations. External stakeholder role will be much more important in the case of participatory or joint evaluations.

**The evaluation team:**

The team is composed of external evaluators who have no prior association with the subject of the evaluation. The team conducts the evaluation in adherence to DEQAS standards and requirements of the **UNEG Norms and Standards** and Code of Conduct for Evaluators\[10\]. The team designs the methodology in line with the evaluation terms of reference and undertakes document review, interviews, surveys, site visits and meetings leading to analysis and report writing.

---

\[10\] UNEG 2008 – [Code of conduct for evaluators](https://www.uneg.org/resources/code-conduct-evaluators)
**Key terms**

18. The Glossary of terms provides a full set of terms associated with WFP decentralized evaluations (see The Glossary of terms). Three key terms for this Process Guide are however provided in Box 3.

**Box 3: Key terms used in the process guide**

- **Commissioning Office**: The WFP Office (CO, RB, Area/Sub-Office, or Division at HQ) commissioning the decentralized evaluation.
- **Evaluation Manager**: The WFP staff member responsible for managing the evaluation process, but not conducting the evaluation.
- **Intervention**: An operation, activity, project, pilot/innovation, or other initiative implemented by WFP offices.

**Other DE Guidance Materials**

19. In addition to this Process Guide, other relevant elements of the Decentralized Evaluation Guidance Package are outlined in box 4 and the links provided in the process map for each phase:

**Box 4: Structure of Guidance Package**

1. **Decision tool for making the Choice: Decentralized Evaluation or Review?** to be used to decide between a Decentralized Evaluation or a Review
2. **A Process Guide** covering the six Phases of a Decentralized Evaluation (this document)
3. **Templates (TM)** for evaluation products (TOR, Inception Report and Evaluation Report). They set out the structure for main evaluation products, suggest some content and include guidance for development of various sections of the document. They aim to enhance the consistency and quality of the evaluations. Other templates are fore processes such as template for comments matrix, budget and evaluation timeline and management response.
4. **Quality Checklists (QC)** for each evaluation product. Following the structure of the template, they facilitate systematic assessment of evaluation documents. They also help structure comments on each product.
5. **Technical Notes (TN)** provide additional guidance on specific aspects of an evaluation process or on types of evaluation. In addition, they provide key background information on specific aspects such as forms of contracting the evaluation team, UNEG norms and standards, Glossary of terms.

**How to use/navigate this Process Guide**

20. The overall Process Map in Figure 3 provides an overview of the entire evaluation process, from Planning through to Dissemination and Follow up. It sets out the main Phases of the evaluation process and, within these, the specific steps of each Phase. It provides an approximate timeframe for each Phase of a decentralized evaluation – though this will vary depending on type and scope. At the beginning of each section, detailed process Maps provide links to relevant materials for each Phase. Links are also provided to wider internal and external guidance for corporate processes such as planning and monitoring; and to specific guidance for particular interventions. For example, programming areas such as Nutrition, Cash Based transfers and Food for Assets have all developed dedicated guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation. The Process Map also makes explicit which evaluation norms are pertinent and need attention in different steps of each Phase. Finally, the main outputs from the phase are listed.

21. The Guide should be used alongside the various other resources summarised in Box 4. This will support the quality of the decentralized evaluation process, and provide staff with materials to expedite the different stages.
22. **Further provisions for impartiality of decentralised evaluations.** The Evaluation Policy (2016-2021) identifies a certain number of provisions to ensure the impartiality of decentralised evaluations as well as roles and accountabilities for various stakeholders in the organization. These are further elaborated in the Evaluation Charter with the identification of various institutional arrangements targeting DEs. Impartiality provisions have been embedded in this process guide and the Technical Note on Independence and Impartiality provides additional guidance.

23. **Mechanisms to support quality of evaluations.** The Corporate Evaluation Strategy identifies a certain number of mechanisms to ensure the quality of decentralised evaluations which have been directly embedded in this guide.

**List of Symbols used in the guide**

- **At the beginning of every phase, this box shows the main outputs of that particular phase.**
- **At the beginning of each step, there is decision box that shows the decisions that will be required under that step by the management. This serves as reminder to the evaluation manager on the approvals they need to seek.**
- **Shaded boxes provided key summary of points to note, definitions or other specific information.**
- **A box with a light bulb provides hints or practical suggestions on a particular step or action.**
- **Shows a Communication point, indicating what products should be shared with RB/OEV/other stakeholders**
Figure 3: Overall evaluation management Process Map – phases and steps

1. Plan
   * Identify evaluation type and scope
   * Estimate budget and timeline
   * Link with monitoring plan
   * Clarify provisions for impartiality & independence
   * Agree roles and responsibilities
   
   * Done at intervention design stage

2. Prepare
   * Draft the Terms of Reference
   * Finalise provisions for impartiality and independence
   * Quality assure, consult and finalise the Terms of Reference
   * Select the evaluation team and finalise budget
   * Prepare a document library
   * Develop Communication and Learning Plan
   
   * Up to 9 weeks

3. Inception
   * Conduct Team Orientation
   * Undertake desk review of documents
   * Conduct Inception meetings
   * Prepare draft Inception Report (IR)
   * Quality assure IR
   * Circulating and finalising the Inception Report
   
   * Up to 7 weeks

4. Collect Data
   * Prepare Evaluation field work
   * Conduct fieldwork and preliminary analysis
   * Present end of Field work debriefing/s
   
   * Up to 3 weeks

5. Analyse Data and Report
   * Draft evaluation report
   * Quality assure the draft report
   * Circulate report for comments
   * Finalise the evaluation report
   * Submit and get approval for Final Report
   
   * Up to 11 weeks

6. Disseminate and follow-up
   * Prepare management response
   * Publish evaluation report
   * Disseminate and use evaluation results
   
   * Up to four weeks

The timing estimated for each phase is only indicative and can be shorter or longer depending on the complexity of the evaluation.
Figure 4: Phase 1 Plan - Process Map and Supporting Guidance

1. Plan

1.1 Identify Evaluation type & scope
- Making the choice: DE or Reviews? – Decision Tool
- Technical Notes by evaluation type
  - TN Joint Evaluation
  - TN Operation Evaluation
  - TN Impact Evaluation
  - TN Activity Evaluation
  - TN Thematic Evaluation
  - TN Transfer Modality Evaluation
  - TN Pilot Evaluation
  - TN on Evaluation Principles
  - TN on Norms and Standards for Decentralized Evaluation
  - TN Engaging with donors on evaluation

1.2 Estimate budget and timeline
- Template for Budget and timeline
- TN Country-level evaluation planning and budgeting
- TN Contingency Evaluation Fund (CEF)
- CEF Application Form

1.3 Link with monitoring plan
- TN on Impact Evaluation
- TN on Methodology and Methods
- TN on Logical Models
- Template Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan (MRE)

1.4 Clarify provisions for impartiality/Independence
- TN on Independence & Impartiality

1.5 Agree roles and responsibilities
- TN on Evaluation Committee
- TN on Evaluation Reference Group
- TN on Stakeholder Analysis

Main outputs of planning phase
- Monitoring, Review and Evaluation plan (MRE) defined
- Evaluation plan embedded in Country Strategic Plans (CSP), or Interim Country Strategic Plans (ICSP), work plans and budgets
- Type of evaluation agreed upon
- Initial timeframe and outline budget set up
- Evaluation manager identified
- Evaluation Committee set up
**PHASE 1: PLAN**

**Introduction**

24. When reaching the planning stage a decision has been made to have an evaluation. The Planning of a decentralized evaluation has 6 main purposes:

- **To ensure that evaluation is embedded in WFP’s programme cycle, thereby contributing to evidence-based programme design and implementation (Evaluation Policy, outcome 1);**
- **To ensure that WFP’s minimum evaluation coverage norms as set in WFP Evaluation Policy are met (Evaluation Policy, outcome 2);**
- **To determine in advance the types of evaluation needed as well as broad parameters for their respective scopes;**
- **To ensure that evaluation costs are adequately budgeted for in Country Portfolio Budgets;**
- **To put the evaluation on the forward agenda and work plans of key stakeholders and ensure that the necessary human resources and time are allocated; and**
- **To ensure that baseline data and follow-up monitoring are collected and aligned with the questions that the evaluation will address.**

**When to plan for an evaluation?**

25. Planning for an evaluation should be done at the design stage of a Country Strategic Plan (CSP) or Interim Country Strategic Plan (ICSP). Those initial decisions (even if broad) will contribute to early resourcing and planning. The CO should develop a Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan (MRE), which will identify requirements for baselines, monitoring, review and evaluation (see figure below and [template]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluations (Centralized &amp; Decentralized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized/ Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation 1 (at least 1 DE mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation 2 (if planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Evaluation (Mandatory for CSP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. In view of the fluid and fast-moving circumstances that characterize WFP operating environment, some of the assumptions made at CSP formulation stage will need to be revisited over the course of the CSP/ICSP. The **Annual Planning Process** and preparation of the annual **Country Operations Management Plan** (COMP) offer an opportunity to check that the evaluation is still needed, the timing is still appropriate, the budget allocation is made and preserved, and what, if any, changes there are in evidence requirements and the implications of changes for planned evaluation. The Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan should be updated accordingly and shared with the Regional Monitoring Adviser and Regional Evaluation Officer to be reflected into the Regional Evaluation Plan. This also offers an opportunity to reflect responsibilities in relation to the evaluation in the individual annual workplans (PACE) of the CO concerned staff, and in particular for the Evaluation Manager.

27. **Budget revision**—budget revisions provide another opportunity to check whether an evaluation may be appropriate or whether there are other changes that need to be made on already planned evaluation to align with the focus of the budget revisions.

28. **Ad hoc**: Where forward planning has not happened or where it is not possible to plan from the outset— e.g. in the case of a sudden-onset emergency – then planning discussions should take place **as soon as feasible**. Other opportunities for planning evaluations exist such as when developing funding proposals. When an ad-hoc or unanticipated need for evaluation arises, an assessment has to be made before moving to the Preparation Phase to check data and resources availability.
Responsibility for the final decision rests with the Country Director, based on information prepared by the relevant Programme Officer, the M&E Officer and the REO. Once decided, the evaluation is prepared and implemented in accordance with this process guide.

**WFP’s minimum evaluation coverage norms**

29. Evaluation planning should be undertaken taking into account WFP’s minimum evaluation coverage norms (see Box 5). Those were set for both centralized and decentralized evaluations by WFP Evaluation Policy (2016 – 2011). They need to be interpreted in light of i) the shift from single operations to Country Strategic Plans under the Integrated Road Map; and ii) the requirement set by the Policy on Country Strategic Plans that all CSPs undergo a Country Portfolio Evaluation towards the end of their implementation. Within a demand-led decentralized evaluation function, the CO has the flexibility to prioritize topics, interventions and timing in line with its learning needs and donors’ and/or partners interests.

**Box 5: Minimum Coverage Norms for Decentralized Evaluations**

The minimum coverage norms for decentralized evaluation as defined by the Evaluation Policy are under review as of February 2018. For the time being, COs are expected to conduct at least one decentralized evaluation during the course of their CSP or I-CSP.

**Recommended to evaluate:**
- Before scale-up of pilots, innovations, and prototypes; High-risk interventions, where level of risk is established in line with the WFP enterprise risk management policy.
- Before third repeat of an intervention of similar type and scope.

30. The number, timing and scope of decentralized evaluations are defined by COs based on their learning needs and donors’ and/or partners’ interests. There are multiple sources of demand for decentralized evaluations:
- CO/RB management’s needs for enhanced knowledge to improve future programme design and implementation, advocacy strategy, etc.
- Requests from donors and partners to generate evidence and demonstrate results, including through joint evaluations.

31. A Technical Note on country-level evaluation planning and budgeting has been developed (covering both centralized and decentralized evaluations) to guide COs involved in developing their evaluation plan.

**Process Map**

32. The process map will guide you through the different steps and tasks to be undertaken during this phase. If you are at CSP/ICSP formulation stage, focus on steps 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 below. You will pick-up and work on steps 1.4 and 1.5 as well as revisit steps 1.1 and 1.2, when the evaluation is soon to start (six months before approximately). If instead, your evaluation is expected to start within the next six months, you should cover all of the below steps (1.1 - 1.5).

**Figure 5: Phase 1 –Process map**
Step 1.1 Identify evaluation intended use, type and scope

The CD/DCD decides the type of evaluation needed and its scope based on intended use

**Intended use**

33. Before deciding on the evaluation type and scope, it is useful to reflect on the evaluation’s intended use and address the following basic but fundamental questions:

- What is the main purpose of the evaluation?
- What are its main objectives (balance between accountability and learning)?
- What are any key questions that should be addressed?
- Whose needs and interests will it serve?
- How will the evaluation be used? Which decisions about the intervention could be informed by this evaluation? When are those decisions being made?

34. Make it in an effective/short, transparent and open discussion among the programme and M&E teams, CO management and possibly consulting with other external stakeholders concerned about the intervention results. Once those key questions on the intended use of the evaluation have been answered, you will be in a better position to determine the most suitable evaluation type and scope.

**Type of evaluation**

35. The relevant programme team and M&E team:

36. **Assemble** the necessary information to facilitate decision making at the design stage (including WFP evaluation coverage norms, CO learning needs, previous commitments with donors/partners; recommendations from past evaluations and reviews, etc.

37. **Consult** the Regional Evaluation officer and if necessary OEV. This is important because of the RB’s role in programme cycle management as well as his/her advance awareness of the other upcoming centralised evaluations (commissioned by OEV) and other activities that may have a bearing on CO plans.

38. **Consult** external stakeholders – Government and partners as well as donors as relevant

39. **Recommend** the most appropriate type of evaluation to CO management. At the design stage of interventions, CSP and ICSP there will be more options on what type of evaluation to conduct. If this opportunity is missed, the flexibility on type of evaluation may be reduced (for instance impact evaluations have to be planned at the design stage to ensure adequate budget – which may be higher than for other types of evaluation - baseline data, control group data are available).

40. The nature of the intervention(s), combined with other factors such as coverage norm requirements, donor demands and information requirements, will determine the type of evaluation to a large extent:

- **Operation evaluation**<sup>12</sup>: Assesses one WFP operation, which may be an Emergency, a Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO), a Special Operation (SO), a Country Programme (CP) or a Development Project (DEV). The evaluation looks at the appropriateness, performance and results of the operation and seeks to provide reasons for its successes and shortcomings (see Technical Note on Operation Evaluation).

- **Activity evaluation**: Assesses one WFP activity or component of a CSP/ICSP. Activity evaluations are distinct from other types of WFP evaluations in their consideration of a specific, bounded component of an operation(s) or CSP/ICSP to understand if, what, how, and why it is contributing to development results (see Technical Note on Activity Evaluation).

<sup>12</sup> Under WFP’s Integrated Roadmap, operations will gradually be replaced by CSP/ICSPs.
- **Evaluation of pilots**: Assesses a pilot initiative, innovation or prototype which is new or innovative and where expected results and the effects of an intervention on a particular population are still unknown. The evaluation of a pilot is critical given that the purpose of a pilot intervention is to test and then assess the effectiveness, efficiency and overall merits of doing things in a new way prior to replication or upscaling (see Technical Note on Evaluation of pilots).

- **Transfer modality evaluation**: Assesses a transfer modality, defined as a modality for distributing resources to target beneficiaries (food in kind, vouchers, cash or a combination). Transfer Modality Evaluations assess the choice and use of a specific or a combination of transfer modalities, its cost-efficiency and effectiveness (see Technical Note on Evaluation of Transfer Modality).

41. Other considerations may point to a particular type or focus of evaluation:

- **Impact evaluation**: This is a rigorous, in-depth analysis of the difference that WFP interventions have made to people's lives. Impact evaluations are principally concerned with evaluating the effects of an intervention on the target groups (families, households and communities, men and women, boys and girls) on institutional, technical or social systems, and on the environment. Impact evaluations specifically seek to understand how a WFP initiative, has contributed to results. Such evaluations demand a high standard of data (about those receiving the intervention and about the non-intervention comparison groups), of design and of resources. They should only be considered where the need is clear e.g. the demand of evidence needed is high and the resources are available to undertake it successfully (see Technical Note on Impact Evaluation).

- **Thematic evaluation**: Thematic evaluations are commissioned to aggregate and produce evidence about specific issues of importance across a range of interventions. They generally assess a sample of interventions, or intervention approaches in a particular sector or cross-cutting theme of WFP work such as gender equality and women’s empowerment, capacity development and protection (see Technical Note on Thematic Evaluation).

- **Joint evaluation**: This may be appropriate for evaluation of an intervention carried out with other agencies in order to develop a shared understanding of how it is performing, to assess the value of joint programming and the contributions of WFP therein. Joint Evaluations are often useful in humanitarian settings where emergency response or recovery involves several humanitarian agencies working side-by-side toward a common goal. They may also be useful in cases of joint programmes within UNDAF framework (see Technical Note on Joint Evaluation).

**Scope of evaluation**

42. At least the broad parameters of the evaluation scope (what will be included/excluded) should be determined during this Planning Phase, while more detail will be decided in Phase 2 when preparing for the evaluation.

43. The programme team and the M&E team:

- **Identify broadly** (mindful of impartiality considerations):
  - the main purpose of the evaluation (balance between learning and accountability objectives)
  - the interventions to be included and excluded
  - the period to be covered
  - the geographical area to be covered.

- **Consult with the REO and technical units at RB and HQ** (as relevant) to avoid overlaps and/or to synchronise plans for maximum utility. Be aware also of OEV’s work plan for centralized evaluations to ensure coherence, complementarity and mutual support.
Step 1.2 Estimate budget and timeline

The CD/DCD approves the evaluation indicative budget and its timing

44. The programme team and the M&E team:

- Prepare an indicative budget for inclusion in the overall intervention budget. While the detailed budget is developed at the next (Preparation) phase, it is important to set some broad parameters at ICSP, CSP and intervention design stage.

Box 6: Country-level evaluation planning and budgeting

A Technical Note on country-specific evaluation planning and budgeting has been developed (covering both centralized and decentralized evaluations) to guide COs involved in the design of Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) or Interim Country Strategic Plans (ICSP) and preparation of the Country Portfolio Budget. It should also be a useful reference when COs review their evaluation plans as part of the Annual Performance Planning and Reporting cycle and the preparation of the Country Operation Management Plan (COMP).

When formulating a CSP or ICSP, COs should develop a Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan (MRE), which will identify requirements for baselines, monitoring, review and evaluation in line with the CSP theory of change (or logical framework in case a ToC has not been developed). The timing of the various monitoring activities, reviews and evaluations should be determined for complementarity and synchronization and ensure the most efficient use of collected data. The Template to develop the CO Monitoring, Review and Evaluation is available at the following link.

45. The costs of an evaluation will depend on a number of factors, including the scope and methodology. Key items to estimate at this stage include:

- The evaluation team: how many members? Key competencies? International and/or national mix and number of days in total?
- Indicative daily rates for each and any costs of hiring the team;
- Number of days of field work required and costs of travel to and within the country/sites, including allowances for evaluation team members and interpreters;
- Data collection costs such as surveys, workshops, meetings and interviews;
- Anticipated costs associated with dissemination e.g. design and printing, translation, dissemination workshops etc.
- The costs for the management of the evaluation.

46. WFP Evaluation Policy does not specify the share of budget to be allocated to evaluation, but experience from recent evaluations can be useful in estimating the overall budget. Based on the experience of the Operation Evaluation Series managed by OEV, some broad indications of budgetary parameters, average evaluation cost per operation size (as reflected in the total operational budget) are provided in table 1. The REO and colleagues who have managed recent evaluations can be consulted. The CO finance team can assist with unit costs. A summary of the agreed daily rates with the long-term agreements is also available here.

---

13 Data drawn from WFP Operations Evaluations series, established in 2013. This is indicative only.
Table 1: Indicative Evaluation budgets by CO size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation size (based on planned budget)</th>
<th>Average evaluation conduct cost ($)</th>
<th>Average evaluation management costs ($)</th>
<th>Estimated # of days per phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large operation (above $275m)</td>
<td>152,742</td>
<td>21,025</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (between $88m and $275m)</td>
<td>111,756</td>
<td>17,811</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (below $88m)</td>
<td>92,301</td>
<td>13,274</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average evaluation costs</td>
<td>118,933</td>
<td>17,370</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


47. If the funds available/ or expected to be are disproportionately small compared to the scale of the intervention (e.g. an evaluation budget of $20,000 that covers all the elements of a $500m intervention), then the ability to undertake a useful and credible evaluation should be questioned. High-quality and useful evaluations require adequate coverage of the subjects under evaluation and this requires sufficient resources commensurate with the scope.

48. If the estimated evaluation cost is unrealistically high, it may be necessary to consider cost saving measures, providing these do not compromise the quality of the evaluation. The following box identifies factors that can affect (reduce/increase) evaluation costs:

**Box 7: Hint: Ways of reducing the costs of an evaluation**

- Getting the balance right between using local/regional and international evaluation specialists, providing sufficient expertise is available, can help keep costs down;
- Managing scope and complexity to control the number of days needed for the various phases of the evaluation: inception, data collection and analysis, and reporting;
- Replacing an Inception Mission with teleconference briefings and discussions;
- Ensuring adequate monitoring and reporting will provide a body of data and minimise the need for and costs of primary data collection by the evaluation team;
- Linking with other actors’ key data collection exercises e.g. Post Distribution Monitoring; Emergency Food Security Assessment; Cluster Reporting Exercises;
- Conducting joint exercises where possible, sharing costs.

49. If the intervention being evaluated is facing significant funding constraints, the CO may apply at preparation phase to the Contingency Evaluation Fund. However to be eligible, the CO should have adequately budgeted for the evaluation costs in its operation or Country Portfolio Budget.

**Timeline**

50. The programme team and the M&E team:

- **Prepare** an indicative timeline for the evaluation, depending on whether it is a mid-term or final evaluation. While the detailed timeline is developed at the Preparation phase, it is important to set some broad parameters at design stage (see Template for Budget and Timeline).

51. The timing of the evaluation depends on various factors. An intervention needs to have been operating long enough to create sufficient evidence for an evaluation. Timing is critical to ensure that
the evaluation’s report is in sync with programme management and decision-making processes – particularly where an evaluation needs to inform the design of the next phase of the intervention i.e. when it is most useful. The timing of evaluation should also be synchronised as far as possible with monitoring plans/schedules as these may yield critical data for an evaluation. For example, if outcome surveys are planned it would make sense to have these completed before an evaluation (see also next step on linking with monitoring plans and processes).

52. Using those broad parameters and the programme cycle of the intervention the likely timing of the evaluation i.e. the year and the required completion date can be estimated. Additional factors should be considered to determine if time of year matters e.g. during school term or during a particular season, when physical accessibility and availability of stakeholders are critical.

53. Working backwards from the required completion date, a provisional timeline can be developed with estimates for each phase: analysis and reporting, including time for commenting; fieldwork; inception including refinement of methodology; and preparing for the evaluation, including stakeholder consultations, development of the terms of reference and selection of the evaluation team; to give an approximate start date. Do not underestimate the time required for each phase and in undertaking critical tasks; but neither should this be overly elongated as it adds to the cost, particularly once the evaluation team is on board. The approximate times provided in figure 3 for each phase provides good working estimates to start with.

**Step 1.3 Link with monitoring plan and Processes**

54. The programme team and the M&E team

- **Identify baselines** and monitoring requirement
- **Consult** with the Regional Monitoring Adviser and Regional Evaluation Officer

55. For most evaluation types, the start point (baseline) before intervention must be specified to allow for a ‘before’ and ‘after’ comparison. The definition of a baseline (‘pre-operation exposure condition’) and how to undertake a baseline study are described in WFP’s Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and Standard Operation Procedures for M&E (see link in Figure 4 Detailed Process Map Phase 1). The SOPs stipulate that baselines be developed for all outcome indicators as part of the project development process.

56. The timing of the baseline study is important for future evaluation. WFP SOPs for M&E recommend that baselines are developed within a time band of three months before to three months after the start of an intervention.

57. Evaluations supported by an effective monitoring system are more likely to be credible and useful, as monitoring results throughout programme implementation is critical to having valid information available for an evaluation. WFP’s Minimum Monitoring Requirements (see link in Process Map in figure 4) should be activated and used at the design phase of interventions. Synchronisation of the evaluation timeline with monitoring plans is important so as not to miss out on key monitoring data being collected. Additionally, as the same people may be involved in both monitoring and evaluation (e.g. M&E Officer), it makes sense to dovetail these activities rather than have a clash.

58. Some evaluations may need data collection over and above that required for corporate monitoring which focuses particularly on process and output/outcome indicators as set out in the project logframe and the monitoring plan. Some evaluations may require a wider or a deeper look at aspects of the intervention during the project cycle, or information on partnerships / service providers / distribution sites / delivery points, etc., which cannot realistically be collected by an evaluation team during an end of intervention evaluation. This is particularly so for impact evaluations and for evaluation of innovations. If so, the requirements should be specified at design stage of the intervention. The TN on Evaluation Methodology and Methods provides more information on types of data collection and explains the distinctions between primary and secondary data sources.
59. When identifying baseline and monitoring requirements, clear plans should be made for presenting disaggregated baseline and monitoring data and, if appropriate, any other relevant gender specific data, depending on the type of intervention.

**Box 8: Hint: Additional forms of data collection for certain types of evaluation**

- Some impact Evaluations require data collection from a control group or ‘counterfactual’ in addition to target groups (see Technical Note on Impact Evaluation).
- Qualitative approaches may involve collecting ‘stories of change’ or case studies to better understand what change is happening, why and how (see Technical Note on Methodology and Methods).

---

**Step 1.4 Clarify provisions for impartiality and independence**

- The CD/DCD ensures that CO staff are aware of and understand the provisions for impartiality and independence.

---

60. The **team** who designs and implements the intervention will need to understand the importance of ensuring that they support the impartiality mechanisms that will be put in place to manage the evaluation process.

61. The **M&E team** ensures, as custodian of data and information (including monitoring reports, databases, list of project sites, partnerships etc.) that these are accessible to the evaluation team.

62. **OEV** is responsible to set the corporate provisions for impartiality and the **RBs** for their applications in their respective regions, as well as the **CO** for the specific evaluation.

63. Impartiality is the absence of bias/its mitigation at all stages of the evaluation process. This is critical to the usefulness and credibility of evaluations as established in the Evaluation Policy 2016-2021 and in UNEG Norms (see Process Map in figure 4). This vigilance on potential bias starts from the beginning of the evaluation process and has to permeate all Phases. This guide is designed to support adherence to this principle throughout the evaluation process (see Technical Note on Independence and Impartiality).

64. The **Preparation Phase** is the moment when the specific mechanisms for independence and impartiality are put in place, but it is useful to consider them already at the planning stage. On doubt, consult with the REO’s.
### Box 9: Integration in this guide of the Policy provisions for impartiality/independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy provisions for independence and impartiality of DEs</th>
<th>Mechanisms identified in this guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Decision making on evaluation made by management as distinct from staff directly responsible for implementing the interventions being evaluation | CO management  
  - to set up and chair an evaluation committee (see Technical Note on Evaluation Committee and step 1.4)  
  - to nominate an evaluation manager under certain conditions (see step 1.5) |
| Mechanisms ensure that evaluations are free from undue influence and reporting is unbiased and transparent – e.g. external review of draft TOR, IR and ER |  
  - mandatory use of the outsourced quality support service managed by OEV which provides feedback on draft TOR, IR and ER (see step 2.3 for first reference)  
  - to set up and chair an evaluation reference group see Technical Note on Evaluation Reference group |
| All evaluations are publicly available |  
  - see step 6.2 |
| OEV ensures a post hoc quality assessment | Will cover all DEs |
| All evaluations are conducted by independent evaluators | See step 2.4 and Technical Note on Options for contracting evaluation teams |
| Potential conflict of interest are assessed prior to hiring of evaluation teams | |
| All evaluators sign code of conduct for evaluators of the UN system | |
| Evaluation Charter and Directive on information disclosure ensure that all staff provide evaluators with access to information | Embedded in various places of the guide in particular in step 4.2 |
| DEQAS for transparent evaluation management | Includes this guide as one of its major component |
| Help-desk | Managed by OEV to support DE management process via the RBs |
| Hotline | Charter institutional arrangement to facilitate resolution of staff or evaluator concerns regarding impartiality and independence. It will be managed by the Director of Evaluation. |
| Roles and accountabilities for evaluation integrated into: i) WFP’s staff performance management system; and ii) the control assurance statements of directors | Beyond the scope of this guide |
Step 1.5 Agree roles and responsibilities

The CD/DCD appoints an evaluation manager
The CD sets up the Evaluation Committee (EC) and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

65. The CD/DCD:

- **Appoints the Evaluation Manager** to allow him/her to plan ahead for evaluation and include his/ her evaluation management duties in his/ her workplan to maintain a degree of separation from the subject of evaluation as necessary to minimise bias. It further facilitates inclusion of the duties in the individual work plans. The choice of Evaluation Manager is likely to be influenced by a number of pragmatic as well as technical considerations. Box 10 shows the key skills required for an evaluation manager.

**Box 10: Skills and capabilities of the Evaluation Manager**

A good Evaluation Manager requires the following skills and capabilities:

- Ability to manage relationships
- Ability to solve problems
- Ability to engage with a wide range of stakeholders and seek their participation/engagement
- Ability to work in and manage a team
- Understanding of WFP processes, including administrative (for contract management)
- Understanding of the country context
- Knowledge of evaluation concepts and principles
There are four options available for appointing the evaluation manager:

**Option 1: M&E officer**
The preferred option is to have the head or a member of the M&E team taking the role of evaluation management. The advantage is that s/he knows about the programme/activities under evaluation while not having managed or implemented them directly (it is recognized that the M&E team is highly likely to have been involved in monitoring the activities under evaluation, except in cases where Country Offices have different monitoring arrangements for different operations). This option should be feasible in very large and large COs and some medium COs who have an M&E officer post.

- If **option 1** is not feasible because the CO does not have an M&E post, or all M&E staff have been directly involved in the management and implementation of the subject being evaluated, or the M&E staff do not have the requisite capacity, then the CD/DCD should consider **option 2**.

**Option 2: The CO VAM Officer or a programme officer**
If and only if the M&E officer cannot be the evaluation manager the alternative could be to appoint the VAM officer or a programme officer or a compliance officer who ideally has not directly managed or implemented the programme/activities to be evaluated.

- If **option 2** is not feasible because the CO does not have a VAM or compliance officer or all programme officers have been directly involved in the management of the subject being evaluated, then the CD/DCD should consider **option 3**.

**Option 3: M&E officer from another CO or external consultant**
If nobody in the CO can ensure the role of evaluation manager then the CD/DCD could explore the possibility of having an evaluation manager from another CO on TDY. For a staff member to be eligible to manage an evaluation taking place in another CO, s/he must have completed one decentralized evaluation management as per the process guide and/or have completed the evaluation learning programme set up by OEV. This option might not be available to COs before 2018. The TDY could be undertaken partly remotely with presence in the CO at peak times of the evaluation process. Alternatively the CD/DCD might opt to hire an external consultant to manage the evaluation process. This can be accomplished remotely, with limited or no presence in the country. Given the nature of the evaluation process, this would not be a full time contract, but rather on a when actually employed basis, with number of days established based on required level of effort at each stage. If the evaluation is contracted to a firm with whom OEV has an LTA, there is an option for the management service to be provided by the same firm.

- If **option 3** is not feasible because there are no available staff for TDY or the CO is not in a position to meet the costs of the TDY/external consultant/use of LTA management services, then the CD/DCD should consider **option 4**.

**Option 4: The Regional Evaluation officer (REO)**
This option should be of last recourse when none of the three others are possible and only available for very small or small COs. Indeed it would be unsustainable for the regional evaluation advisor to manage all decentralized evaluations in his/her region especially in regions with many Country Offices.
67. Once appointed under any of the above options, the evaluation manager reports to the CD/DCD on all issues related to the management of the evaluation process. In the event that the evaluation manager leaves before the completion of the evaluation (e.g. through reassignment), the replacement should be appointed following the same principles.

68. Setting up and clarifying the chairing of the Evaluation Committee (see Technical Note on Evaluation Committee) and of the Evaluation Reference Group (see Technical Note on Evaluation Reference Group) should be discussed at this early stage and agreement reached on how these will be shared between the CD or DCD. This allows them to put this in their forward work plans in order to provide the necessary support to the next phases of the evaluation and to better anticipate future demands on their time. Composition and TOR of both the evaluation committee and the evaluation reference group will be finalised during the next phase in step 2.2. The Regional Evaluation Officer will be part of the Evaluation Reference Group; it may be helpful to also include him/her in the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Manager should engage with the REO as early as possible in the process.

**Box 11: Engaging with donors on evaluations**

Significant commitments were made in the Agenda 2030 as well as the World Humanitarian Summit for increased evidence on results and enhanced transparency, efficiency and accountability to all stakeholders. In a complex, crowded and competitive arena, donors’ expectations to see evidence of WFP’s impact on the people it serves are rising. Evaluation plays a major role in this endeavor. This note provides guidance to WFP Government or Private Sector Partnerships Officers as well as CO/RB staff interacting with donors on key issues related to evaluation.

There are four main options for donors to engage in an evaluation process:

1. Joint/UN-system wide evaluations:
   - UN system wide evaluations are seen as efficient accountability mechanisms, providing donors the involvement they require for reporting on results to their respective constituents, while maximizing learning. In such a case, all concerned organizations and donors would partner to prepare, resource and commission the joint evaluation.

2. Member of the Evaluation Reference Group of a WFP commissioned evaluation:
   - WFP may propose to selected donors who have made significant contributions to a programme to be part of the ERG. This should be decided by the EC at the start of the evaluation process and reflected in the ToR.

3. Key informant of a WFP commissioned evaluation:
   - Evaluation teams are expected to engage with internal and external stakeholders in a systematic way thereby ensuring balanced and accurate findings that support relevant recommendations.

4. External evaluation:
   - Donors may also decide to commission their own external evaluation often focusing on their broader support to a given country/region or initiative, under which WFP is one of the many stakeholders

A Technical Note on Engaging with Donors on Evaluation was developed to provide guidance to Donor Relations Officers at CO/RB/HQ levels as well as CO/RB staff interacting with donors on key issues related to evaluation and the different points.

69. The design process for the intervention should identify key external stakeholders. During the Planning Phase this should be reviewed and internal and external stakeholders’ interests in an evaluation determined, along with their potential influencing of and by it. Their likely involvement in the evaluation should also be specified (see Technical Note on Stakeholder Analysis). Once key stakeholders are identified, the broad timeline for the evaluation should be discussed and shared with them, as and where appropriate, to facilitate their own planning.
Summary

Table 2: Summary of responsibilities - Planning Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps &amp; Responsibilities*</th>
<th>CD/DCD</th>
<th>CO Prog. Team</th>
<th>CO M&amp;E team</th>
<th>Other CO units</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Other HQ units</th>
<th>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Decide DE type &amp; Scope</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Estimate budget and timeline</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Link with monitoring</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Clarify provisions for impartiality</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Agree roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
A/D: Approve/ decide  
L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step  
P: Participate actively in step  
S: Support the process with specific tasks, if required

* The structure of the Country Office may be different from the above presentation. For example some COs may have a joint M&E programme team. The roles are to be adapted as appropriate, mindful of the need for impartiality as discussed in step 1.4

Table 3: Checklist for Planning Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key activities:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1.1: decide DE type and Scope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the evaluation type identified and included in the MRE plan, CSP/ICSP and CO Annual performance plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are its intended use and scope broadly identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1.2: estimate budget and timeline for the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is an indicative budget available and planned in the Country Portfolio Budget?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is an estimated timeline for the evaluation available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1.3: Link with monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the baseline requirements clarified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the monitoring needs for the evaluation identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1.4: Clarify provisions for impartiality/independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the relevant CO colleagues aware of the importance of impartiality and of its provisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1.5: agree on roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the evaluation manager appointed by the CD/DCD?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has an evaluation committee been set up?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has an evaluation reference group been set up?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Have the role of the CD and DCD been clarified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are all other roles and responsibilities for the CO/RB clarified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLAN PHASE COMPLETE

When the Planning phase is complete:  
The CO informs the RB and OEV of evaluation plans
**Figure 6: Phase 2: Preparation – Detailed Process Map and Supporting Guidance**

**2. Prepare**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of DE Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Template for TOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TN Evaluation Criteria &amp; Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical Note on integrating gender in WFP evaluations, Checklist, and Quick Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TN on Methodology and Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TN Stakeholder Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TN Norms and Standards for Decentralized Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Template for Budget and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links to PGM and External Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG Norm #4 on Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG Norm #5 on Impartiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG Norm #7 on Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG Standard #4.2 on Evaluability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG guidance integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Draft the TOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Finalize provisions for impartiality/independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Quality Assure consult and finalise ToR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Select Evaluation Team &amp; finalise budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Prepare document library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Develop Communication and Learning Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main outputs of preparation phase**

- Draft TOR
- Feedback from the outsourced quality support service on the TOR
- Completed comments matrix
- Final approved TOR
- Evaluation team contracted
- TOR for Evaluation committee and for the evaluation reference group available
- Communication and learning plan available
**PHASE 2: PREPARE**

**Introduction**

70. The Preparation Phase for a decentralized evaluation has two main purposes:

- To design the evaluation
- To select, appoint and contract the evaluation team

71. The Preparation Phase follows Phase 1 on Planning, at which time the type of evaluation, its provisional timing and financial resources, stakeholders and their involvement, and mechanisms for impartiality and independence have been broadly set out.

72. Tasks in this phase should be conducted well in advance of the planned start of the inception, particularly due to the time needed for obtaining feedback on the TOR from stakeholders, ensuring quality, and selecting the evaluation team. Typically, the Preparation Phase for a decentralized evaluation can last up to 9 weeks.\(^\text{14}\)

**Process Map**

73. The process map will guide you through the different steps and tasks to be undertaken during this phase.

**Figure 7: Phase 2 – Process map**

**Step 2.1 Draft the Terms of Reference**

74. The Evaluation Manager:

- **Takes the lead** to draft the TOR
- Consults with relevant CO staff, RB and external stakeholders
- Checks the readiness of the CO for evaluation
- Identifies the overall rationale (purpose of the evaluation) and the more detailed objectives of the evaluation (what it is expected to achieve) and clarify the evaluation questions to be addressed
- Identifies the evaluation design/method
- Determines the language of evaluation outputs
- Prepares the document library, including those used as sources of information for draft TOR
- Prepares a detailed timeline and budget.

\(^{14}\) Estimated based on experience with Operations Evaluations series. It may take shorter depending on the option used for contracting team.
75. Preparing the terms of reference is probably the most critical step of the whole evaluation process. This step will require significant consultation and is an iterative process for which adequate time needs to be allowed to do it properly. The TOR template provides further guidance on the structure and content.

76. The TOR for the evaluation is the master reference document for all stakeholders.\(^5\) It ensures, for those tendering, that they are clear on the evaluation’s requirements and deliverables, and ultimately, that the evaluation team and all stakeholders are clear on expectations.

77. The UNEG Standards 4.3–4.7 set out key elements that a well-designed TOR will include, such as clarity on the subject, scope, objectives and sufficient rigour in methodologies to ensure a comprehensive and fair assessment (see Technical Note on Norms and Standards).

**Box 12: Content of TOR**

- Information on the purpose, objectives and rationale of the evaluation
- Information on the evaluation’s stakeholders, users and their roles
- Information on the subject of the evaluation
- Information on the intended approach to the evaluation, including key evaluation criteria and key questions, scope, intended methodology, data availability, considerations on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEEW) integration into the design of the evaluation and quality assurance process
- Information on the organization of the evaluation including phases and deliverables, timeline, conduct, team composition and competencies and any security considerations
- Explanation of the roles and responsibilities of different parties and core stakeholders
- Information on data availability and quality
- Information on intended communication of and learning from the evaluation
- Information on the budget parameters
- Information on limitations (access and security issues, data availability, seasonality etc)

**Consulting stakeholders**

78. The evaluation manager

- Undertakes a gender-responsive stakeholder analysis guided by the Technical Note on Stakeholder Analysis which provides further information on who, when and how to involve stakeholders in the evaluation process.
- Identifies and makes early contact with the stakeholders to be included as part of the evaluation reference group, as well as to be met during the evaluation fieldwork, so that they can be prepared to engage sufficiently with the evaluation.
- Ensures that stakeholders’ needs and interests are considered through consultations at the start of the Preparation Phase.

79. Involving stakeholders early on, keeping them informed of progress during the process, and providing opportunities for input at key stages (such as development of the terms of reference, participation in briefing sessions and reviewing draft products) will help secure support for the evaluation process and strengthen commitment to use of the evaluation findings.

80. Initial stakeholder consultations should help inform the draft TOR and the communication and learning plan by focusing discussions on the following (see step 2.6):

- What is the main purpose of the evaluation?
- What are its main objectives (balance between accountability and learning)?
• What are any key questions that should be addressed?
• Whose needs and interests will it serve?
• How will the evaluation be used? By whom and when?

**Checking the evaluation readiness and gathering key documents**

81. The Evaluation Manager

- Reviews the programme design:
  - Is there clarity on the problem that the programme/intervention planned to address?
  - Is the logical framework clearly set out with expected targets, outputs, outcomes and goals specified, such that the expected changes are clear and explicit?

82. The clarity of the intervention design and programme logic should be considered, to ensure that there is sufficient understanding to allow the intervention to be evaluated effectively.

83. Ideally, the intervention will have a clear logical framework, against which the evaluation team can assess performance. If this is absent, then WFP staff should consider how the intended results can be mapped and re-constructed from available sources and prepare to work with the evaluation team in doing so. Similarly, baselines and targets should be in place, but may require mitigation strategies if not: their absence should not prevent an evaluation taking place. More guidance is available in the Technical Note on Using Logical Models.

84. The Evaluation Manager

- **Gathers and reviews** key documents and assess availability of data and consider whether relevant data sources are available for the evaluation to draw on (see Box 13).
- Starts to build the document library for evaluation team which will be completed in step 2.5

**Box 13: Key sources of data**

- WFP Orientation Guide
- Key operational documents including programme documents; monitoring reports; SPRs, COMET logframes; studies by the CO and its partners; etc.
- Outcome and output data
- Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM) data
- Monitoring plans
- Dispatch and distribution reports from WFP and partners
- COMPAS and LESS data
- SCOPE data on beneficiaries
- Financial data on expenditures/transfer to beneficiaries
- Maps (operational, food security)
- Previous evaluations or reviews
- Programme reports (E.g. Pipeline, Projected Needs)
- Resources updates and financial contributions
- Notes for Record of Coordination meetings (cluster, donor groups, etc.)
- Information related to co-operating partners (Field level agreements; Memorandum of Understandings; lists of partners by activity and location).
- Key relevant WFP policies and guidelines such as Gender, Protection, Cash and Vouchers
- Other relevant operations ongoing
- Information on the CO structure such as location and number of sub-offices, organigrams, etc.
- Information on intended communication of and learning from the evaluation
- Information on the budget parameters
- Information on limitations (access and security issues, data availability, seasonality etc.)

---

16 May vary depending on evaluation subject, type etc.
If additional data collection will be needed, this should be identified, budgeted for and implemented either as part of the monitoring prior to the evaluation or as part of the evaluation itself. Any remaining gaps will need to be explicitly stated in the Terms of Reference. This will allow the evaluation team to make a clear assessment of what mitigation strategies may be needed and what the implications may be (e.g. on timelines).

**Evaluation criteria and questions**

In preparing for an evaluation, the appropriate criteria for the evaluation will need to be selected, based upon the agreed purpose and objectives (see Box 14). The evaluation questions will also need to be developed in alignment with the criteria. The [Technical Note on Evaluation Criteria and Questions](#) provides explanations of the criteria to be applied, and guidance on how to prioritise them. It also provides example questions against each criterion.

**Box 14: Notes on evaluation criteria**

WFP evaluations assess WFP interventions in relation to an internationally-agreed set of evaluation criteria and standards of performance. Used widely by development evaluators worldwide, the five standard criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability are essential components of evaluation.

WFP often includes additional humanitarian evaluation criteria: appropriateness, connectedness, coherence and coverage.

**Table 4: Example Evaluation Questions linked to Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples of evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance  | • To what extent is the [evaluation subject] in line with the needs of beneficiaries (men and women, boys and girls) and partners, including government?  
• To what extent is the [evaluation subject] aligned with WFP, Government partners, UN agency and donor policies and priorities at the time of design and over time?  
• To what extent was the intervention based on a sound gender analysis? To what extent was the design and implementation of the intervention GEEW sensitive? |
| Effectiveness | • To what extent were the outcomes/objectives of the intervention achieved/are likely to be achieved?  
• What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes/objectives of the intervention?  
• To what extent did the intervention deliver results for men and women, boys and girls? |
| Efficiency  | • Were activities cost-efficient?  
• Was the [evaluation subject] implemented in a timely way?  
• Was the [evaluation subject] implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?  
• Did the targeting of the [evaluation subject] mean that resources were allocated efficiently? |
| Impact     | • What were the long-term effects of the [evaluation subject] on beneficiaries’ lives?  
• Did any negative effects occur for beneficiaries?  
• What were the gender-specific impacts? Did the intervention influence the gender context? |
Considering Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEEW) dimensions

87. GEEW should be integrated in evaluation criteria and questions as per the United Nations System Wide Action Plan (UNSWAP) on gender equality and women’s empowerment. The earlier GEEW approaches are incorporated into the evaluation thinking, the higher the chances that they will be thoroughly analysed and reported upon. WFP has a corporate commitment to gender equality and women’s empowerment and requirements for all evaluations are highlighted in the Technical Note on integrating gender in WFP evaluations, Checklist, and Quick Guide further information can be found in the UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples of evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sustainability | • To what extent did the benefits of the [evaluation subject] continue after WFP’s work ceased? OR  
• To what extent is it likely that the benefits of the [evaluation subject] will continue after WFP’s work ceases?  
• Has the project made any difference to GEEW relations in the medium or longer term?  
• To what extent did the intervention implementation arrangements include considerations for sustainability, such as handover to government (national and local), communities and other partners? |
| Appropriateness | • Was the intervention approach chosen the best way to meet the food security/nutrition needs of beneficiaries?  
• Were adopted transfer modalities the best way of meeting beneficiary needs?  
• Were protection needs met?  
• To what extent was the intervention based on a sound GEEW analysis? To what extent was the design and implementation of the intervention GEEW sensitive? |
| Coverage | • Were the humanitarian needs of key target groups (men and women, boys and girls) met by the intervention?  
• Was WFP’s assistance provided proportionally according to the needs of the context? |
| Coherence | • To what extent was WFP’s activity coherent with key policies/programming of other partners operating in the context?  
• To what extent were ‘do no harm’ principles taken into account? |
| Connectedness | • What have been the linkages between the relief and recovery and resilience phases of WFP’s interventions?  
• What have been the linkages between parallel WFP interventions, if any?  
• To what extent has the [evaluation subject] been situated within an analysis of longer-term and interconnected problems of the context?  
• To what extent has the [evaluation subject] been designed and operated to respond to the needs of the fragile and conflict-affected environment of (region/ country)?|

---

87 ALNAP Humanitarian Definitions for Coverage, Coherence, and Connectedness
Box 15: Considerations for integrating gender equality and women’s empowerment dimensions in the evaluation

1. Ensuring that the preparation for the evaluation is GEEW sensitive e.g. a GEEW responsive stakeholder analysis, GEEW concerns integrated into evaluation questions and sub-questions.

2. A gender-balanced, geographically and culturally diverse evaluation team recruited with appropriate gender expertise and skills;

3. An evaluation team recruited with gender expertise

4. Ensuring that the methodology for the evaluation is gender-sensitive (going beyond disaggregated data by sex and age to ensure that e.g. any (quantitative and qualitative) indicators used are GEEW-sensitive, data collection and analysis techniques integrate GEEW concerns throughout)

5. Ensuring that the evaluation report and its use reflect gender concerns, i.e. the findings, conclusions and recommendations address gender issues, where appropriate; and the Communication and Learning Plan for the evaluation considers gender dimensions and includes GEEW sensitive dissemination strategy.

Selecting the appropriate evaluation design

88. The Evaluation Manager

- **Outlines** the evaluation methodology (see Technical Note on Methodology and methods) in the TOR which will be further developed by the evaluation team at the inception stage.

89. Most evaluations in WFP apply mixed-methods (quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and analytical approaches) to account for the various dimensions of WFP’s interventions. The design will depend on the purpose, objectives, key questions and on the data available prior to the start of the evaluation.

Develop realistic Timeline & Agree and secure Budget

90. The Evaluation Manager

- **Clarifies** the evaluation intended **duration/timeline**, including the schedule of deliverables, deadlines and communication/dissemination activities. The timeline should be feasible and realistic, but anticipated timing risks should also be identified at this stage and mitigation plans made if necessary (see Template for Budget and timeline). The timeline should be included as an Annex to the TOR under the heading ‘Evaluation Schedule’.

- **Finalizes the budget** building on the initial budget estimated and allocated during the Planning Phase. The budget template clarifies the key determinant of budget such as the number of days per Phase and for field-based data collection activities required, allied with the number of people to be engaged and the rates/fees to be paid.

91. COs that had planned and budgeted for a DE, but are facing genuine resource constraints, can apply to the Contingency Evaluation Fund (CEF). The CEF technical note describes the nature and purpose of the fund, the eligibility criteria and process for applying (see CEF application form). A call for applications to the CEF takes place every 3 months approximately. COs that intend to apply, should finalize their evaluation TORs and Evaluation Budget prior to submitting their application forms.

92. Once the overall methodology, timelines and estimated budget are clearer, the evaluation manager, in consultation with the evaluation committee (see step 2.2 below) may launch a call for expression of interest among the evaluation firms that have a long term agreement with WFP. Give heads up to a number of firms of the upcoming evaluation, and give an indication of when the TOR will be finalised. This is critical especially when using firms with long term agreement, to ensure that they have sufficient lead time to consider the evaluation in their schedules.
Step 2.2 Finalise provisions for impartiality/independence

The CD/DCD establishes (in case not done during the planning phase) and chairs the Evaluation Committee and the Evaluation Reference Group.

93. The CD/DCD will have initiated the **evaluation committee** during the planning phase and clarified the chair. This is an essential mechanism to manage the evaluation process. To remain practical this group needs to include the head of programme, the responsible staff of the intervention under evaluation, the evaluation manager and the head of the M&E team in case s/he is not the evaluation manager. The Regional Evaluation Officer can be part of the Evaluation Committee. The committee will consider and the chair will approve the TOR, budget, evaluation team, and inception and evaluation reports. (See Technical Note on Evaluation Committee).

94. The Evaluation Manager

- **Drafts simple TOR for the Evaluation Committee** guided by the Technical Note on Evaluation Committee which includes a template for such TOR - See box 16.

**Box 16: Purpose and role of the Evaluation Committee**

The **overall purpose** of the evaluation committee is to ensure a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation process in accordance with WFP Evaluation Policy 2016-2021. It will achieve this purpose by supporting the evaluation manager through the process, reviewing draft evaluation deliverables (TOR, inception report and evaluation report) and submitting them for approval by the CD/DCD who will be the chair of the committee.

The CD sets up and chairs an evaluation committee for each evaluation commissioned by his/ her office, in order to:

- support the evaluation manager;
- make decisions on the evaluation budget, funds allocation, selection of the evaluation team;
- approve TOR, inception and evaluation reports

The chair role may be delegated to DCD, except when the DCD is also the head of programme. The Evaluation committee membership is a subset of the evaluation reference group membership. Based on the advice given by the EC members, the committee Chair makes decisions on key aspects of the evaluation.

95. The Chair of the Evaluation Committee will have initiated an **evaluation reference group (ERG)** composed of internal and external stakeholders during the planning phase, which s/he will chair. This is an important mechanism for advising and steering the evaluation process, and supporting independence and impartiality (see Technical Note on Evaluation Reference Group).

96. The Regional Evaluation Officer should be systematically part of the ERG. To ensure that GEEW dimensions are integrated from the evaluation onset, the CO gender focal and/or the RB gender advisor should be members of the ERG.

97. Including members external to WFP is mandatory. External membership increases the relevance, ownership, credibility and utility of the evaluation, as well as helping minimize bias. It is important to select people who will commit to the role and add value to the process. The evaluation reference group composition should be finalized during the preparation phase and before the TOR are approved.

98. The Evaluation Manager

- **Drafts simple TOR for the ERG** guided by the Technical Note on Evaluation Reference group which includes a short template for such TOR – see Box 17.
Box 17: Purpose and role of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

The overall purpose of the ERG is to support a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation process in accordance with WFP Evaluation Policy 2016-2021. ERG members review and comment on evaluation TOR and deliverables. The ERG members act as experts in an advisory capacity, without management responsibilities. Responsibility for approval of evaluation products rests with the Country Director/Deputy Country Director as Chair of the Evaluation Committee. The ERG always includes external stakeholders.

The Chair of the ERG is Country Director or the Deputy Country Director (by delegation). The chair of the ERG can also be delegated to the Evaluation Manager if considered in a senior enough position to engage with external stakeholders.

It is important to note that the chair of the ERG CANNOT be delegated
- to the Head of Programme unless s/he is the Deputy Country Director
- or to the Programme Officer directly in charge of the activities being evaluated.

Step 2.3 Quality assure, consult and finalise the TOR

The Chair of the Evaluation Committee (CD/DCD) approves the final TOR

99. Achieving quality in all evaluation processes is a key UNEG standard (#5), and it is one of the principles that guide all WFP evaluations. Once all the key elements of the TOR have been developed, the draft TOR should be systematically quality assured and finalised as per approach spelled out in this guide.

100. The Evaluation Manager:

- **Reviews the draft TOR against the quality checklist**¹⁸ (See Quality checklist for TOR), to ensure that it follows the structure, provides the main contents and that there are no major contextual and/or factual errors;
- If s/he considers that the above requirements are met, s/he, shares the draft ToR with the REO to confirm that those meet the minimum requirements for submission to DE QS.
- **Shares, the draft ToR with the outsourced Quality Support service (DE QS) for DE** which will provide a feedback, within 4 working days on the quality of the draft ToR from an evaluation perspective (see box 18 to access the service).
- Revises the TOR based on the DE QS feedback to produce a final draft TOR;
- In case of issues/challenges with the feedback provided by the quality support service, the evaluation manager should seek advice from the REO (or OEV as last recourse);
- Shares **the draft TOR with the ERG and the RB** for review and comment. Additional reviewers may be identified e.g. from technical units at RB or HQ levels, and would be part of the ERG;
- Collates all comments in a comments matrix (See Template for comments on TOR) and explains how s/he is addressing them when revising the TOR;
- Finalizes the TOR on the basis of comments received from the ERG, RB and the other stakeholders;
- Submits the final TOR to the internal evaluation committee for approval.

¹⁸ The quality checklist sets expectations (structure and contents) for each of the main deliverables that can be used by the Evaluation Manager and the internal evaluation committee.
Box 18: Outsourced DE Quality Support (DE QS) service: TOR Assessment

The DE QS is managed by OEV (as per WFP evaluation policy provision) to provide a timely feedback on all draft TOR. The RBs and COs are able to access this service directly as per the following procedure (http://newgo.wfp.org/services/decentralized-evaluation-quality-support):

1. Check that the draft TOR includes all the elements of the corresponding DEQAS template
   - If not revise the draft TOR and check it against the quality check list
   - If yes go to 2.
2. Share draft ToR with the REO to ensure that it meets minimum requirements for DE QS
3. Send email with draft TOR to be reviewed and service request (The service request form is available here)
   - to deqs@iodparc.com
   - and cc wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org, the REO and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee.
4.IODPARC to acknowledge receipt and confirm return date for the feedback;
5. IODPARC to return completed feedback form in 4 working days for draft TOR.
6. Participate in follow-up call with the IOD PARC reviewer to clarify any question arising from the feedback received and understand the reviewers overall thinking on the quality of the ToR. The REO is also encouraged to participate.
7. The EM makes appropriate changes to the TOR based on feedback received

101. The Chair of the Evaluation Committee
  ➢ Approves the final TOR. The TOR cannot be approved by anyone with direct management or implementation experience in the intervention. If the DCD is also the head of programme, he/she should not be chairing the EC and approving the TOR.

Step 2.4 Select the evaluation team and finalise budget

The Chair of the Evaluation Committee (CD/DCD) approves the evaluation team selection and budget

102. The Evaluation Manager:
  ➢ Selects one of the 3 contracting options and prepares a schedule of the selection process.
  ➢ Identifies and pre-selects the evaluation team (checking combined competencies against the evaluation’s skills requirements as per the TOR);
  ➢ Revises the budget accordingly;
  ➢ Submits proposed team and budget to the evaluation committee with a decision matrix.

103. The chair of the Evaluation Committee
  ➢ Approves the evaluation team and the evaluation budget.

104. The finalised TOR is the reference document for identifying and selecting the team. There are three possible options to follow depending on the expertise required by the TOR and the availability of expertise in the country or region. While all team members must be independent consultants, they may be hired individually or through a firm (see Technical Note on Options for Contracting Evaluation Teams):
• **Recruitment of individual consultants** - Once the Evaluation TOR are approved, the evaluation manager prepares a vacancy announcement (VA) for each team member for the purpose of recruitment by HR, which is used to identify consultants through WFP Roster of Evaluation Experts (which lists pre-qualified candidates for the positions of Team Leader, Senior Evaluator, Intermediate Evaluator, Evaluator, Junior Evaluator) or various evaluation networks at national, regional or global level. Additional guidance on how to access the WFP Roster of Evaluation Experts and external evaluation networks is available in the [Technical Note on Options for Contracting Evaluation Teams](#).

• **Procurement through Long Term Agreements (consultancy firms & research institutions)**: OEV in collaboration with HQ procurement has established long term agreements (LTAs) with certain consultancy firms and research institutions for the provision of evaluation services across WFP. The LTAs were established through an open, competitive procurement process. The successful firms/institutions can now provide evaluation services to WFP using a more streamlined procedure. The CO may request between two to four LTA firms for a proposal using the templates available. This mini-competitive process allows the commissioning office to compare firms to get the best offer, taking into account both technical and financial aspects. This is not a tender process and is not required by Procurement rules but is considered to be good practice. The daily consultancy rates/fees are fixed in the LTA and therefore not negotiable. However, it is critical for the Evaluation manager to assess the proposal(s) based on several parameters outlined in the Technical Note. A summary of the agreed daily rates with the long-term agreements is also available [here](#). Additional information and guidance on hiring a team through a consultancy firm or a research institution that has a long-term agreement (LTA) with OEV, is available in the technical note on options for contracting evaluation teams and through the following [link](#).

• **Competitive Procurement Process (consultancy firms & research institutions)**: “Tendering” - the CO follows the stipulated processes and procedures for procurement of services to: issue a request for proposals (RFP); disseminate it through the evaluation networks listed on the DE Intranet. Evaluate responses to the RFP; and award and issue the contract. As per the procurement manual, the value of the contract will determine whether the approval falls within the delegated authority of the Country Director or whether it has to be approved from HQ (only when the evaluation budget is over 500,000 USD). The receipt and evaluation of proposals, issuance of contracted and notification of those suppliers who were not successful will all be done in line with the procurement procedures and led by the procurement team. Recruiting an evaluation team can take time and should be done well in advance of the start of the evaluation as good consultants tend to be booked.

105. Each of the three options has implications for who makes the final decision on the team/firm selection, access to expertise, time required and levels of administration effort on the part of the evaluation manager. The Technical Note provides the pros and cons of each options, and suggests key considerations.

106. It is very important for the credibility and legitimacy of the evaluation that the selected evaluation team is impartial and independent and that conflicts of interest are avoided in the selection of evaluation teams (see [Technical Note on Independence and Impartiality](#)). The UNEG has identified a number of requirements for evaluation teams (see [Technical Note on Norms and Standards](#)) and has developed a [code of conduct for evaluators](#), an [evaluation competency framework](#) as well as [ethical guidelines](#) to be followed by all evaluators contracted by WFP.
Box 19: Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest occurs when, because of a consultant/consultancy firm’s work history or possibilities for future contracts, the consultant or firm’s ability to provide an impartial analysis is compromised. For decentralized evaluations, cases are those in which consultants or firms could: i) influence the analysis or recommendations so that they are consistent with findings previously stated by themselves (upstream conflict of interest) or ii) artificially create favourable conditions for consideration in a future assignment (downstream conflict of interest). The following rules should apply to the selection of consultants/firms.

- Consultants/consultancy firms should have had no prior involvement or close family involvement in the design, implementation, decision-making or financing stages of the operation being evaluated.
- Consultants/consultancy firms should agree not to work with the concerned Country Office for a period of six months after the end of the evaluation.

Box 20: Skill Set for Evaluators

The skills and qualifications needed by the evaluation will vary, depending on the sectors, type of evaluation and implementation arrangements, but the following are important considerations:

- **Evaluation expertise.** These skills include the methodological skills to design and implement evaluations. They also include communication skills and ability to present findings in an accessible way to WFP and possibly other audiences, and knowledge of ethical standards in the UN system.

- **Technical/sectoral expertise.** The requirement for different technical expertise will vary from evaluation to evaluation (though GEEW related skills for Evaluators including sensitive participatory approaches and analytical methods, should always be mainstreamed) and should be clarified in the ToR.

- **Knowledge of the context:** Since many WFP evaluations are focused on learning for the Country Office, a sound understanding of local conditions helps improve the quality of learning and contribute to the soundness of the analysis.

- **Knowledge of WFP:** Knowledge of WFP (and willingness to challenge the organisation on the basis of evidence) means that team members can be swiftly immersed in the specific subject of the evaluation, rather than learning about the organisation.

- **Language skills:** Ability to communicate in the official language of the country.

- **Interpersonal skills:** Ability to communicate and liaise with a range of stakeholders in a way that enhances the credibility of the evaluation process.
Box 21: Questions to consider when selecting an Evaluation Team

- Is the Team Leader sufficiently experienced and has he/she demonstrated his/her ability to manage a team?
- Are the evaluators credible in terms of competence and reputation? Do they have a strong track record?
- Does the evaluation team have the necessary mix/complementarity of skills, including evaluation skills, experience and country knowledge for this evaluation?
- Do the evaluators have appropriate interpersonal skills?
- Do the team have the ability to remain balanced, impartial, objective and constructive?
- Have the team worked together previously? Will they function effectively as a team?
- Is the evaluation team gender balanced? Do they include members from the countries or regions concerned?

108. When selecting an evaluation team directly as individual consultants, at minimum, telephone or Skype interviews should be conducted and reference checks with credible referees made. The evaluation manager is responsible for checking references based on the consultants latest assignments, outlined in their CV. If the consultant has undertaken previous evaluation for WFP, the EM should contact the EM that was in charge of the evaluation.

109. If the team is hired through a firm, the company will be expected to do these background checks and carefully review the proposal. The EM can request the firm to replace team members and submit a new proposal if a proposed team member does not meet the evaluation requirements, but the evaluation manager should also undertake some checks before accepting the proposed team.

110. As part of managing the evaluation process, the evaluation manager should note the payment schedules and request invoicing following the appropriate WFP finance and administration procedures depending on type of contacting used.

111. Once the team composition and budget is approved by the chair of the EC, the next steps will vary depending on the option for contracting retained. See technical note on options for contracting evaluation teams for more info.
Step 2.5 Prepare a document library

112. The Evaluation Manager with support from relevant Country Office/Regional Bureau Staff

- Ensures that all relevant data sources are available for the evaluation team in an organized manner.

113. This supports compliance with provisions on independence and impartiality in the Evaluation Policy. Once the team is selected, they should be provided with a comprehensive information library. This includes the WFP Orientation Guide which provides a comprehensive overview of WFP. The sources should be collated into an information library for the evaluation team to access (see WFP Directive on Data Disclosure CP2010/001). This step helps set the ground for the evaluation team in terms of its initial preparation and understanding of the subject of the evaluation. Having a comprehensive library can minimise time loss and false starts created by gaps in documentary evidence. These documents will be utilised by the evaluation team during the Inception Phase.

Step 2.6 Develop Communication and Learning Plan

114. The Evaluation Manager:

- Prepares a communication and learning plan with the support of the programme team and donor relation officer (or public information officer), to ensure that the evaluation results will be sufficiently communicated and made accessible to all relevant stakeholders, internal and external.

115. The plan is developed, refined and adapted, throughout the evaluation. It is a crucial step in ensuring adequate engagement during the process, follow-up and knowledge building (see Template on communication and learning plan and Technical Note on stakeholder analysis). The plan should make clear the respective roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team and CO, timing and means of communication. Relevant internal and external audiences should be identified and user-friendly means of communicating considered. Any translation needs should also be identified.
Summary

Table 5: Summary of responsibilities – Preparation Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps &amp; Responsibilities</th>
<th>(CD/DCD)</th>
<th>CO Prog team</th>
<th>M&amp;E team</th>
<th>Eval Manager</th>
<th>Other CO units</th>
<th>Eval Team</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Other HQ units</th>
<th>Ext stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Draft the TOR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Finalise provisions for impartiality</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Quality assure, consult and finalise the TOR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Select evaluation team and finalise budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Prepare document library</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Prepare communication and learning plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: A/D: Approve, decide  
L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step  
P: Participate actively in step  
S: Support the process with specific tasks, if required

Table 6: Checklist Prepare Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓ Key activities:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.1 : Draft the TOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has the Evaluation Manager consulted relevant stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has the Evaluation Manager assessed the readiness for evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.2: Finalise provisions for impartiality and independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the TOR for the evaluation committee available and is the membership confirmed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the TOR for the evaluation reference group available and is the membership confirmed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.3 Quality assure, consult and finalise the evaluation TOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Have the TOR been assessed by the DE QS and is the quality support feedback form available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Have the TOR been shared for consultation with the ERG &amp; the RB?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has the comments matrix been completed by the EM?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Have the TOR been approved by the Evaluation Committee Chair (CD/DCD)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.4: Select evaluation team and finalise budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the evaluation team approved by the CD/DCD?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the budget approved by the CD/DCD?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.5: document library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is there a comprehensive document library set up for the evaluation team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2.6: Prepare communication and learning plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the communication and learning plan available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARATION PHASE COMPLETE

When the Prepare Phase is complete:  
The CO shares the final TOR, budget and team composition with RB and OEV
3. Inception

Elements of DE Guidance

- TN on Norms and Standards for Decentralized Evaluation
- TN on Evaluation Criteria & Questions
- TN on Methodology and Methods
- TN on Evaluation Matrix

- TN on Using Logical Models
- TN on Stakeholder Analysis
- Template Inception Report
- Quality Checklist for Inception Report
- Template Comments Matrix

Links to PGM and External Resources

- UNEG Norms and Standards
- UNEG code of conduct for evaluators
- UNEG ethical guidelines
- Integrating human rights and gender in evaluations

- UNEG Standard #4.2 on Evaluability
- UNEG Norm #7 on Transparency
- UNEG Standard #5 on Quality of Evaluation
- UNEG Norm #4 on Independence
- UNEG Norm #5 on Impartiality
- UNEG Norm #7 on Transparency

**Main outputs of the inception phase**

- Draft Inception Report
- Feedback from the outsourced quality support service on the draft Inception Report
- Completed comments matrix
- Final approved Inception Report
PHASE 3: INCEPTION

Introduction

116. The Inception Phase of an evaluation has two main purposes:

- To ensure that the Commissioning Office, the evaluation team and the stakeholders involved in the evaluation have a common, in-depth understanding of the evaluation TOR;
- To develop an agreed operational plan (indicating the approach, methodology, team work plan and field work schedule) for the evaluation.

117. The inception report clarifies the whole approach to the evaluation and together with the Terms of Reference the main reference tool for guiding the evaluation and checking its progress. It helps establish clarity and mutual understanding between parties in the evaluation.

118. The Inception Phase involves initial analyses of background materials and discussions with stakeholders (face-to-face or virtual e.g. teleconference, skype) that will give the evaluation team a strong understanding of the evaluation.

119. The most critical elements of an inception report are:

- the evaluation matrix (see Technical Note on Evaluation matrix),
- the methodology and analytical steps to be taken, and
- the criteria used to select the sites to be visited.

120. In addition the Inception Report clarifies:

- how the work is to be organised
- who is to do what
- what is to be produced and
- when deliverables are expected
- what WFP quality standards are (established under UNEG norms and elaborated by WFP’s Evaluation Quality Assurance System and, for Decentralized Evaluations, this Guidance.)

121. The Inception phase starts once the Terms of Reference are final; the evaluation team recruited; and the document library in place. Typically, an Inception phase for a decentralized evaluation takes six to seven weeks, depending on the complexity of the subject of the evaluation.

Process map

Figure 9: Phase 3 - Process map
**Step 3.1 Conduct evaluation team orientation**

122. The Evaluation Manager:

- **Organises an orientation meeting**—in person or remotely—with the evaluation team, the programme team and the M&E team. This should take place prior to the inception mission (if one is planned).

- **Shares the document library** and key internal documents to ensure a quality and impartial evaluation process. The team leader will be responsible to identify all external documents.

123. Key purpose of the Orientation meeting is to present the TOR and CO expectations. This will include:

- The purpose and subject of the evaluation
- Relevant data sources (including corporate policies and strategies; monitoring data; any previous evaluations or research; any data sources on the context). Any gaps or limitations in the data should be made clear; and the priority ones to be read should also be clarified.
- The expected deliverables, scheduling and deadlines
- Mutual expectations between the CO and the evaluation team but also within the evaluation team, who may not have worked together previously e.g. on report writing by individual team members;
- The review of DEQAS quality standards, Inception Report template, quality checklists and arrangements for quality assurance (including the purpose and process of the DE QS).
- The roles and responsibilities of all the key stakeholders involved in the evaluation;
- The communication modalities and rules of engagement, including
  - To whom, how often and how the evaluation team will report to WFP
  - How the evaluation team is expected to engage with external stakeholders
  - Conflict resolution modalities
- The expected audience and uses of the evaluation, including where and how the report will be published/disseminated
- The next steps, which will include responsibilities for scheduling inception meetings, with dates, times and locations for these meetings.

124. The evaluation team:

125. Is aware of and conducts all evaluation activities in line with standards set out in UNEG guidance. In particular it will follow:

- The UNEG Norms and Standards
- The code of conduct for evaluators
- The ethical guidelines for evaluation

126. The EC, ERG and the Evaluation team:

127. Are aware of the hotline to be managed by the Director of Evaluation (to be operational by the end of 2017) to enable recourse for breaches of independence and impartiality throughout the evaluation process.
Step 3.2 Undertake desk review of documents

128. The evaluation team:

129. **Conducts** a desk review and analysis of the documents stored in the document library and particularly those signalled as priority by the EM. It is very important that all evaluation team members are familiar with the main documents, so that best use can be made of inception mission and fieldwork time.

130. The evaluation manager supported by the programme and M&E teams:

131. Is available to provide support and additional documents. While the document library should provide most of the key documents, the evaluation team is likely to have to search for additional documents relevant to the subject of the evaluation, during the evaluation, to fill evidence gaps and triangulate information.

132. Analysis of key design/implementation documents and in particular the logical framework/results framework (or alternative sources which set out the intervention logic) is particularly important; along with identification and analysis of the assumptions made (see Technical Note on Using Logical Models). From this analysis, implications for the evaluation can be established. This phase should also include the review of context specific documentation (such as policies, strategies, assessment reports and programmes of the Government) if applicable.

Step 3.3 Conduct Inception Meetings

133. The Evaluation Manager:

134. Organises the inception meetings for the evaluation team to meet with relevant colleagues in the CO, RB or HQ Division as well as external stakeholders as relevant. S/he may attend them with the evaluation team provided the team leader is in agreement with having the evaluation manager present.

135. The CD/DCD:

136. Briefs the evaluation team at least once as part of the Inception Meetings.

Purpose of inception meetings:

137. As part of the inception phase, the evaluation manager can decide to either conduct meetings remotely or face-to-face. Holding face-to-face meetings has cost implications when the team leader is based in another country but can be more effective to meet the intended results of the inception phase (see box 22). The purpose of the Inception is to familiarise the evaluation team, to ensure their understanding of requirements and to increase the likelihood of developing a realistic and adequate approach and schedule for the evaluation. The Regional Evaluation Officer can provide useful support to the Evaluation Manager by participating to key meetings with the Evaluation Team and clarifying expectations.

138. When inception missions are planned, this should be explicitly stated in the TOR with associated costs included in the budget.

139. If an Inception Mission is taking place, the Evaluation Committee and/or Evaluation Reference Group should a) provide a briefing at the start of the mission and b) be debriefed by the team at the end of the mission.
Box 22: Purpose and content of Inception Meetings

- Clarify the Terms of Reference
- Discuss key areas of technical and operational interest to the commissioning office and stakeholders
- Conduct stakeholder analysis and how their perspectives will be included
- As appropriate, meet the main stakeholders in the evaluation
- Agree field site mapping and sampling criteria to allow for a representative observation of the evaluation subject
- Discuss evaluation matrix and evaluation questions (see Technical Note on Evaluation Matrix and Technical Note on Evaluation Criteria and Questions)
- Collect documentation and data (monitoring reports, data sets etc); identify gaps in documentation
- Determine data collection methods and tools
- Identify data limitations and how these will be addressed, any implications
- Agree administrative and logistics arrangements for the field mission (such as travel to field sites, translation/interpretation, modes of transport etc)
- Take account of access/security/protection considerations

Technical aspects, to be covered in technical briefings, include:
- Context in which WFP operates
- Language skills: Ability to communicate in the official language of the country
- Interpersonal skills: Ability to communicate and liaise with a range of stakeholders in a way that enhances the credibility of the evaluation process.
- Aspects of WFP programming in the location generally (relevant to the evaluation subject) such as nutrition, emergency response, cash based Transfers, school feeding, social protection, capacity development, etc.
- Monitoring and evaluation arrangements/processes

Inception meetings may take place with:
- WFP staff directly involved in the implementation of the evaluation subject
- The Evaluation Committee and/or Evaluation Reference Group members
- Regional Bureau staff
- HQ staff from relevant divisions
- The CD/DCD
- Other stakeholders e.g. Government (including Ministries or institutions with primary responsibility for GEEW issues such Ministry of Women Affairs), UN agency, donor or Co-operating partners who have an interest in the evaluation.
Step 3.4 Prepare the draft Inception Report

140. The evaluation team leader

141. **Prepares the draft Inception report** with the support of the evaluation team. The Inception Report ensures ownership by the evaluation team of the process. This is a working document and therefore remains internal to evaluation (it is shared with the EC and with ERG members but is not published.)

142. The Inception Report should be prepared following the structure and content guide provided in the Template for Inception Report and should include the following (see Box 23):

**Box 23: Contents of Inception Report**

- Introduction: Description of purpose, users and strategic context for the evaluation
- Context: Overview of the country context relevant to the evaluation, including updates from the TOR
- Subject of the Evaluation: Inclusion of key facts and description of the subject of the evaluation including timing, objectives, beneficiaries, logical framework or theory of change, Partners, Resource requirements, and reflecting any updates from the TOR
- Stakeholder: analysis of stakeholders including whom, why and how they will be involved (see TN on Stakeholder Analysis)
- Site mapping and sampling: information about how sites have been selected for field visits
- Evaluation approach and methodology: Detailed information about the proposed approach that will be used to undertake the evaluation and the methods selected for data collection and analysis
- Evaluation matrix (see below)
- Description of quality assurance mechanisms for process and product
- Organization of the evaluation, including timeline on the phases and deliverables for the evaluation, including if updated from the TOR; support required by the evaluation team from the commissioning office and/or stakeholders
- Relevant annexes including operational map

143. The Inception Report therefore needs to be:

- **Well-informed**—by analysis of the documentation provided and the technical briefings/inception meetings held
- **Technically sound**—with a robust methodology ([Technical Note on Methodology and Methods](#)) and based on reliable and triangulated data sources
- **Feasible and realistic**—based on Inception discussions re: resources, access, security etc.
- **Demonstrative of readiness for evaluation**—indicating that sufficient data sources are available for the evaluation to be conducted

144. The Evaluation Team Leader

145. **Ensures** that the draft Inception Report meets quality standards (see [Quality Checklist for Inception Report](#)),

146. When the evaluation team is contracted through a consultancy firm, the firm checks the quality before submitting the draft inception report to the Evaluation Manager.

147. **The Evaluation Matrix** is the most critical part of the Inception Report. It breaks down the main evaluation questions from the TOR into key sub-questions and includes indicators, methods and data sources. It sets out how the evaluation’s methodology will be operationalised by the evaluation team. More guidance is available from the [Technical Note on Evaluation Matrix](#).
In addition to the evaluation matrix, the Inception Report will also include a number of set of tools/annexes. These include:

- **Evaluation Schedule** – The outline schedule should have been developed in the TOR is updated in the IR. In the IR, it is more comprehensive and give confidence that the evaluation can proceed as planned.

- **Stakeholder analysis** – this will build on the initial analysis provided in the TOR but will validate and deepen this analysis relative to who the beneficiaries and other stakeholders are and their interests in the evaluation; and will ensure that this analysis informs the evaluation matrix and translates into the methods and tools used in the evaluation;

- **Information on the methodology and organization for the evaluation** - The overall methodological approach will have been proposed in the TOR proposes. The IR will provide a more in-depth and detailed methodology, including sampling of sites for field visits, which has been mutually agreed between the evaluation team and the Evaluation Manager and Committee/Reference Group. The IR will also contain the data collection tools.

### Step 3.5 Quality assure the Inception Report

**150. Carries out an overall review of the draft IR** using the Quality Checklist for IR as a guide, to ensure that it follows the structure, provides the main contents and that there are no major contextual and/or factual errors in the report, focusing only on major issues.

**151. In case s/he considers the draft inception report does not meet the standards spelled out above, the EM returns the draft inception report to the evaluation team leader so that the report is brought to the quality standards.**

**152. If s/he considers that the above requirements are met, s/he, shares the draft IR with the REO to confirm that those meet the minimum requirements for submission to DE QS.**

**153. Shares, the draft IR with the outsourced Quality Support service (DE QS) for DE which will provide a feedback, within 6 working days on the quality of the draft IR from an evaluation perspective (see box 24 to access the service). At the same time that the draft IR is being reviewed by the outsourced quality support service, the EM conducts a more thorough review of the draft report against the Quality Checklist for IR and formulates systematic and constructive comments.**

**154. Shares EM comments and DE QS feedback with the evaluation team leader.** In case of issues/challenges with the feedback provided by the independent quality support service, the EM seeks advice from the REO (and /or OEV as last recourse), before sharing it with the evaluation team leader.
Box 24: Outsourced Quality Support service for DE: IR assessment

The DE QS is managed by OEV (as per WFP evaluation policy provision) to provide a timely feedback on all draft inception reports. The RBs and COs are able to access this service directly as per the following procedure (http://newgo.wfp.org/services/decentralized-evaluation-quality-support):

1. Check that the draft IR includes all the elements of the corresponding DEQAS template
   - If not return the draft IR to the Team leader for revision;
   - If yes go to 2
2. Shares draft IR with REO to ensure that it meets the minimum requirements for DE QS
3. Send email with draft inception report to be reviewed, final ToR for reference and service request form (The service request form is available [here](http://newgo.wfp.org/services/decentralized-evaluation-quality-support))
   - to deqs@iodparc.com
   - and cc wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org, the REO and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee
4. IODPARC to acknowledge receipt and confirm return date for the feedback
5. IODPARC to return completed feedback form in 6 working days for draft IR
6. Participate in follow-up call with the IOD PARC reviewer and the evaluation team leader to clarify any question arising from the feedback received and understand the reviewers overall thinking on the quality of the IR. The REO is also encouraged to participate.
7. The evaluation manager shares feedback with evaluation team leader to make the appropriate changes based on feedback received

155. The evaluation team leader:

156. **Revises the IR** according to feedback from the Evaluation Manager and the quality support service, to produce a second draft.

157. The EM:

158. **Ensures that comments have been adequately addressed** and that the IR is of good quality prior to sharing the draft IR to the evaluation reference group.

**Step 3.6 Circulate, finalise and approve the Inception Report**

159. The EM:

160. **Circulates the draft Inception Report** to the ERG and other internal stakeholders as relevant. The stakeholders should be given between five days and two weeks to provide comments, depending upon the circumstances and the timeline for the evaluation.

161. The EM:

162. **Consolidates comments** into one overall Comments Matrix using the [template for Comments](http://newgo.wfp.org/services/decentralized-evaluation-quality-support) provided, sorted into groups, according to the section of the report that they relate to. If there are significant contradictions between several comments, the Evaluation Manager should discuss with the evaluation team leader how this should be addressed most appropriately.

163. **Checks** if any of the comments appear ambiguous, in which case the Evaluation Manager should seek clarification from the reviewer first.
164. **Shares** the comments with the evaluation team leader and discusses them with him/her during a meeting or teleconference, in order to deepen mutual understanding of the issues raised.
165. The evaluation team leader:
166. **Records** in the comments matrix **how each comment has been addressed**, and for those that have not been addressed, the reasoning. The completed comments will help ensure a transparent and credible process.

167. **Revises and resubmits the final IR** and the completed matrix of comments to the evaluation manager

168. The EM:
169. **Reviews the final IR and the comments matrix** with feedback. Any disagreements between WFP, evaluation stakeholders and the evaluation team will need to be addressed and resolved before the Inception Report is considered finalised and the evaluation can move forward. In case of hesitation the evaluation manager consults the RB and/or OEV in last recourse;

170. **Submits the draft final IR** to the evaluation committee for final review and approval by the CD/DCD.

171. The Chair of the EC:
172. **Approves** the final IR.

173. The EM:
174. **Shares** the approved final IR with the ERG and REO

175. **Processes payments** as per contractual terms and contract management procedure
Summary

Table 7: Summary of Responsibilities Inception Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps &amp; Responsibilities</th>
<th>CD/DCD</th>
<th>CO Program Team</th>
<th>CO M&amp;E Team</th>
<th>CO Eval Manager</th>
<th>Other CO Units</th>
<th>Eval Team</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Other HQ units</th>
<th>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Team Orientation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Desk review of documents</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Inception Meetings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Prepare the draft Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Quality Assure the draft IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Circulate, finalise and approve IR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  A/D: Approve/decide  L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step  P: Participate actively in step  S: Support the process with specific tasks, if required

Table 8: Checklist Inception Phase

| Step 3.1: Team orientation | | | |
| Has the orientation meeting taken place? | Yes | No | Justification |
| Has the document library and the evaluation documents on impartiality and quality been shared ahead of the inception meetings? | Yes | No | Justification |

Step 3.2: Document desk review (Lead by evaluation team)

| Step 3.3 Conduct inception meetings | | | |
| Have the inception meetings with internal and external stakeholders taken place? | Yes | No | Justification |
| Has the CD/DCD briefed the evaluation team? | Yes | No | Justification |

Step 3.4 Prepare the draft inception report (Led by the evaluation team)

| Step 3.5 Quality assure the draft inception report | | | |
| Has the draft IR been assessed by the DE QS and is the quality support feedback form available? | Yes | No | Justification |
| Have all comments on the IR been adequately addressed? | Yes | No | Justification |

Step 3.6 Circulate, finalise and approve the inception report

| Step 3.6 Circulate, finalise and approve the inception report | | | |
| Has the IR been circulated to ERG and RB for comments? | Yes | No | Justification |
| Has the comments matrix been completed by the evaluation team leader? | Yes | No | Justification |
| Has the IR been submitted to the Evaluation Committee? | Yes | No | Justification |
| Has the IR been approved by the Evaluation Committee Chair (CD/DCD)? | Yes | No | Justification |

INCEPTION PHASE COMPLETE

When Inception phase is complete:
The CO shares the final IR with RB and OEV
Figure 10: Phase 4 Collect Data - Detailed Process Map and supporting guidance

4. Collect Data

- 4.1 Prepare Evaluation Mission
- 4.2 Collect Data
- 4.3 End of fieldwork debriefing

Elements of DE Guidance
- TN on Stakeholder Analysis
- TN on Independence & Impartiality
- TN on Evaluation Principles
- Template on End of Fieldwork Debriefing
- TN on Norms and Standards for Decentralized Evaluation

Links to PGM and External Resources
- UNEG Norm #4 on Independence
- UNEG Norm #5 on Impartiality
- UNEG Norm #6 Evaluation Ethics

- Technical Note on integrating gender in WFP evaluations, Checklist, and Quick Guide

Main output of Collect Data phase

End of Phase debriefing presentation, which summarises the evaluation team’s preliminary findings and acts as a validation tool.
PHASE 4: COLLECT DATA

Introduction

176. The data Collection Phase has two main purposes:

- To facilitate the evaluation team’s conduct of data collection and analysis, in order to build up the evidence base for the evaluation, and particularly to see the intervention at work on the ground;
- To collect sufficient reliable data to enable evaluation questions to be answered.

177. The Data Collection Phase follows the planning, preparation and inception phases, above, by which time the evaluation team has been appointed and their inception report approved.

178. Data collection and analysis tasks are mostly conducted by the evaluation team, but the CO should support any field site visits and end of fieldwork debriefing, to ensure that they are as effective as possible. Typically, data collection and early analysis in this Phase lasts three weeks.

Process map

Figure 11: Phase 4 –Process map

Step 4.1 Prepare evaluation fieldwork

179. The Evaluation Manager coordinates with the evaluation team to:

180. Prepare any field site visit agenda in line with the requirements set out in the inception report;
181. Organize the meetings (including a briefing and debriefing) and site visits;
182. Identify the relevant stakeholders to meet;
183. Prepare the field site visits;
184. Provide administrative/logistical support to evaluation team members are required;
185. Ensure relevant logistical arrangement are in place, including liaising with units/authorities for ticketing, payments, transport, visa, authorisations as relevant.
186. Communication and coordination mechanisms between the evaluation team and Evaluation Manager should be established for the duration of data collection activities, and made clear to all at the outset. To be noted that: when the evaluation team is coming from abroad this first step is undertaken prior to the arrival of the evaluation team in the country.
Security arrangements for evaluation teams

152. The following security arrangements are relevant for evaluation teams:

**Box 25: Security arrangements for evaluation teams**

If the team is contracted through a firm, the evaluation firms are responsible for ensuring the security of all persons in the contracted team since they are ‘independent suppliers’ of services. This should include adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. Independent suppliers do not fall under the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel.

The WFP Commissioning Office should, however, take measures to support the security of the evaluation team while in country. This can include recommending relevant UN online training for the team members to take prior to travel, arranging for them to attend a security briefing on arrival, and advising them to observe all applicable UN security rules and regulations while in-country.

If the team members are directly recruited by the CO, they fall under the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel.

**Step 4.2 Conduct fieldwork and preliminary analysis**

153. The evaluation team:

154. **Undertakes** the data collection work as per the agenda set with the evaluation manager at the onset of the Data Collection and Analysis Phase.

155. The Evaluation Manager

156. **Organizes a meeting** between the evaluation team and key WFP (and partner organisation(s) for joint evaluations) staff with a key role in facilitating the evaluation.

157. This entry briefing should cover:

- Work plans and work norms including the UNEG code of conduct (see Box 26 for a summary of its provisions) and expected standards for evaluation teams and individual consultants
- Recap on mutual expectations between the CO and the evaluation team but also within the evaluation team, who may not have worked together previously e.g. on report writing by individual team members;
- The planned agenda for field site visits;
- Access to data and key informants;
- Dates of and expectations for the end of fieldwork debriefing(s). The evaluation team should be given access to the Evaluation Debriefing Template if they have not been already.
- A brief overview of the subject of the evaluation and key issues that concern the office currently.

158. The Evaluation Manager and other WFP staff

159. **Ensure that the evaluation team is aware of the standards and code of conduct expected of the team when collecting data.** This includes sensitivity to beliefs and customs, acting with honesty, integrity and respect for stakeholders and agreement to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of informants (see TN Norms and Standards for Decentralized Evaluation).

160. **Ensures that the evaluation team** is aware of WFP GEEW in evaluation and its implication, notably on data collection from both male and female participants in WFP activities and that data is disaggregated by sex and age.

161. After the entry meetings, data collection activities may continue with key informant interviews with WFP and relevant partners, government bodies and donor organisations in the capital city. Meetings with organisations who do not work directly with WFP but have an important role in food security in the region being studied should also be encouraged. These will have been identified earlier
and arrangements made by the Evaluation Manager in good time. It may be helpful to prepare a 1-2 page briefing note on the evaluation for stakeholders.

162. The above is followed by travel to the selected field sites. Further stakeholder interviews, engagement with beneficiaries, observation and other planned data collection activities – depending on the methodology - are carried out.

163. Evaluation field sites visits may vary in length. This can be due to variations in, for example, sector, geographical coverage, number and type of activities, number of partners and ease of access. The evaluation methodology and design is one of the main determinants of duration with, for example, a representative survey, requiring significant time to conduct and to analyse. A typical mission might include one week in the capital city and two weeks visiting relevant Area/Sub Offices and field sites. The evaluation team may decide to split into separate teams for some activities.

164. It is important that WFP staff ensure that impartiality and independence are adhered to during the evaluation mission. This generally includes non-participation by WFP or partner organisation staff in the team’s data collection activities with external stakeholders. The team leader has the final authority on who should attend data collection meetings. Further guidance is available in the TN on Independence and Impartiality.

165. Data collection will continue to involve evaluation team’s request for secondary data where applicable, and the M&E team should be available to provide that when appropriate. This is because as the team starts data collection, more questions may come up related to monitoring processes etc.

**Box 26: Measures to achieve impartiality and independence during the evaluation mission**

The Evaluation Manager, with the oversight of the EC and the advice of the ERG, has the responsibility to anticipate different interests and to counteract attempts to avoid focus on particular issues or with particular sub-groups, or to influence the evaluation in any way. Anticipating and addressing potential bias in the planning and conduct of data collection field work demands that attention is paid to eliminating bias in the selection of interviewees and informants and the process of collecting information from them.

Helpful measures include:

- Applying the evaluation design set out in the Inception report to guard against bias (as well as increase reliability). Any deviation from the design should be transparently discussed and documented.

- Ensuring that staff of WFP and of cooperating partners do not participate in meetings with external stakeholders or beneficiaries.

- Informants and contributors to the evaluation must be reassured of confidentiality, respect and non-judgement by the Evaluation Team. During field work, to remain impartial requires restraint on the part of the Evaluation Team in relation to expressing their own views.
Step 4.3 Present end of fieldwork debriefing(s)

166. The evaluation team leader:

167. **Prepares and presents a debriefing**, based on data gathered and early analysis conducted. This should cover the team’s initial findings/early analysis, including early impressions, any information gaps and next steps. Recommendations are not presented at this stage using the **End of fieldwork Debriefing Template**.

168. The presentation will serve as a reference document to stakeholders but will not be reviewed, commented on or revised. The evaluation team should be asked to keep the presentation concise (e.g. a maximum of 20 slides).

**Box 27: Recommended content of debriefing presentation**

- Purpose (evaluation objectives and uses)
- Methodology overview
- Data collection activities undertaken
- List of field sites visited and rationale
- Stakeholders interviewed and rationale
- Context (country/area and operational)
- Preliminary findings by evaluation question or sub-heading, including key themes emerging and any knowledge gaps
- Emerging themes for further analysis, including any predicted implications for WFP CO
- Next steps
- Opportunity for comments and questions

169. The purpose of debriefing sessions is to provide an opportunity for the evaluation team to further engage stakeholders, encourage reflection and validate the data collected. For internal and external stakeholders, it is an opportunity to hear the preliminary findings and provide feedback to the ET. Depending on the agreed methodology, there may be up to three debriefing sessions held. Further, depending on the type and complexity of evaluation, the detailed debriefings may be planned after the team has had time to do some preliminary analysis. Number, timing and type of debriefings should be clarified in the TOR or during the inception phase.

- **Bilateral meeting with WFP management**: A meeting between the evaluation team and key WFP managers, held before the full internal debriefing to discuss the initial findings and provide management insights.

- **Internal debriefing**: A full internal debriefing where the evaluation team presents to key WFP stakeholders (and possibly partners for a joint evaluation), usually held at the main WFP commissioning office, but with the option of teleconference participation (e.g. for relevant WFP Area/Sub-Office and Regional Bureau staff).

- **External debriefing**: An external debriefing where the evaluation team presents to key external stakeholders (including all ERG members), having absorbed feedback from the internal briefing participants.

170. The **evaluation manager** is responsible for:

- Providing a venue and facilities are provided for
- Sending invitations well in advance to the internal evaluation committee, the ERG and other relevant stakeholders;
- Sharing the debriefing presentation.
Summary

Table 9: Summary of Responsibilities Collect Data Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps &amp; Responsibilities</th>
<th>(CD/DC)</th>
<th>CO Program team</th>
<th>CO M&amp;E team</th>
<th>CO Eval manager</th>
<th>Other CO units</th>
<th>Eval Team</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Other HQ units</th>
<th>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Prepare field work</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L (co)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L (co)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Conduct fieldwork and preliminary analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 End of fieldwork debriefing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: A/D: Approve/decide
D: Decide
S: Support the process with specific tasks, if required
L: lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step
P: participate actively in step

Table 10: Checklist Collect Data Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key activities:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 4.1: Prepare field site visit activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the agenda for field site visits available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has it been shared in advance with stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4.2: Conduct fieldwork and preliminary analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Did the team gather all available information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Were the intended visits to field sites all conducted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4.3: End of fieldwork debriefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has the end of fieldwork debriefing taken place?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the PPT available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECT DATA PHASE COMPLETE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Data Collection Phase is complete:
The CO shares the debriefing PPT with RB
Figure 12: Phase 5 Analyse Data and Report – Detailed Process Map and supporting guidance

5. Analyse Data and Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of DE Guidance</th>
<th>Links to PGM and External Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Draft the Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Quality assure the draft report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Circulate report &amp; comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Finalise the evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Submit the evaluation report for approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Template for Evaluation Report
- TN on Quality of Evaluation Recommendations
- Formatting Guidelines
- Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report
- Template Comments Matrix
- TN on Stakeholder Analysis
- TN on Independence & Impartiality
- UNEG Standard #5 on Quality of Evaluation
- UNEG Norm #7 on Transparency
- UNEG Norm #4 on Independence
- UNEG Norms #5 on Impartiality
- UNEG Norm #7 on Transparency
- UNEG Norm #7 on Transparency
- TN on Stakeholder Analysis
- TN on Independence & Impartiality

Main outputs of Report phase

- Independent quality support provided to the ER (QA)
- Feedback from the outsourced quality support service on the draft evaluation report
- Matrix of comments completed
- Final approved evaluation report (ER)
PHASE 5: ANALYSE DATA AND REPORT

Introduction

171. The Report phase for a decentralized evaluation has several main purposes, including:

- To finalise the analysis of data gathered;
- To produce a draft evaluation report (and any agreed additional materials to support the dissemination of the evaluation) which presents the main, evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations in an accessible manner;
- To review, quality check and comment on the draft report; and
- To finalise and obtain CO management approval of the evaluation report.

172. The Report phase follows the conduct of the evaluation, by which time the evaluation team has completed the data collection activities and conducted early analysis. The duration of the reporting phase depends on the scope, purpose of the evaluation.

173. Reporting is mostly undertaken by the evaluation team, but the WFP commissioning office, the OEV managed quality support service, its partners and other evaluation stakeholders must feed into the process to help ensure quality and utility. Including time for commentary and approval on the report, the Report phase for a decentralized evaluation typically lasts eleven weeks.

Process map

Figure 13: Phase 5 –Process map

Step 5.1 Prepare the draft the evaluation report

174. The evaluation team leader

- Prepares and submits the draft evaluation report with the support of the evaluation team following the Evaluation Report Template and using the TN Quality of Evaluation Recommendations.

- Ensures that the draft Evaluation Report meets quality standards (see Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report).

175. To note: when the evaluation team is contracted through a service provider, the latter checks the quality before submitting the draft ER to the Evaluation Manager.
Step 5.2 Quality assure (QA) the draft evaluation report

176. The evaluation manager:

177. **Carries out an overall review of the draft ER using the Quality Checklist for ER as a guide, to ensure that it follows the structure, provides the main contents and that there are no major contextual and/or factual errors in the report, focusing only on major issues**

178. In case s/he considers the draft evaluation report does not meet the standards spelled out above, the EM returns the draft evaluation report to the evaluation team leader so that the report is brought to the quality standards.

179. If s/he considers that the above requirements are met, s/he, shares the draft ER with the REO to confirm that those meet the minimum requirements for submission to DE QS.

180. **Shares, the draft ER with the outsourced Quality Support service (DE QS) for DE which will provide a feedback, within 6 working days on the quality of the draft ER from an evaluation perspective (see box 28 to access the service).**

181. At the same time that the draft ER is being reviewed by the outsourced quality support service, the EM conducts a more thorough review of the draft report against the **Quality Checklist for ER** and formulate systematic and constructive comments.

182. **Shares EM comments and DE QS feedback with the evaluation team leader.** In case of issues/challenges with the feedback provided by the outsourced quality support service, the EM seeks advice from the REO (and /or OEV as last recourse), before sharing it with the evaluation team leader.

**Box 28: Outsourced Quality Support service for DE: ER assessment**

The DE QS is managed by OEV (as per WFP evaluation policy provision) to provide a timely feedback on draft evaluation reports. The RBs and COs are able to access this service directly as per the following procedure ([http://newgo.wfp.org/services/decentralized-evaluation-quality-support](http://newgo.wfp.org/services/decentralized-evaluation-quality-support)):

1. Check that the draft ER includes all the elements of the corresponding DEQAS template
   - If not return the draft ER to the Team leader for revision;
   - If yes go to 2.
2. Shares draft ER with REO to confirm that it meets the minimum requirements for DE QS submission
3. Send email with draft evaluation report to be reviewed and service request (The service request form is available [here](#))
   - to deqs@iodparc.com
   - and cc wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org, the REO and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee
4. IODPARC to acknowledge receipt and confirm return date for the feedback
5. IODPARC to return completed feedback form in 6 working days
6. Participate in follow-up call with the IOD PARC reviewer and the evaluation team leader to clarify any question arising from the feedback received and understand the reviewers overall thinking on the quality of the ER. The REO is also encouraged to participate.
7. For the ER EM shared feedback with evaluation team leader to make the appropriate changes based on feedback received
8. Fill in [customer satisfaction form on quality and utility of service](#) after feedback received on draft TOR, IR and ER, EM and send by email
183. The evaluation team leader:

184. **Revises the ER** according to feedback from the Evaluation Manager and the outsourced DE quality support service, to produce a second draft.

185. The Evaluation Manager:

186. **Ensures that comments have been adequately addressed** and that the ER is of good quality prior to sharing the report to the evaluation reference group.

### Step 5.3 Circulate the draft ER report to stakeholders (for comments)

187. The Evaluation Manager:

188. **Circulates the draft Evaluation Report** to the ERG and other internal stakeholders as relevant. The stakeholders should be given two weeks to provide comments, depending upon the circumstances and the timeline for the evaluation.

189. To ease the report review process, some practical hints for the Evaluation Manager are provided in Box 29:

**Box 29 Hint: Suggestions to ease the report review process**

- Establish in advance a circulation list (in addition to ERG members) in collaboration with the evaluation team and RB focal points and discuss the modalities and timing to elicit stakeholder comment;
- Allow sufficient time – two weeks is the norm – for stakeholders to read and provide comments in writing on the draft report. Sending a reminder a few days before the deadline can be useful;
- Let people know that their comments will be consolidated in a matrix of comments, responded to and circulated back to all reviewers so as to encourage considered feedback;
- Provide guidance to reviewers so that their comments focus on the accuracy of information presented (see box 30 below).

190. While two weeks is the norm for reviewing and commenting, this may need to be adjusted, depending on the timelines of the evaluation schedule overall and timing of the draft report submission. Sometimes to ensure that the report is available for to decision makers when required, the time allowed may have to be reduced, in agreement with the reviewers.

**Box 30 Hint: Tips for stakeholders while reviewing the draft ER**

- Is the data accurate? If not, please provide additional materials for considerations
- Are the findings consistent with the data presented?
- Do the conclusions logically follow the findings?
- Are the recommendations feasible and following logically form the findings and conclusions?
- Are there significant gaps in the data presented?
- Is the data presented in a clear, unbiased and objective manner?

191. The Evaluation Manager:

192. **Consolidates comments** into one overall Comments Matrix using the template provided, sorted into groups, according to the section of the report that they relate to. If there are significant
contradictions between several comments, the Evaluation Manager should discuss with the evaluation team how this should be addressed most appropriately.

193. **Checks** if any of the comments appear ambiguous, in which case the Evaluation Manager should seek clarification from the reviewer first.

194. **Shares the comments** with the evaluation team leader and discuss them with him/her during a meeting or teleconference, in order to deepen mutual understanding of the issues raised.

195. **Maintains the dialogue** with the team to help with issues such as:

- enhancing mutual understanding of issues related to the evaluation;
- providing clarifications on specific areas when requested; and
- discussing the main areas of findings, conclusions and recommendations as they are developed.

196. Dialogue can be through email, teleconferencing and/or face-to-face meetings, as appropriate and feasible. Time invested at this stage will help improve the quality of the draft report, making for a more efficient reporting process.

197. It is important to ensure, however, that the independence or impartiality of the reporting process is not compromised - for example by trying to unduly or inappropriately influence the conclusions drawn or recommendations made by the evaluation team.

### Step 5.4 Finalise the evaluation report

198. The evaluation team leader:

199. **Records** in the comments matrix **how each comment has been addressed**, and for those that have not been addressed, the reasoning. The completed comments will help ensure a transparent and credible process.

200. The completed comments matrix will help ensure a transparent and credible process. It is important that the evaluation team leader acts on stakeholders’ comments in order to correct factual errors, avoid misrepresentation and provide additional information as they finalise the evaluation report. The evaluation team should exercise judgement as to which comments merit follow up. For any comments (both stakeholders and quality support service) not addressed/incorporated, the team should provide adequate rationale for not addressing/incorporating it. This supports transparency in analysis.

201. **Revises and resubmits the final ER** and the completed matrix of comments to the evaluation manager.

### Step 5.5 Submit the final report for approval

202. The Evaluation Manager

203. **Reviews the final ER and the comments matrix** with feedback. If the Evaluation Manager finds that any of the comments have not been considered sufficiently, the evaluation team should be asked to re-address those comments and re-submit the final report and Comments Matrix. Any comments that have been rejected by the team require a solid rationale as to why. Any disagreements between WFP, evaluation stakeholders and the evaluation team will need to be addressed and resolved.
before the Evaluation Report is considered finalised. In case of hesitation the evaluation manager consults the REO or OEV in last recourse.

204. **Submits the final ER to** the evaluation committee for final review and approval by the CD/DCD.

**Box 31: Formatting guidelines for Evaluation report**

To ensure standardization and compliance with corporate communications policy, formatting guidelines have been prepared and should be followed when finalizing the ER. Formatting of ToR and IR can also be aligned to this guidance. Formatting guidelines are available at the following link.

205. The Chair of the Evaluation Committee:

206. **Approves** the final ER.

207. The Evaluation manager:

208. Shares the approved ER with the ERG

209. **Processes payments** as per contractual terms and contract management procedure.
Summary

Table 11: Summary of Responsibilities Report Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps &amp; Responsibilities</th>
<th>CD/DCD</th>
<th>CO Prog team</th>
<th>CO M&amp;E team</th>
<th>CO Eval manager</th>
<th>Other CO units</th>
<th>Eval Team</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Other HQ units</th>
<th>Externals Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Prepare draft ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Quality assure draft ER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Circulate the draft ER for comments</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Finalise evaluation report</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Submit the evaluation report for approval</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- A/ D: Approve/ decide
- L: lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step
- P: participate actively in step
- S: Support the process with specific tasks if required, if required

Table 12: Checklist for Report Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key activities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.1: Prepare draft ER (Lead by evaluation team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.2 Quality assure the draft ER</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the draft ER been assessed by the DE QS and is the quality support feedback form available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.3 Circulate the draft ER for comments</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the ER been circulated to ERG for comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.4 Finalise the ER</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have all comments on the ER been adequately addressed in the comments matrix and final ER?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the filled comments matrix available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5.5 submit the evaluation report for approval</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the evaluation report been approved by the CD/DCD?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPORT PHASE COMPLETE

When the Reporting phase is complete:
The CO shares the approved evaluation report with RB and OEV
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Main outputs of Disseminate and Follow-up phase

✓ Posting of the ER on the internet
✓ A management response to the evaluation recommendations posted on the internet
✓ Wide availability of the evaluation findings, recommendations and key lessons following dissemination to internal and external stakeholders (as per the Communication and Learning Plan)
PHASE 6: DISSEMINATE AND FOLLOW UP

Introduction

210. The Disseminate and Follow-up phase has two main purposes which both aim to maximize the use of the evaluation findings:

- To develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations
- To publish the report and disseminate its findings

211. The Disseminate and Follow-up phase follows the reporting phase. By now, the evaluation findings have been documented into an evaluation report that has been quality assessed, reviewed by stakeholders, finalised and approved by the CO management.

212. The Disseminate and Follow-up stage is key to making sure that the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation are made available to the intended audience – so that they can be used to help improve WFP interventions. UNEG Norm 14 on Evaluation use and follow-up and standard 4.11 on communication and dissemination are addressed through this phase. Timeframes for this phase will vary, but around four weeks should be planned for.

Figure 15: Phase 6 –Process map

Step 6.1 Prepare management response and record in appropriate systems

⇒ The Chair of the Evaluation Committee (CD/DCD) leads the preparation of the Management Response

213. The management response specifies the actions that the commissioning office has agreed to take to address each evaluation recommendation, along with the corresponding implementation deadlines. The management response should be prepared within four weeks of the approval of the final evaluation report. In order to enhance accountability and learning, the evaluation recommendations and corresponding management response should be recorded in the appropriate system, and the responsible office/person track and update their implementation.

214. The Chair of the Evaluation Committee

215. Leads the preparation of a management response to the evaluation using the Template for Management Response (see Technical Note on Management Response and Follow up to Evaluation Recommendations for more details).

216. Ensures that all follow-up actions adequately address the evaluation recommendations, include a specific timeline within which they can be realistically implemented and are allocated to a specific
team/unit. If a recommendation is targeted to the RB or a HQ Division, inputs from the concerned offices should be sought.

217. Approves the management response.

218. Once approved by the Chair of the EC, the Evaluation Manager submits the Management Response to the RB (Regional Evaluation Officer and Senior Regional Programme Adviser) for review and endorsement.

219. The Regional Evaluation Officer, the Senior Regional Programme Adviser and other concerned RB colleagues as relevant jointly review the management response; more specifically, they check that:
   - All recommendations are adequately reflected in the Management Response.
   - The justifications provided for partially accepting or rejecting a recommendation are relevant and adequate.
   - The proposed follow-up actions adequately address the recommendations.

220. This review process may involve further discussion with the CO management. Once the Management Response is finalized, the Regional Evaluation Officer or Regional Monitoring Adviser:

221. Seeks the approval of the Management Response by RB management.

222. Uploads the Management Response in the appropriate corporate system to be established by the Performance Management and Monitoring Division (RMP). Until such system is in place, it is recommended that the RB maintains a matrix consolidating all recommendations for all evaluations in their respective region.

**Step 6.2 Publish Report and Management Response**

223. The Evaluation Manager:

224. Shares the final evaluation report and Management Response with the Regional Evaluation Officer and the Office of Evaluation for publication on WFP’s internal and external websites.

225. Ensures the report and Management Response are proactively shared with all evaluation stakeholders.

226. The processes for publication and dissemination should have been specified in the Communication and Learning Plan during the Planning Phase.
Step 6.3 Disseminate and use evaluation results

In line with WFP’s Evaluation Policy 2016-2021, and to enhance the utility of the evaluation, findings from the evaluation should be actively disseminated. This should have been planned in the Communication and Learning Plan. This sets out who is responsible for each dissemination activity, what material is to be disseminated (e.g. the full evaluation report, the Executive Summary only, or an Evaluation Brief), who to, how, when and why. These dissemination activities should be reviewed and enacted during this phase.

Evaluation results should be used to inform and improve future programme design and implementation, advocacy and strategy and in particular evaluation evidence used for the design of new Country Strategic Plans/ Interim Country Strategic Plans and revisions. It is therefore important to actively share lessons among stakeholders and with other colleagues in CO, RB and HQ to inform similar activities, in other places. In order to maximise the use of the evaluation findings, different products should be developed for different groups of users depending on their information needs.

Box 32 Hint: Effective ways to disseminate, evaluation evidence and results

- Send the full evaluation report to the Evaluation Committee and the Evaluation Reference Group.
- Circulate a stand-alone Executive Summary or a one-pager Evaluation Brief to other internal and external stakeholders (along with a link to the full report) as identified in the Stakeholder Analysis and Communication and Learning Plan.
- Hold workshops in the country as interactive events are more likely to be effective in disseminating the evaluation findings.
- Identify and use other emerging opportunities for sharing or using the evaluation findings and recommendations e.g. consultation meetings at CO, RB or HQ levels.
- Identify creative dissemination methods to further disseminate the evaluation findings and stimulate discussions including with the affected population e.g. evaluation briefs/pamphlets/posters which summarise key evaluation information and power point presentations, video and radio/visual media clips, community consultations. See as an example a video on the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations in the Philippines, South Sudan and Central African Republic (http://www.unocha.org/top-stories/all-stories/evaluating-humanitarian-response-major-crisis)
- Ask partner organisations to post links to the evaluation report on their websites.
- Use the online Evaluation Community, or other thematic WFP communities, as a channel through which to disseminate evaluation findings.
- Make the evaluation report more accessible to the broader evaluation and humanitarian community by uploading it onto the UNEG and ALNAP evaluation report databases.
- Use evaluation evidence for the design of new Country Strategic Plans / Interim Country Strategic Plans and revisions.
Step 6.4 Track the implementation of follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations

229. The evaluation manager, or another staff designated by the CD (most preferably the M&E team) should:

- **Periodically reviews** the status of implementation of the follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations, and uploads updates in the appropriate corporate system to be developed and managed by RMP.

230. As an interim solution, it is recommended that CO, with support of the Regional Bureau use a system based on the DEQAS management response matrix (see Tracking of Evaluation Recommendations Template), for systematically tracking the implementation of all evaluation recommendations.

231. The consolidation of this information should be done at least twice a year in order to be used as inputs to the CO for annual performance planning and reviews.

232. The RB should:

- **Solicit and consolidate** updates from COs within the region on the status of implementation of the follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations as part of the evaluation function reporting and to inform RB oversight.

- **Support** the development of lessons learnt from decentralized evaluations, to enhance use of evidence for design and implementation of WFP interventions across the region; as well as policy dialogue/engagement and advocacy.
Summary

Table 13: Summary of Responsibilities Disseminate and Follow-Up Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps &amp; Responsibilities</th>
<th>CD/DCD</th>
<th>CO Prog team</th>
<th>CO M&amp;E team</th>
<th>CO Eval manager</th>
<th>Other CO Units</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Other HQ units</th>
<th>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Prepare Management Response and record in appropriate system</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Publish Report and management response</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Disseminate and use evaluation results and regularly review</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Follow-up and tracking implementation of evaluation recommendations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: A/D: Approve/decide  L: lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step  P: participate actively in step  S: Support, if required

Table 14: Checklist for Disseminate and Follow Up Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key activities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 6.1: Prepare the Management Response</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the management Response available in a timely manner?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Has the management response been reviewed and signed-off by the RB and approved by the Chair of the EC?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the recommendations and responses recorded in appropriate system?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6.2 Publish the report and management response</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the report and management response publicly available?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the report logged in the MIS and shared with OEV?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6.3 Disseminate and use evaluation results</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the Communication and learning plan implemented?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Are the evaluation results used to inform programming activities?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6.4 Follow-up and tracking Implementation of evaluation recommendations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Is the implementation of the recommendation regularly reviewed?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Disseminate and follow up phase is complete:
The Evaluation process is completed!
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List of Acronyms

CD  Country Director
CES  Corporate Evaluation Strategy
CEs  Centralized evaluations
CO  Country Office
CP  Country Programme
CSP  Country Strategic Plan
ICSP  Interim Country Strategic Plan
DCD  Deputy Country Director
DEs  Decentralized evaluations
DEQAS  Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System
DEQS  Decentralized Evaluation Quality Support service
DEV  Development Project
EC  Evaluation Committee
EM  Evaluation Manager
EMG  Executive Management Group
ER  Evaluation Report
ERG  Evaluation Reference Group
EQAS  Evaluation Quality Assurance System
GEEW  Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment
HQ  Headquarters
IR  Inception Report
M&E  Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO  Non-governmental organization
OEV  Office of Evaluation
PACE  Performance and Competency Enhancement
PRRO  Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation
QC  Quality checklist
RB  Regional Bureau
REO  Regional Evaluation Officer
RMP  Performance Management and Monitoring Division
SDGs  Sustainable Development Goals
SO  Special Operation
SRPA  Senior Regional Programme Advisor
TDY  Temporary Duty
TN  Technical Note
TOR  Terms of Reference
UNEG  United Nations Evaluation Group
UNSWAP  United Nations System Wide Action Plan