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The Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (DEQAS) is one of the building blocks for implementation of the WFP Evaluation Policy. As such, it is the evaluation function’s primary means of safeguarding international evaluation principles of:

- **Independence**: by setting standards that increase the impartiality of the evaluation process and reporting on findings.
- **Credibility**: by setting standards that ensure evaluations are evidence-based and follow transparent and systematic processes.
- **Utility**: by building milestones into evaluation processes for timeliness and reporting standards to ensure accessibility.

The DEQAS guides all decentralized evaluations commissioned by WFP and undertaken by independent evaluation teams. The DEQAS is a comprehensive system to support and guide Country Offices, Regional Bureaux and headquarters divisions (other than the Office of Evaluation) when planning, commissioning and managing decentralized evaluations. The DEQAS is a working tool for WFP’s evaluation cadre and evaluation teams, covering all stages of the evaluation cycle. It is not a comprehensive handbook on evaluation and does not replace the range of evaluation literature available.

The DEQAS builds on the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG); the OECD-DAC Evaluation Network; related tools from the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP); and wider evaluation literature and community of practice.

The DEQAS pack consists of:

I. **Process Guide**
II. **Quality Checklists**
III. **Templates**
IV. **Technical Notes**
V. **Mini-guide for Country Directors/Deputy Country Directors**
VI. **Decision tool for making the choice: decentralized evaluation or review?**
VII. **Other reference materials**.

The first version of the DEQAS was piloted in 2016. Since then, it has been periodically and systematically updated in line with the WFP evaluation function’s evolving needs, international best practice and based on feedback from Regional Evaluation Units and Evaluation Managers to ensure that the final material serves its intended purpose. In 2020, the Office of Evaluation (OEV) reviewed its entire Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) across all types of evaluations to ensure closer alignment where required and to reflect recent UNEG guidance, such as the 2020 Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Further updates and new material will continue to be added as needed, to ensure the DEQAS continues to reflect emergent best practice and management requirements.

Andrea Cook  
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March 2021
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1. Introduction

The DEQAS Process Guide is intended for WFP staff managing decentralized evaluations (DEs). As the majority of DEs are commissioned by Country Offices (COs), this guide has been developed for this context. With minor adaptations it can also be used by Regional Bureaux (RBx) and headquarters divisions/units commissioning DEs. The guide should also be used by Regional Evaluation Units when guiding CO Evaluation Managers, as well as Chairs of Evaluation Committees and evaluation teams.

The guide is structured around the six phases of an evaluation process, from the planning phase through to the dissemination and follow-up phase. The guide sets out the specific steps of each phase with links to relevant materials.

1.1. BACKGROUND

WFP's evaluation function is framed by three foundational pillars (see Figure 1):

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

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

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

Figure 1: Framing documents – WFP evaluation function
These three documents clearly outline WFP's commitment to a demand-led DE function, complementing a centralized evaluation function in line with the organization's commitment to enhancing evidence and accountability for results. All Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) are expected to be subject to at least one DE. Regional evaluation strategies and regional evaluation plans are updated on a yearly basis and set out evaluation priorities for each region. In addition, the Office of Evaluation (OEV) commissions policy, strategic, CSP, corporate emergency response and impact evaluations.

To ensure their independence, all WFP evaluations, whether centralized or decentralized, are conducted by independent consultants. While some organizations refer to the term “self-evaluations” or “internal evaluations” when they are conducted by their own staff, WFP refers to these exercises as “reviews” and does not consider them evaluations.

The evaluation principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility underpin WFP's evaluation framing documents.

**Table 1: International evaluation principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence and impartiality</td>
<td>As stated in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines, “independence and impartiality prevent bias and are therefore both essential for the credibility of an evaluation. The main difference between the two is that independence relates to external pressure or influence on those who organize or do evaluations, while impartiality is an attitude towards the evaluated subject. In other words, independence means that the evaluator should be able to work freely and without outside interference, while impartiality means that the evaluator should not be biased with respect to what is being evaluated.” This implies that the evaluators must not have been (or expect to be in the near future) directly responsible for the policy setting, design or management of the evaluation subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Utility is the extent to which evaluations are useful to decision makers and stakeholders, informing policies, strategies and programmes, and in meeting accountability requirements. WFP is committed to enhancing utility by planning and conducting evaluations with a clear intent to use their results; undertaking evaluations in a timely manner to inform decision making processes; and ensuring the accessibility of evaluation results by making reports publicly available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implications of these principles across all stages of the evaluation process are further detailed in the Technical Note on Principles, Norms and Standards. See also Step 1.4: Clarify provisions for impartiality and independence.
1.2. **OVERVIEW OF DE SUPPORT MECHANISMS AND GUIDANCE**

This Process Guide forms one element of WFP's Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (DEQAS). It should be used alongside the other elements summarized in Box 1.

**Box 1: Overview of DEQAS guidance package**

- **Decision tool for making the choice: decentralized evaluation or review?** to be used to decide between a DE or a review based on the objective pursued and expected use.
- **Templates** for evaluation products (Terms of Reference [TOR], inception report, baseline report and evaluation report), which set out the structure for the main evaluation products, suggest some content and include guidance for development of various sections of the document. These products aim to enhance the consistency and quality of evaluations. Other templates are for processes such as the template for comments matrix, budget and evaluation timeline and management response.
- **Quality Checklists (QCs)** for each evaluation product. Following the structure of the template, QCs facilitate the systematic assessment of evaluation documents. They also help structure comments on each product.
- **Technical Notes (TNs)** provide additional guidance on key elements or tools contributing to the design of an evaluation (e.g., evaluation questions and criteria, evaluation methods, etc.), specific aspects of an evaluation process (e.g., contracting of evaluation teams) or on various types of evaluation.
- **Mini-guide for Country Directors/Deputy Country Directors** sets out the main roles and accountabilities of WFP management and the key decisions they have to take at each phase of a DE process. Typically, those are Country Directors, Deputy Country Directors, Regional Directors, Deputy Regional Directors, or Directors of a headquarters division.
- **Other reference materials** include WFP Data Protection guidelines and other UNEG guidelines.

The Guidance Package is part of a broader set of support mechanisms for DEs which includes an Evaluation Learning Programme (EvalPro), an outsourced quality support service, a Contingency Evaluation Fund (CEF), a help desk to complement the support from Regional Evaluation Officers, access to evaluation expertise and the post hoc quality assessment (PHQA) system for all final evaluation reports. The PHQA system was established to provide an expert external appraisal of the extent to which the final centralized and decentralized evaluation reports meet evaluation quality standards, reinforcing the internal and external credibility of the WFP evaluation function and evidence WFP's external accountability. For further information, please consult WFP Support Mechanisms for DEs.

**Figure 2: WFP support mechanisms for DEs**

- **Quality Assurance System**
- **DE Help Desk**
- **Outsourced DE Quality Support Service (QS)**
- **Regional Evaluation Unit Support**
- **Contingency Evaluation Fund (CEF)**
- **Access to Evaluation Expertise**
- **WFP's Evaluation Capacity Development**
- **Post Hoc Quality Assessment System**
1.3. WHAT IS A DE IN WFP?

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, coherence, impact and sustainability of WFP’s activities, strategies and policies, and their contribution to the development and humanitarian processes of countries that receive WFP assistance.”\(^1\) Evaluations have a different purpose and approach than other exercises such as needs assessments, appraisals, monitoring and audits. See the Glossary of terms for a list of definitions.

Evaluations fall into three categories: those commissioned and managed by OEV (centralized evaluations); those commissioned and managed by COs, RBx and headquarters-based divisions other than OEV (decentralized evaluations); and those commissioned and managed by OEV with partners (impact evaluations). See Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Evaluation types

The commonalities between centralized and decentralized evaluations and the key characteristics of DEs are identified in Box 2.

---

\(^1\) Adapted from UNEG definition in the 2016 UNEG Norms and Standards.
Box 2: Characteristics of WFP evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decentralized Evaluations</th>
<th>Centralized Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to both objectives of accountability and learning.</td>
<td>• Commissioned and managed by OEV, or jointly with partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Apply international evaluation criteria, and the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) standard on gender equality and women's empowerment.</td>
<td>• Take place at global or national levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be conducted by independent consultants or firms.</td>
<td>• Presented to the Executive Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Findings must be publicly shared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commissioned and managed by COs, RBx, headquarters divisions other than OEV or jointly with partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take place at global, regional, national or subnational levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not presented to the Executive Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Roles and responsibilities in a DE at CO level are described in the WFP Evaluation Charter and are further detailed below. For DEs commissioned by an RB or a headquarters division, the Country Director's main responsibilities apply to the Regional/ Deputy Regional Director or the headquarters Division Director. In the context of a joint evaluation commissioned with partners, “CO management” should be interpreted as “management of the various commissioning entities”.

**CO management (Country Director/Deputy Country Director), headquarters Division Director (for headquarters commissioned DEs) or RB Regional Director or Deputy Regional Director (for RB commissioned DEs):**

a. Decide strategically on the number of DEs, their respective scope, type, budget and timing at CSP formulation stage and ensure adequate sequencing with other exercises.

b. Budget adequately in the Country Portfolio Budget (average to date is USD 135 000) for the management and conduct of DEs.

c. Ensure that the evaluation is independent and impartial as per the Evaluation Policy’s provisions and is free from undue influence, and that reporting is unbiased and transparent. This implies nominating the Evaluation Manager in line with guidelines (see Step 1.5 below); setting up an Evaluation Committee and an Evaluation Reference Group; ensuring that the evaluation is conducted by qualified independent consultants who sign the Pledge of Ethical Conduct and confidentiality agreement; ensuring that the required information is provided to the evaluation team; and discussing with CO staff the implications of impartiality and independence principles.

d. Ensure that evaluation plans are reflected in the CO workplan and individual PACE; and that the Evaluation Manager has a realistic workload that allows him/her to devote sufficient time to the management of the evaluation as well as complete EvalPro 4.

e. Undertake the online course EvalPro 2 evaluation for decision makers.

f. Provide strategic steering of the evaluation process and make key decisions on the evaluation, notably: budget, funds allocation and selection of the evaluation team; approve TOR, and inception and evaluation reports.

g. Lead preparation of a management response and clear it (See [Technical Note on Management Response to Decentralized Evaluations Recommendations](#)).

h. Ensure that the final evaluation report and management response are published and widely disseminated.

i. Nominate a staff member responsible for tracking implementation of follow-up actions.

j. Use evaluative evidence to inform the design and/or implementation of the CSP or other initiatives.
The Evaluation Manager:

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) but the Country Director may decide to nominate another staff member. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for the evaluation process through all phases and:

a. Ensures that DE plans are embedded in the Country Portfolio Budget and reflected in the CO Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping, Monitoring and Evaluation Planning and Budgeting tool (at CSP formulation stage).
b. Prepares the TOR.
c. Leads assessment of the proposed evaluators in collaboration with the Procurement or HR Units.
d. Presents the budget and proposed evaluation team to the Country Director/Deputy Country Director for approval.
e. Is the main contact point in WFP for the evaluation team leader throughout the evaluation process; maintains regular communication; and provides updates on the evaluation to key stakeholders.
f. Convenes, for the chair, the Evaluation Reference Group and Evaluation Committee.
g. Consolidates the evaluation document library.
h. Coordinates the administrative and logistical support for the evaluation.
i. Comments on and quality assures the evaluation products in compliance with DEQAS.
j. Submits final, quality assured TOR, inception and evaluation reports for approval of the Country Director/Deputy Country Director.
k. May facilitate/support the development of a management response.
l. Disseminates the evaluation report and management response widely and requests that OEV publish them on WFP websites.
m. Undertakes the learning programme EvalPro 4 managing a DE.

M&E team:

a. Along with the programme team, helps identify knowledge gaps, supports appropriate planning and budgeting for evaluations and provides advice to CO management accordingly.
b. Contributes to the evaluability\(^2\) of WFP’s undertakings – establishing baseline information, performance indicators and targets for expected results as well as providing latest logframes/monitoring data.
c. 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.
d. Provides the Evaluation Manager with relevant monitoring reports and data on performance indicators for measuring the achievement of the subject being evaluated.
e. Provides support in reviewing and quality assuring evaluation products.
f. Engages with the evaluation team as relevant and supports the overall evaluation process.
g. Ensures that baselines and monitoring data are available to enable evaluation.
h. Seeks clarity on requirements for ensuring impartial and credible evaluation.
i. Contributes to preparation of the management response and implementation of follow-up action.
j. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for M&E staff.

CO Programme team:

a. Advises CO management on evaluation needs/plan and makes provision for evaluation CSPs with a clear intended use.
b. Provides the evaluation team with relevant background information on activities/interventions being considered for evaluation.
c. Supports in assessing the evaluability of the activity/intervention to be evaluated, including clarifying the theory of change or helping to reconstruct it if it does not exist.
d. Supports in estimating the evaluation budget.
e. Provides support in reviewing and quality assuring evaluation products.

\(^2\) Evaluability is the extent to which an intervention can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. Evaluability assessment calls for the early review of a proposed activity to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable. Source: OECD-DAC Glossary of Terms, 2010, p.21.
f. Engages with the evaluation team as relevant and supports the overall evaluation process.
g. Provides the evaluation team with relevant background information on activities/interventions being evaluated.
h. Contributes to preparation of the management response, dissemination of findings and implementation of the follow-up actions.
i. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for Programme staff.

Procurement team:

a. Advises the Evaluation Committee on procurement options (Long-Term Agreement [LTA] or competitive tender), referring to appropriate procurement manuals and the Technical Note on Options for Contracting Evaluation Teams.
b. Leads communication with LTA firms, participates in the assessment of proposals and manages the mini bid with LTA firms (in offices outside headquarters).
c. Advises the Evaluation Committee on the implications of the contracting modality on time and the level of effort required to enable an estimation of the evaluation timeline.
d. Participates in the assessment of evaluation proposals submitted by the evaluation firms.
e. Reviews the draft TOR, inception and evaluation reports and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of procurement-related data to ensure they are factual.
f. Contributes to preparation of the management response and implementation of the follow-up actions.
g. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for Procurement staff.

HR team

b. Briefs the evaluation team on specific issues related to HR.
c. Engages with the evaluation team to discuss HR processes and systems.
d. Reviews the draft evaluation report and provide comments.
e. Discusses further with CO management any strategic/sensitive issues raised by the evaluation recommendations.
f. Contributes to preparation of the management response and implementation of follow-up actions as required.
g. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for HR staff.

Finance team

a. Advises CO 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 the Technical Note on country-specific evaluation planning and budgeting.
d. Provides finance-related documents to be used in preparation of TOR.
e. Provides finance data and reports, and any additional data/information or clarification required.
f. Reviews the draft evaluation report and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of finance and resource management data to ensure they are factual.
g. Contributes to preparation of the management response and implementation of follow-up actions as required.
h. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for Finance/Resource management staff.
**Government Partnership Officer**

a. Engages with donors as relevant to manage expectations on evaluations, ensuring a common understanding of the process, with a view to ensuring WFP’s evaluation coverage norms are applied.

b. Should a donor request explicit provisions for evaluation in a grant/contribution agreement, seeks to secure a sufficient evaluation budget.

c. Provides the evaluation team with relevant background information on partnerships and donor engagement.

d. Briefs the evaluation team on specific issues related to partnerships.

e. Reviews the draft TOR, inception and evaluation reports and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of partnership data.

f. Contributes to preparation of the management response and implementation of follow-up actions as required.

g. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for government partnership staff.

**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 vulnerability analysis and mapping can provide.

c. Contributes to briefing the evaluation team during the inception and data collection phases on food security assessment systems, processes and reports.

d. Reviews the draft TOR, inception and evaluation reports and provides comments, focusing on the analysis and presentation of food security data.

e. Contributes to preparation of the management response and implementation of follow-up actions as required.

f. Familiarizes itself with its role through the evaluation function summary for vulnerability analysis and mapping staff.

**At regional level,** roles and responsibilities in a DE commissioned by a CO are described in the Evaluation Charter, the Evaluation Function TOR and are further detailed below:

**The Regional Director:**

a. Applies the impartiality provisions for DEs as per the Evaluation Policy.

b. Ensures that evaluation plans are embedded in CSP design and interventions and meet coverage norms.

c. Ensures complementarity between decentralized and centralized evaluations and advises on possible synergies and collaborations on DEs between COs.

d. Embeds roles and accountabilities for evaluation in Country Director 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 management responses to DEs are prepared and made publicly available and that relevant follow-up actions are undertaken.

i. Ensures that new CSPs are informed by evaluation evidence.

**Regional Evaluation Officer, with the support of other members of the Regional Evaluation Unit:**

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. Ensures that COs commissioning DEs are enrolled in the Evaluation Learning Programme.

e. Acts as first port of call for advice/support to COs during planning and conduct of DEs.

f. Reviews the management response to DEs in collaboration with the Regional Monitoring Adviser, the Senior Regional Programme Adviser and other RB colleagues and technical staff concerned and facilitates RB management endorsement of the management response.

g. Ensures that all DE reports and management responses are publicly available.

h. Promotes the use of evaluation findings in CSP design and implementation.
Other Regional Advisers:

a. May participate in DE Evaluation Reference Groups and comment on draft evaluation products.
b. Provide inputs to the management response when recommendations are directed to the RB.
c. The Regional Monitoring Unit is responsible for uploading management responses for DEs in the R2 system and periodically liaise with COs and RB units on implementation of follow-up actions.

At headquarters level, roles and responsibilities are described in the Evaluation Charter, the Evaluation Function TOR and are further detailed below:

Office of Evaluation (OEV):

a. Defines the norms and standards, safeguards for impartiality, and expected coverage for WFP DEs.
b. Periodically updates the DEQAS.
c. Provides technical support and guidance to headquarters divisions, RBx and COs commissioning DEs through the OEV help desk (wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org).
d. Manages a range of support mechanisms, including an outsourced quality support service; WFP Contingency Evaluation Fund; and LTAs with firms providing evaluation services.
e. Ensures an independent post hoc quality assessment of all final evaluation reports and shares the results with the commissioning office.
f. On behalf of commissioners, publishes the evaluation products and management response on WFP evaluation websites.
g. Promotes the use of evaluation findings in CSP design and implementation.

Other headquarters divisions:

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 some Evaluation Reference Groups for DEs.
c. Provide inputs to the management response when recommendations are directed to their units.
d. Use DE findings for the development of guidance and strategies.

External stakeholders:

Many external stakeholders such as beneficiaries, governments, other humanitarian and development actors such as national and international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), donors and UN agencies will have a direct or indirect interest in an evaluation. Assessing their level of interest (stakeholder analysis) and planning for their involvement in the evaluation is one of the early steps to be undertaken. Their degree of involvement will vary from being a key informant to participating in an Evaluation Reference Group, commenting on draft reports, as well as providing insights/information and follow-up on recommendations.

The evaluation team:

The team is composed of external evaluators who have no prior association with the subject of the evaluation. The team is expected to conduct the evaluation in adherence to DEQAS standards, the UNEG Norms and Standards and the UNEG 2020 Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation. The team is responsible for designing the evaluation methodology in line with the TOR and undertaking the data collection, analysis, report writing and presentation of findings and recommendations to the commissioning office. The team is expected to consider gender and wider equity issues throughout the evaluation process and adequately address them in the evaluation results.

1.5. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Quality assurance cuts across all phases as it includes clearance of all evaluation outputs. For the preparation phase, the Evaluation Manager has the primary responsibility for developing TOR in line with the DEQAS. For inception and reporting phases, the evaluation team leader and, when relevant, the evaluation firm that hired her or him, have the primary responsibility for timely delivery of evaluation reports that meet WFP evaluation quality standards. The WFP Evaluation Manager is responsible for ensuring that the evaluation progresses as per the DEQAS Process Guide and for conducting a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their approval by the Director of the commissioning office. S/he is supported by the Regional Evaluation Officer and the Decentralized Quality Support Service.
Phase 1: Plan

The planning phase has the following purposes:

- Ensure that DEs are planned with a clear intended use and are embedded in WFP’s programme cycle, thereby contributing to evidence-based programme design and implementation.

- Ensure adequate and balanced evaluation coverage, which involves determining in advance the type and number of evaluations needed as well as broad parameters for their respective purpose, scope and timing.

- Ensure that evaluation costs are adequately budgeted for in Country Portfolio Budgets and are reflected in the CO’s vulnerability analysis and mapping, and Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan, building synergies and the right sequencing between the various data collection exercises.

- Put the evaluation on the agenda and workplans of key stakeholders and ensure that the necessary human resources and time are allocated.

Table 2: Summary of responsibilities – planning phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps and 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 Identify evaluation intended use, type and scope</td>
<td>A</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 initial timeline</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Link with monitoring plan and processes (Country Portfolio Budget; vulnerability analysis and mapping, Monitoring and Evaluation Planning and Budgeting tool; CSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Clarify provisions for impartiality and independence (identify Evaluation Reference Group members; establish Evaluation Committee)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Agree on roles and responsibilities (identify Evaluation Manager)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

3 The structure of the CO may be different from the presentation. For example, some COs may have a joint M&E and vulnerability analysis and mapping team. The roles are to be adapted as appropriate, mindful of the need for impartiality.
When to plan for an evaluation?

- Planning for an evaluation should be conducted when formulating a CSP. Initial decisions (even if broad) contribute to a more coherent and timely evaluation plan as well as early resourcing. The CO should ensure that evaluation costs are adequately budgeted for in Country Portfolio Budgets and are reflected in the CO's vulnerability analysis and mapping, and Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan. This will identify requirements for assessments, baselines, monitoring, review and evaluations.

- In view of the fluid and fast-moving contexts in which WFP operates, some of the assumptions made at CSP formulation stage will need to be revisited over the course of the CSP. The Annual Planning Process and preparation of the annual Country Operation 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; if there are any changes in evidence requirements; and the implications of any changes for the planned evaluation. At the same time, evaluation management responsibilities should be reflected in the Evaluation Manager's annual PACE workplan.

- Budget revisions provide another opportunity to check whether an evaluation is appropriate or whether there are other changes that need to be made on already planned evaluations to align with a change in operational context and programmatic response (for example in case of a sudden-onset emergency). New evaluation plans can be made when developing funding proposals for a donor requiring a specific evaluation or when designing a joint programme with other partners.

- Before finalizing the plans, you should be clear about the intended use of the evaluation, and the availability of monitoring data and resources. The final decision rests with the Country Director, based on information prepared by the relevant Programme Officer, the M&E Officer and the Regional Evaluation Officer.

WFP's minimum evaluation coverage norms

- All CSPs should undergo at least one DE (see Box 3). The number, timing and scope of DEs are defined by COs based on their learning needs and donor and/or partners' interests. Larger COs are expected to conduct more than one DE. Box 3 presents the minimum evaluation coverage norms as set out in the WFP Evaluation Policy and the subsequent changes agreed with the Executive Board at the Annual Session in 2018.

Box 3: Minimum coverage norms for DEs

At least one DE is planned and conducted within each CSP and Interim Country Strategic Plan (ICSP) cycle. Should the CSP/ICSP be extended beyond five years, the CO should conduct an additional DE.

Recommended to evaluate:

- Before scale-up of pilots, innovations and prototypes.
- For high-risk interventions where the level of risk is established in line with the WFP enterprise risk management policy.
- Before the third application of an intervention of similar type and scope.

There are multiple sources of demand for DEs:

- CO/RB management's need 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.

---

4 The tool should be updated and shared with the Regional Monitoring Adviser and Regional Evaluation Officer in the first quarter of each year.

• The Technical Note on country-specific evaluation planning and budgeting (covering both centralized and decentralized evaluations) guides CO and RB staff involved in the design of CSPs as well as the preparation of the Country Portfolio Budget.

**STEP 1.1 IDENTIFY EVALUATION INTENDED USE, TYPE AND SCOPE**

**Intended use**

The following basic but fundamental questions on the intended use of the evaluation should be addressed before determining the most suitable evaluation type and scope:

- What evaluation evidence is currently available? Where are the key gaps and what are the main learning priorities?
- What is the main purpose of the evaluation? How will the evaluation be used? Which decisions about the intervention could be informed by this evaluation? When are those decisions being made?
- Which key questions should be addressed?
- Whose needs and interests will it serve? Are there other interested actors in this sector – government, donors, or local or national groups – who would inform or could be informed by this evaluation?
- Would there be value in jointly commissioning the evaluation with partners?

The Head of the M&E Unit should first assemble the necessary information including a mapping of available evidence; strategic learning priorities identified by the RB; information on evaluation commitments made with donors/partners; and recommendations from past evaluations and reviews, etc. In a second step, s/he should facilitate an effective and open discussion with the programme team, CO management and key partners around the questions listed above. Addressing the questions helps to determine the type of evaluation needed, its scope and timing.

**Type of evaluation**

The nature of the subject of the evaluation will determine the type of evaluation as follows:

- **Activity evaluation**: Assesses an ongoing or completed WFP activity, from design to implementation and results. It can cover one or several activity(ies) within a CSP but should not attempt to cover the entire portfolio. It can also cover one activity across several CSPs in multiple countries.
- **Pilot evaluation**: Assesses a pilot intervention, defined as an experiment or test, often small-scale at first, before introducing an intervention more widely. Evaluations of pilot projects generate evidence on their relevance; results, whether intended or not; and how the pilot project has impacted target communities to determine whether the pilot can be scaled up in the same country or elsewhere and, if so, under which conditions. The evaluation of a pilot is critical prior to any scale-up or replication and before decisions are made on the design of a potential successor intervention.
- **Transfer modality evaluation**: Assesses, notably in view of beneficiary preferences, the appropriateness of the choice of a transfer modality(ies), defined as the mode in which assistance is transferred to intended beneficiaries (in kind, commodity vouchers and cash). Transfer modality evaluations assess the intended or unintended results of various transfer modalities and their relative efficiency with the aim of understanding when, why and how a given transfer modality or combination of transfer modalities best achieves the desired outcomes compared to another.
- **Thematic evaluation**: Covers a theme across the entire CSP portfolio or selected activities in one or more countries, or globally. They provide a “big-picture” perspective on how WFP is performing; how the organization could further improve in a given thematic area such as gender equality and the empowerment of women, capacity strengthening and protection; and identify good practices in a given thematic area and within a range of operational contexts.

The Technical Note on Decentralized Evaluation Types clarifies specificities of the different types of evaluations, including what they assess; how they are used; what questions they typically answer; and the specific data requirements. Other considerations may point to a particular type of evaluation:

- **Impact evaluation**: An assessment of the positive and negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended changes in the lives of affected populations in receipt of WFP interventions. Impact evaluations measure changes in development outcomes of interest for a target population that can be
attributed to a specific programme or a policy through a credible counterfactual. Such evaluations demand a high standard of data, design and 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. The Impact Evaluation Decision Guide helps determine whether a proposed evaluation fits with the definition of impact evaluation. OEV and Regional Evaluation Officers (when an evaluation is commissioned in their region) provide advice on the feasibility and relevance of impact evaluations. If deemed relevant, the impact evaluation is managed by OEV; alternatively, OEV may recommend alternative approaches for a DE. For more information, see WFP’s Impact Evaluation Strategy (2019–2026).

As part of the 2030 agenda, COs are increasingly encouraged to participate in joint evaluations, which offer opportunities to assess collective contributions to common goals in a more holistic manner, by learning together and strengthening partnerships. Joint evaluations certainly add value in cases of joint programmes; when commissioned jointly with government partners, they constitute an interesting opportunity to leverage national evaluation capacity strengthening. While offering numerous advantages, joint evaluations can be complex to manage and require a common understanding of quality standards, clear governance mechanisms and a common purpose. The Technical Note for Joint Evaluations includes a decision tree to facilitate decision making on whether to commission a joint evaluation.

Scope of evaluation

The broad parameters of the evaluation scope (what will be included/excluded) should be determined by the programme and M&E teams during the planning phase. This includes: (i) the activity(ies)/theme/transfer modalities to be evaluated; (ii) the period to be covered; and (iii) the geographical area to be covered.

Decisions on the scope of a DE should be driven by the CO learning agenda, with the only exception being where WFP has committed to a specific donor to commission an evaluation of a given activity. CO management is responsible for ensuring there is no “cherry-picking” or avoidance of potentially contentious issues in the definition of the scope of a DE.

The scope of the DE should be defined avoiding overlaps and ensuring optimal complementarity with other exercises such as the CSP mid-term review, or the CSP Evaluation. Regional Evaluation Officers can support the sequencing of these exercises in a way that reduces the burden on the CO team and maximizes the utility of the exercises. Indeed, by optimizing synchronization in timing and scope, CSP Evaluations will increasingly build on the evidence generated through DEs and mid-term reviews.

STEP 1.2 ESTIMATE BUDGET AND INITIAL TIMELINE

The focus of the M&E team at CSP formulation stage should be on budgeting for an adequate overall amount for the DE for inclusion in the Country Portfolio Budget. WFP’s Evaluation Policy does not specify the share of budget to be allocated to evaluation, but experience to date shows that WFP DEs cost on average USD 135,000, noting that budgets typically range from USD 90,000 to USD 250,000. At the minimum, key DE costs to be budgeted for include:

- **Evaluation management costs**: 34–50 percent of the cost of a National Officer (NOC) for one year – under Direct Support Cost (DSC) staffing costs. Evaluation management costs relate to the costs of the WFP staff member designated as Evaluation Manager.

- **Evaluation conduct costs**: on average USD 135,000 – to be increased based on the considerations listed above – under the implementation costs of the activity(ies) being evaluated (budget line: “Evaluation Contracted Services”). Evaluation conduct costs relate to the costs of implementing the evaluation.

Annex 2 of the Technical Note on country-specific evaluation planning and budgeting provides further details on the key elements of an evaluation budget. Consult with the Regional Evaluation Officer to estimate the overall budget for DEs.
**Timeline**

In consultation with the programme team, the M&E team should determine an indicative timeline for the evaluation on the basis of the following considerations:

- Has the activity been operating for a long enough period of time to create sufficient evidence for an evaluation?
- When will the key decision-making processes that the evaluation should inform take place (e.g. the design of the next phase of the intervention)?
- The timing of the evaluation should be synchronized 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 for these to be completed before an evaluation (see also Step 1.3 on linking with monitoring plans and processes).
- Additional factors should be considered to determine if the time of year is significant, e.g. during the school term or during a particular season, when physical accessibility and availability of stakeholders are critical.

**Joint evaluations** tend to require lengthier consultation processes and, consequently, have a longer timeline (see the [Technical Note for Joint Evaluations](#)). It is important to jointly develop a timeline with the other commissioning agencies and ensure that agreed milestones and dates are clearly communicated to all involved.

Working backwards from the required completion date and considering the below recommended length and average actual length for WFP decentralized evaluations from the preparation to the dissemination phase, you can determine an approximate start date. The timing recommended for each phase is only indicative and can be longer depending on the complexity of the evaluation, the level of experience of the Evaluation Manager, reassignment/ turn-over of the Evaluation Manager, the efficiency of decision-making processes, and external factors (e.g. emergency situation). Table 3 below provides good working estimates to start with, noting that, in practice, the actual time for the DEs has varied.

### Table 3: Recommended duration of a decentralized evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Recommended length (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning</td>
<td>Conducted at CSP design stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inception</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data collection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reporting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Follow-up and dissemination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (excluding planning phase)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34 weeks / 7.5 months</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 1.3 LINK WITH MONITORING PLAN AND PROCESSES**

Evaluations supported by an effective monitoring system are more likely to be credible and useful. When formulating a CSP, the M&E team should identify requirements for assessments, baselines, monitoring, reviews and evaluations in line with the CSP theory of change (or logical framework in case a theory of change has not been developed). The timing of the various assessments, monitoring activities, reviews and evaluations should be determined for complementarity and synchronization and to ensure the most efficient use of collected data.

For most evaluation types, the start point (baseline) before an 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 Operating Procedures (SOPs) for CSP Monitoring. The Standard Operating Procedures stipulate that baselines be developed for all outcome indicators as part of the CSP development process.

The timing of the baseline study is important for future evaluations. WFP Standard Operating Procedures for CSP monitoring recommend that baselines are developed within a timeframe of three months before to three months after the start of a CSP.

Some evaluations may need data collection over and above that required for corporate monitoring. They may require a wider or deeper look at some aspects of the intervention such as partnerships, service providers, distribution sites or delivery points, etc. which cannot realistically be collected by an evaluation team during a final evaluation. This is particularly important for pilot evaluations. If so, the requirements should be specified at the design stage of the intervention. The Technical Note on evaluation approaches, methods and tools provides more information on types of data collection and explains the distinctions between primary and secondary data sources.

When identifying baseline and monitoring requirements, clear plans should be made for presenting disaggregated data (including on gender, disability and any other relevant subpopulation group).

**STEP 1.4 CLARIFY PROVISIONS FOR IMPARTIALITY AND INDEPENDENCE**

Impartiality is the absence of bias and its mitigation at all stages of the evaluation process. This is critical to the usefulness and credibility of the evaluation. The Country Director is expected to set the tone and ensure that the CO staff and key partners involved in the evaluation understand the principle of impartiality and its implications. This vigilance on potential bias starts from the beginning of the evaluation process and should inform all phases (see the Technical Note on Principles, Norms and Standards).

The whole CO supports the impartiality of the evaluation by engaging constructively with the evaluation team and sharing all relevant information. As custodian of data and information, the M&E team ensures that information is accessible to the evaluation team. The Country Director/Deputy Country Director ensures that CO staff and partners understand and respect the implications of the principles of impartiality and independence.

Maintaining independence does not mean that those responsible for design and delivery of the intervention being evaluated are isolated from the evaluation process. They are key stakeholders and their participation is essential and must be meaningful. However, they should not have any control or influence in the design or conduct of the evaluation or any veto on its findings. See Figure 4 for an overview of the provisions on safeguarding the impartiality of DEs.

**Figure 4: Impartiality provisions in DEs**
**STEP 1.5 AGREE ON ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Country Director/Deputy Country Director **appoints an Evaluation Manager in advance** to allow him/her to plan ahead for the evaluation and include the evaluation management duties in his/her workplan. The choice of the Evaluation Manager is central to the success of the evaluation and should be made by balancing various considerations, including the key skills and capabilities outlined in Box 4. For more information, refer to [WFP generic job description for M&E Officer](#).

**Box 4: Summary of skills and capabilities required for an Evaluation Manager**

- **Strategic management**: Good understanding of humanitarian and development actions in different country/regional contexts and knowledge of global geo-political issues and UN reform.

- **Performance management**: Solid performance management cycle skills including development of a theory of change to support design and implementation of M&E systems; and an in-depth knowledge of international norms and standards for evaluation and the ability to apply them appropriately.

- **Methodology, approaches and analysis**: Ability to select and apply high-quality, credible and analytical approaches, and qualitative and quantitative methods appropriately. Knowledge of a range of evaluation data collection and analysis methods and ability to define key methodological requirements and critically review the evaluation design proposed by the evaluation team. Ability to validate data quality and ensure that data collection and analysis have been conducted ethically.

- **Communication and use**: Ability to communicate key evidence from evaluations effectively to a range of stakeholders and create clear, influential messages to senior audiences. Active listening and conflict resolution skills are required to promote constructive engagement from stakeholders with diverse, complex and high-stake interests.

- **Ethics**: Ability to demonstrate ethical behaviour and communicate WFP's expectation that all personnel act ethically in furtherance of the ideals of the UN and WFP’s mission. Understands the implications of ethics in evaluation activities and ability to consistently ensure that appropriate actions are taken to safeguard ethics.

- **Team management**: Strong interpersonal skills with demonstrated ability to manage diverse teams and solve problems effectively and sensitively. Strong organizational skills and proven ability to produce results to deadlines. Demonstrated skills in project management.

*Source: WFP Generic Job Description – M&E Officer*

After carefully balancing the above considerations, in consultation with the Regional Evaluation Officer, the Country Director/Deputy Country Director will appoint the Evaluation Manager. Recognizing that the circumstances in each CO vary, the Country Director/Deputy Country Director is encouraged to seek advice from the Regional Evaluation Officer on the advantages and disadvantages of the various options (as outlined below).
Option 1 – CO M&E Officer: Typically, the head of the CO M&E unit would be best placed to take the role of Evaluation Manager. The advantage is that s/he knows the activities under evaluation, while being involved to a lesser extent in the design and implementation of the intervention than the Head of Programme. This option should be feasible in very large, large and some medium COs which have an M&E Officer with the requisite capacity. In some instances, another staff member within the M&E unit may be able to take on this role if sufficiently experienced. Resource permitting, the Country Director/Deputy Country Director might decide to hire a new staff member to manage the evaluation, who would be placed within the CO M&E unit. Depending on the number and complexity of the evaluation(s), this may be through a “when actually employed” contract, with the number of days established based on the required level of effort. If a CO intends to commission multiple studies in parallel, then a full-time position would be required.

If option 1 is not feasible because the CO does not have an M&E officer with adequate capacity, or because all M&E staff have been directly involved in the management and implementation of the subject being evaluated, then consider option 2.

Option 2 – CO Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Officer or Compliance Officer: The Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Officer or another CO staff member such as the Compliance Officer, who has not been directly involved in the management or implementation of the programme/activities to be evaluated, may be appointed the Evaluation Manager.

If option 2 is not feasible because the CO does not have a VAM or compliance officer or they have been directly involved in the management of the subject being evaluated, then consider option 3.

Option 3 – Regional Evaluation Officer or a member of the Regional Evaluation Unit: The CO may request support from the Regional Evaluation Unit to manage the evaluation. This should be approved by the Deputy Regional Director. This option is to be considered when the DE is covering multiple countries, or in the case of single-country DE, for small and very small COs. Otherwise, it would be unsustainable for the Regional Evaluation Officer or another member of the Regional Evaluation team to manage all DEs in the region.

If option 3 is not feasible consider one of the options under option 4.

Option 4: a number of alternative options are presented below:

a) Evaluation Manager from another CO: Explore the possibility of having an Evaluation Manager from another CO on temporary duty (TDY). For a staff member to be eligible to manage an evaluation taking place in another CO, s/he must have managed at least one DE and have completed the WFP Evaluation Learning Programme. The TDY could be undertaken remotely with travel to the CO at peak times of the evaluation process. An Evaluation Focal Point within the CO team should be appointed to be coached by the Evaluation Manager on TDY and perform the tasks that require an in-country presence.

b) CO Programme Officer: A CO Programme Officer could be considered if s/he oversees a different activity from that being evaluated. The advantage of the Programme Officer is that s/he knows the activities under evaluation and has strong linkages with the programme team. The selected staff member should have the ability to manage the evaluation process effectively and ensure a high degree of impartiality at all stages despite his/her involvement in the activity being evaluated.

c) Outsourced evaluation management: The Country Director/Deputy Country Director might opt to outsource part of the evaluation management role to an individual or an evaluation firm. However, given that this person would have limited or no presence in the country, s/he would only be able to assume the tasks that can be performed remotely such as drafting the TOR and quality assuring the deliverables produced by the evaluation team. Other responsibilities including consolidating the evaluation document library, preparing the field mission, or engaging with key stakeholders would need to be performed by a CO staff member. Therefore, the Country Director/Deputy Country Director would also need to appoint an “Evaluation Focal Point” within the CO team to perform these tasks. A template for the Evaluation Manager’s TOR is available here. This option should be of last resort when none of the previous options are possible as it does not contribute to enhance evaluation management capacity within WFP.
For small COs, the options for ensuring impartiality will be more limited as most, if not all, staff are likely to have had some involvement in the subject of the evaluation whether its design, management or monitoring and evaluation. Allocation of roles and responsibilities must take account of these levels of exposure. If a staff member has had extensive involvement in the subject of the evaluation, including: (i) playing a major role in the design team; or (ii) playing a major role in implementation, then that particular staff member should (ideally) not assume the role of Evaluation Manager, or be involved in sign-off of the evaluation report.

Once appointed, the Evaluation Manager reports to the Country Director/Deputy Country Director on all issues related to the management of the evaluation process. In the event that the Evaluation Manager leaves before completion of the evaluation (e.g. through reassignment), the replacement should be appointed following the same principles. The Evaluation Manager should engage with the Regional Evaluation Officer as early as possible in the process. Once appointed, the Evaluation Manager should sign the pledge of ethical conduct and confidentiality agreement and then ensure that the evaluation team also signs these documents at the contracting stage.

The Country Director sets up and clarifies the chairing of the Evaluation Committee. Ideally, the Country Director would chair the Evaluation Committee; however, s/he may delegate this role to the Deputy Country Director, except when the Deputy Country Director is also the head of programme. Making an explicit decision on who will be the Evaluation Committee Chair allows the Country Director/Deputy Country Director to add this to his/her workplan and anticipate future demands on his/her time. The Evaluation Committee's composition and TOR should be reconfirmed and finalized during the next phase in Step 2.2. For more information about the role and composition of the Evaluation Committee, see the Technical Note on Evaluation Committee.

The Evaluation Manager should draft a simple TOR for the Evaluation Committee guided by the Technical Note on Evaluation Committee (which includes a template for such TOR). The Chair of the Evaluation Committee should share the TOR with its members, informing them of its establishment.

Box 5: Purpose and role of the Evaluation Committee

The Country Director sets up and chairs an Evaluation Committee for each evaluation commissioned by his/ her office. The overall purpose of the Evaluation Committee is to ensure a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation process. This mechanism helps prevent undue influence over the key evaluation decisions. The Evaluation Committee is responsible for:

- Supporting the Evaluation Manager throughout the evaluation process.
- Making decisions on the evaluation budget, funds allocation, selection of the evaluation team, reviewing draft deliverables and making comments.
- Advising the Chair on the approval of final TOR, and the inception and evaluation reports.

The Evaluation Committee is composed of four to seven CO staff, who, de facto, are also members of the Evaluation Reference Group.

For joint evaluations, a similar committee is established; although it may be called “Joint Evaluation Steering Committee”, its purpose and role are the same. It should be composed of the heads or deputy heads of the agencies jointly commissioning the evaluation.

The Evaluation Reference Group (see Technical Note on Evaluation Reference Group) should be discussed at this early stage. The CO team should reflect on the composition of the Evaluation Reference Group and who will chair it, bearing in mind that steering the group requires strong leadership. The interests of key internal and external stakeholders in the evaluation should be determined, along with their potential influence 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 to facilitate their own planning. Composition and TOR of the Evaluation
Reference Group is finalized during the next phase in Step 2.2. The Regional Evaluation Officer should be part of both the Evaluation Committee and the Evaluation Reference Group.

**Box 6: Engaging with donors on evaluations**

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 organizations concerned, 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 select donors who have made significant contributions to a programme to be part of the Evaluation Reference Group. This should be decided by the Evaluation Committee at the start of the evaluation process and be 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, 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.

The [Technical Note on Engaging with Donors on Evaluation](#) provides guidance to Donor Relations Officers at CO/RB/headquarters levels and CO/RB staff interacting with donors on key issues related to evaluation.
Phase 2: Prepare

INTRODUCTION

The preparation phase is aimed at designing the evaluation and selecting and contracting the evaluation team. Typically, the preparation phase for a DE should take approximately nine weeks. However, experience to date shows that it can take longer, with the main delays experienced while seeking feedback from Evaluation Reference Group and in identifying a qualified evaluation team. As strong evaluators tend to be committed a long time in advance, the earlier you start the preparation phase, the higher your chance of securing a good evaluation team.

Table 4: Summary of responsibilities – preparation phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps and 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>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Draft the TOR (including consultations, evaluation design, timeline and budget)</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 Finalize provisions for impartiality and independence (Evaluation Reference Group established and TOR for Evaluation Committee and Evaluation Reference Group)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Quality assure (using DEQS feedback and comments matrix), consult and finalize the TOR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Select and contract the evaluation team and finalize budget</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Prepare and share document library</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Prepare communication and knowledge management plan</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Box 7 outlines the key implications of the principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility at the preparation stage.
Box 7: Principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility

- **Independence:** The Evaluation Manager ensures that the independent evaluators selected have not had prior involvement with the subject to be evaluated and have no vested interest.
- **Impartiality:** The Evaluation Manager prepares the TOR following this Process Guide to ensure the absence of bias in terms of scope and design. A reference group, which includes key stakeholders, is formed to help steer the evaluation and reduce the risk of bias. The Evaluation Manager has demonstrated his/her ability to maintain impartiality towards the evaluated subject, i.e. should not be biased with respect to what is being evaluated.
- **Credibility:** The overall evaluation design, plan and process is reflected in the TOR which serves as the master document for guiding the evaluation. The TOR benefits from a rigorous quality assurance process. All available data is consolidated and made accessible to the evaluators at the start of the inception phase. The selected evaluation team has a track record of producing high-quality evaluations.
- **Utility:** An explicit discussion on the intended use of the evaluation takes place with internal and external stakeholders. The evaluation questions should be focused, appropriate and relevant to users' needs and linked to the evaluation's objective(s) (accountability and/or learning). The evaluation TOR clearly sets out the evaluation's purpose, scope and intended use(s) by various stakeholders. The Evaluation Manager effectively steers the evaluation process to ensure adherence to planned timelines and the timely completion of the evaluation.
- **Ethics:** The UNEG ethical guidelines include a pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation to be followed by all evaluation commissioners and evaluators contracted by WFP and a checklist of ethical issues that the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team should consider at each phase of the process.

**STEP 2.1 DRAFT THE TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

Preparing TOR 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. The Evaluation Manager should seek support from the Regional Evaluation Officer, as appropriate, to reduce duplication of effort for all parties without compromising on evaluation standards. The TOR template provides further guidance on the TOR's structure and content.

The TOR for the evaluation is the master reference document for all stakeholders. It ensures, for those bidding, that they are clear on the evaluation's requirements and deliverables, and ultimately, that the evaluation team and all stakeholders are clear on expectations.

UNEG Standards 4.3–4.7 set out key elements that a well-designed TOR should 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 Evaluation Principles, Norms and Standards).

When engaging in a joint evaluation, partners will need to agree on which quality assurance system to apply. As other partners may have alternative systems that are equally as rigorous as the WFP DEQAS, there is flexibility in which system to apply as long as WFP and partners are confident that the agreed system can support the delivery of a credible and useful evaluation. Two important principles should be maintained:

- Two distinct quality assurance systems should not be used in parallel to avoid duplication of work.
- Different agency's quality assurance systems should not be mixed (guidance, templates, checklists, quality support service) but rather one system should be selected and applied consistently to all evaluation deliverables. Not all international organizations or national counterparts may be at the same stage in terms of level of maturity of their respective evaluation functions. Should

---

6 The Inception Report, addressed in Phase 3, also provides an opportunity to revise the evaluation's expected outputs, approach and key lines of enquiries. The TOR and the Inception Report combined provide the roadmap for the evaluation.
commissioning partners in the joint evaluation be at an emerging stage, it would make sense for WFP to assume a lead role in evaluation management.

**Consulting stakeholders**

As part of drafting the TOR, 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. This requires identifying and making early contact with the stakeholders who will form the Evaluation Reference Group, or will be met during the evaluation fieldwork, so that they are prepared to engage sufficiently with the evaluation. It is important to ensure that stakeholders’ needs and interests are considered through consultations at the start of the preparation phase.

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

Drawing from the initial stakeholder consultations that took place at the planning stage, the following points should be refined/validated to inform the draft TOR and the communication and knowledge management plan:

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

**Checking evaluation readiness and gathering key documents**

For an intervention to be effectively evaluated, there should be a common understanding of its design and logic, and clarity on the problem that the intervention planned to address. The Evaluation Manager reviews the logical framework or theory of change to check that it explicitly outlines the expected changes along with planned outputs, outcomes and goals (baseline and targets).

If the intervention does not have a clear logical framework or theory of change, then the Evaluation Manager should consider facilitating a discussion with the programme team to map the intended results and re-construct a theory of change from available sources. This can be conducted through a mini workshop during the preparation phase with support from the RB. Alternatively, it can be included as a first deliverable from the evaluation team at the inception phase but will require close engagement with the programme team. More guidance is available in the *Technical Note on Using Logical Models*.

The document library for the evaluation team should be composed of the list of documents shown in Box 8, gathered by the Evaluation Manager, who should also assess the availability of data for the evaluation to draw on. The list of documents may vary depending on evaluation subject, type, etc.
Box 8: Key documents and sources of data

- DEQAS Process Guide, templates, quality checklists and technical notes
- CSP narrative document (or other documents describing the subject of the evaluation) and subsequent budget revisions (if any)
- Country Portfolio Budget (original and subsequent budget revisions if any)
- NFR from S-PRP meeting and comments submitted through e-PRP on original CSP and subsequent budget revisions
- Key operational documents, including post-distribution monitoring reports; Annual Country Reports (ACR); COMET logframes; studies by the CO and its partners; etc.
- M&E outcome and output data; and output and process reports
- Vulnerability analysis and mapping data
- Dispatch and distribution reports from WFP and partners
- COMPAS and LESS data
- SCOPE data on beneficiaries
- Financial data on expenditure/transfers to beneficiaries
- Maps (operational (project sites, distribution sites, warehouse sites), food security, IPC phases)
- Previous evaluations or reviews (thematic or CSP mid-term reviews)
- Extract from R2 system on status of implementation of follow-up actions from past evaluations
- Programme reports (E.g. Pipeline, Projected Needs)
- Resource updates and financial contributions
- Notes for Record of Coordination meetings (clusters e.g. food security, nutrition, logistics; donor groups, etc.)
- Information related to cooperating partners (field level agreements; memorandum of understanding; lists of partners by activity and location)
- Key relevant WFP policies and guidelines such as Evaluation, CSP, Gender, Protection, Cash and Vouchers, Food for Assets
- WFP Corporate Results Framework
- Information on CO structure (number of sub-offices, locations, organigrams, etc.)
- Information on budget parameters
- Information on limitations (access and security issues, data availability, seasonality etc.)
- Government policies, strategies, assessments and programme documents
- UNSDCF documents

Should baseline and/or follow-up monitoring data not be available, this will require mitigation strategies including, for example, conducting additional data collection exercises. If needed, this should be budgeted for and implemented either as part of monitoring prior to the evaluation or as part of the evaluation itself. Any remaining gaps will need to be explicitly stated in the TOR. This allows the evaluation team to make a clear assessment of available data and reflect on what mitigation strategies may be needed and what the implications may be (e.g. on timelines and costs).

Evaluation questions and criteria

The evaluation questions should be developed in line with the evaluation’s agreed purpose and objectives. Appropriate criteria for the evaluation should be selected in alignment with the evaluation questions. Fewer, strategically designed and well-defined evaluation questions are better than many questions that may duplicate or contradict each other.

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 standard criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability are essential components of evaluation. WFP often includes additional humanitarian evaluation criteria: appropriateness, connectedness and coverage. Depending on the subject and the evaluation questions of interest to the commissioner, a specific set of criteria might be more/less dominant in a particular evaluation. The Evaluation Manager should provide a justification in the TOR for the selection of the evaluation criteria, and for any exclusion. The Technical Note on Evaluation Criteria and Questions provides further guidance on how to prioritize
evaluation questions and link them to evaluation criteria. It also includes examples of questions against each criterion.

**Considering gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) dimensions**

GEWE should be integrated in evaluation criteria and questions as per the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on gender equality and women's empowerment. The earlier that GEWE approaches are incorporated into the evaluation thinking, the higher the chances are that they will be thoroughly analysed and reported upon. WFP has a corporate commitment to GEWE. Further information can be found in the **Technical Note on integrating gender in WFP evaluations**, **Checklist**, and **Quick Guide**, which draw from the UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations. Similarly, wider equity issues should be taken into consideration looking at other marginalized groups including, but not limited to, persons with disabilities. The WFP EQAS will be revised in due course to provide additional guidance on this.

**Box 9: Considerations for integrating GEWE dimensions in the evaluation**

1. The preparation for the evaluation is GEWE sensitive, e.g. a GEWE-responsive stakeholder analysis is conducted, and GEWE concerns are integrated into evaluation questions and subquestions.

2. The Communication and Knowledge Management Plan for the evaluation considers gender dimensions and includes a GEWE-sensitive dissemination strategy.

3. The evaluation team is gender-balanced, geographically and culturally diverse and has appropriate gender expertise.

4. The methodology for the evaluation is gender-sensitive (quantitative and qualitative indicators are GEWE-sensitive; data is disaggregated by sex and age; data collection and analysis techniques integrate GEWE concerns).

**Selecting the appropriate evaluation design**

The Evaluation Manager outlines the evaluation methodology (see **Technical Note on Evaluation Approaches, Methods and Tools**) in the TOR which is further developed by the evaluation team at the inception stage. 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 data available prior to the start of the evaluation. The Regional Evaluation Officer engages with the Evaluation Manager to provide technical support on the evaluation questions, methodology, theory of change and evaluability assessment at the outset of the evaluation and, when possible, during in-country missions.

The **DE Quality Support Service (DEQS)** is managed by OEV and carried out by an external firm to provide timely feedback from an evaluation perspective. This firm relies on a pool of independent evaluation experts with English, French and Spanish language skills. At the preparation stage, (prior to the drafting of the TOR) the CO can request an optional phone call with the DEQS reviewer (jointly with the Regional Evaluation Officer) to provide advice and enhance the evaluation methodology and main questions in light of the evaluation’s intended use, type of questions to be addressed, data availability and resources/time available. The Evaluation Manager should provide a summary of the scope and intended use of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed, data availability and resources and time available to inform the discussion. Key options/recommendations provided during the call are then summarized by the reviewer in an email following the call.

**Develop realistic timeline and agree and secure budget**

The Evaluation Manager defines the evaluation timeline, including the schedule for key milestones and deadlines for each deliverable (see **Template for Budget and timeline**). The timeline should be realistic, providing sufficient time for the evaluation team to develop the expected deliverables; the Evaluation Manager to quality assure the deliverables; and for the Evaluation Reference Group to review and provide comments. It is advisable to plan for some contingency in case of any unforeseen challenges (e.g. sudden
event delaying the field mission or withdrawal of an evaluation team member. Carefully consider a range of elements when determining the timing of the field mission (seasonality of the intervention, elections, availability of key stakeholders, etc.). The timeline should be included as an annex to the TOR.

The Evaluation Manager develops a detailed budget building on the overall budget estimated at the planning phase. The budget template clarifies the key determinants of budget such as: the number of days per phase; the field-based data collection activities required; and the size of the evaluation team and their daily rates. When costing your DE, consider the following elements which may increase/reduce costs:

- What type of evaluation is envisaged?
- What scope is envisaged (in terms of the number of activities and geographical coverage)?
- What methodology do you foresee? Is additional collection of quantitative data required to answer the evaluation questions? If so, how many rounds of data collection are envisaged? What is the sample size?
- What are the costs for recruiting enumerators or travelling in the country?
- What dissemination modalities do you foresee (see Step 2.6 below)?

Box 10 identifies factors that can affect evaluation costs.

**Box 10: How to contain evaluation costs**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure adequate monitoring to provide a body of data and minimize the need for and costs of primary data collection by the evaluation team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link with other actors’ key data collection exercises e.g. Post Distribution Monitoring; Emergency Food Security Assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find the right balance in the use of local/regional and international evaluation specialists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the scope and complexity of the evaluation and limit the number of evaluation questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace an inception mission with a remote inception phase conducted via teleconferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct joint exercises where possible, sharing costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the evaluation was appropriately planned and budgeted but the CO is facing significant funding shortfalls, the CO can apply to the Contingency Evaluation Fund (CEF). The CEF Technical Note describes the eligibility criteria and process for applying (see CEF application form). A call for applications to the CEF takes place approximately every three-four months. If the CO intends to apply to the CEF, the Evaluation Manager should inform the Regional Evaluation Officer and finalize the evaluation TOR and budget prior to submitting the CEF application form. The CEF application process takes about two months between the submission of the application by the CO to the RB and the disbursement of the funds.

**Call for expression of interest among evaluation firms**

If the CO intends to contract an evaluation firm through WFP long-term agreements (LTAs) for evaluation services, the Evaluation Manager and the Procurement Officer, in consultation with the Evaluation Committee, may launch a call for expression of interest among the LTA firms that have qualified for the DE lot. This can be conducted while the evaluation TOR is still in draft form, sharing only basic information on the evaluation (scope, timeline, number and profile of evaluators). This is critical to ensure that LTA firms have sufficient lead time to consider the evaluation in their schedules. The Technical Note on Options for Contracting Evaluation Teams provides further guidance.

**STEP 2.2 FINALIZE PROVISIONS FOR IMPARTIALITY AND INDEPENDENCE**

In principle the Country Director/Deputy Country Director has already established the Evaluation Committee during the planning phase and assigned the Evaluation Committee chair. If the planning phase took place a long time before the preparation phase, the Evaluation Committee Chair should re-confirm the composition of the Evaluation Committee and chair (see above). In any case, the Evaluation Manager
should update the Evaluation Committee's TOR to reflect the new membership and revised evaluation timeline.

The Evaluation Manager should draft a simple TOR for the Evaluation Reference Group, to be shared by the Chair of the Evaluation Reference Group with its members, inviting them to be part of the group. The Country Director/Deputy Country Director establishes and chairs the Evaluation Reference Group, which is composed of internal and external stakeholders. This is an important mechanism for advising and steering the evaluation process and supporting independence and impartiality. Close attention should be paid to the selection of Evaluation Reference Group members. Some members will already have been identified at the planning stage when consulting on the scope of the evaluation. Typically, the Evaluation Reference Group should be composed of 8-12 members so that the process is manageable. It is important to select people who will commit to the role and add value to the process. To ensure that GEWE dimensions are integrated from the evaluation onset, the CO gender focal and/or the RB gender adviser should be members of the Evaluation Reference Group. Relevant Regional Bureau Programme Advisers should also be included in the Evaluation Reference Group. The composition of the Evaluation Reference Group should be finalized during the preparation phase and before the evaluation TOR are approved. For more information on the purpose and role of the Evaluation Reference Group and how to keep it engaged, see Technical Note on Evaluation Reference Group.

**STEP 2.3 QUALITY ASSURE, CONSULT AND FINALIZE THE TOR**

Achieving evaluation quality is a key UNEG standard, and 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 finalized.

### Table 5: Process map for TOR quality assurance and review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
<td>• Reviews the draft TOR against the <a href="#">Quality checklist for TOR</a> and corresponding DEQAS template to ensure that it follows the structure; included the main content; and that there are no major contextual and/or factual errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Evaluation Officer</strong></td>
<td>• Reviews the draft TOR against the <a href="#">Quality checklist for TOR</a> to confirm that it meets the minimum requirements for submission to the DE Quality Support Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
<td>• Shares the draft TOR and <a href="#">service request form</a> with the DE Quality Support Service (copying the Helpdesk, <a href="mailto:wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org">wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org</a>, the Regional Evaluation Officer and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEQS</strong></td>
<td>• Acknowledges receipt and confirms return date for the feedback within five working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In some instances, the DE Quality Support Service Project Manager may decide to conduct a peer-review to ensure that the assessment and feedback by the independent evaluation expert (the “reviewer”) is appropriate. This would eventually result in a few additional days for submitting the final DE QS feedback to the Evaluation Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizes a (mandatory) follow-up call with the Evaluation Manager to clarify any questions arising from the feedback received and to understand the reviewer’s overall thinking on the quality of the TOR. The Regional Evaluation Officer should also take part in this call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
<td>• Finalizes the draft TOR based on the DE Quality Support Service feedback and any additional guidance from the Regional Evaluation Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shares the draft TOR with the Evaluation Reference Group for review and comments. When communicating with the Evaluation Reference Group, the Evaluation Manager is advised to describe the previous steps taken to enhance the quality of the draft TOR (application of DE Quality Support Service as well as quality assurance by the Evaluation Manager).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collates all comments in a <a href="#">comments matrix</a> and explains how s/he has addressed...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them when revising the TOR.
• Finalizes the draft TOR on the basis of comments received from the Evaluation Reference Group and submits the final TOR to the Evaluation Committee for approval by the Chair.

Evaluation Committee Chair
• Approves the final TOR.

Evaluation Manager
• Shares the budget and team composition with the Regional Evaluation Officer; the final TOR with the Evaluation Reference Group; and ensures the approved TOR is proactively shared with all evaluation stakeholders.

Regional Evaluation Officer
• Shares the final TOR with OEV for publication on WFP’s internal and external evaluation websites.

STEP 2.4 SELECT AND CONTRACT THE EVALUATION TEAM AND FINALIZE BUDGET

Contracting options: There are three possible options to hire the team: (i) procurement through consultancy firms and research institutions that have an LTA for evaluation services with WFP; (ii) competitive procurement process; and (iii) recruitment of individual consultants. The next steps and the schedule of the selection process to be prepared by the Evaluation Manager will vary depending on the option for contracting retained. This would either require a vacancy announcement or an Expression of Interest and Call for Proposals, which would need to be widely disseminated. For further information, see Technical Note on Options for Contracting Evaluation Teams.

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 outlines the advantages and disadvantages of each option and key considerations to be made when deciding on the contracting modality. Remember that recruiting an evaluation team can take time and should be done well in advance as good consultants tend to be booked.

Conflict of interest: It is very important for the credibility and legitimacy of the evaluation that the selected evaluation team is impartial and independent and that there are no conflicts of interest. Familiarity with WFP can be valuable, but the potential for bias increases when a consultant’s work is solely focused on one agency. There should be no official, professional, personal or financial relationships that might cause, or lead to a perception of bias in terms of what is evaluated, how the evaluation is designed and conducted, and the findings presented. When reviewing the CVs of proposed evaluation team members, the Evaluation Manager should pay close attention to checking that they do not present a potential conflict of interest. When in doubt, the Evaluation Manager should consult with the Regional Evaluation Officer and OEV. In addition, evaluators should not be recruited by the DE commissioning office for a period of six months after the end of the evaluation (for work that goes beyond the scope of the evaluation and the dissemination of its results). Box 11 defines what a conflict of interest entails.
Box 11: Definition of conflict of interest (extract from UNEG Ethical Guidelines)

Conflicts of interest are typically identified by a lack of independence or a lack of impartiality. These conflicts occur when a primary interest, such as the objectivity of an evaluation, could be influenced by a secondary interest, such as personal considerations or financial gains.

Evaluators are particularly exposed to potential conflicts of interest since their assessment may have major consequences on the evaluated subject, such as changes in implementation, reputation or funding. Evaluators (...) may therefore be compromised in their assessment by factors such as money or career prospects, which can lead them, for example, to provide a more positive analysis than what is actually deserved. It is recognized that conflicts of interest generally carry a high risk of bias and must therefore be avoided to the extent possible.

To avoid conflicts of interest, particular care should be taken to ensure that independence and impartiality are maintained. For example, evaluators should not evaluate subjects for which they have worked or had responsibility in the recent past, or in which they have been financially involved. Similarly, they should not evaluate any organization, department or team to which they are presently applying or where there is a significant possibility of being hired in the near future. Conflicts of interest, however, may go beyond such basic rules. They can be manifold and at times ambiguous. It is therefore all the more important to stay aware of any apparent or potentially arising conflicts of interest and to respond to them adequately.

Evaluator skill set: It is also very important for the credibility of the evaluation that the evaluation team has the required expertise and experience to conduct the evaluation. For this, you can check the UNEG Evaluation Competency Framework. Skills required will vary according to the type of evaluation but will cluster around the core skills shown in Box 12. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for identifying and pre-selecting the evaluation team and checking combined competencies against the evaluation’s skills requirements as per the TOR.

Box 12: Skill set for evaluators (adapted from UNEG Evaluation Competency Framework)

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

- **Ethics and Integrity:** Has knowledge of UNEG ethical guidelines, is able to understand its implications for the evaluation process and communicates this to others; is able to ensure the protection and confidentiality of evaluation subjects, including that the evaluation will not place the individual/organization at risk.
- **Evaluation expertise:** Includes the methodological skills to design and implement evaluations and knowledge of ethical standards in evaluations.
- **Thematic / sectoral expertise:** The requirement for different thematic/sectoral expertise will vary from evaluation to evaluation (though GEWE related skills should always be mainstreamed) and should be clarified in the TOR.
- **Knowledge of the context:** A sound understanding of country/regional context contributes to the soundness of the analysis.
- **Knowledge of WFP:** Knowledge of WFP (and willingness to challenge the organization on the basis of evidence) means that team members can swiftly immerse themselves in the specific subject of the evaluation, rather than learning about the organization. This should not be required for all team members.
- **Language skills:** Ability to communicate in the official language of the country.
- **Interpersonal and Communication skills:** Ability to communicate and liaise with a range of stakeholders in a way that enhances the credibility of the evaluation process. They also include communication skills and ability to facilitate group discussions and present findings in an accessible way.
Box 13: Questions to consider when selecting an evaluation team

- Is the team leader sufficiently experienced and has s/he 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?
- Does the team have the ability to remain balanced, impartial, objective and constructive?
- Has the team worked together previously? Will they function effectively as a team?
- Is the evaluation team gender balanced? Does it include members from the countries or regions concerned?

When selecting an evaluation team directly as individual consultants, the Evaluation Manager is responsible for organizing interviews with all evaluation team members and checking references with credible referees based on the consultants’ latest assignments, outlined in their CVs. If the consultant has undertaken previous evaluations for WFP, the Evaluation Manager in charge of the evaluation should be contacted. The Regional Evaluation Officer and OEV can help to identify him/her.

If the evaluation team is contracted through an LTA firm, the company is expected to have made these background checks and interviews prior to submitting the proposal. However, the Evaluation Manager should carefully review the proposal and is encouraged to conduct reference checks on the team leader and main evaluators. It is also advisable to organize a conversation with the team leader to ensure that s/he has a good understanding of the assignment as well as clarify elements of the proposal.

The Evaluation Manager can request the firm replace team members and submit a new proposal if a proposed team member does not meet the evaluation requirements. The Evaluation Manager may also share qualified local/regional consultants’ CVs with the firm(s) for their consideration. The same information should be shared with all firms participating in the mini bid.

To facilitate an objective assessment of the proposals, the Evaluation Manager should use the template for the assessment of proposed evaluation teams and consult with the Regional Evaluation Officer.

The Evaluation Manager should submit the proposed team and budget to the Evaluation Committee with a decision matrix. Once the composition of the evaluation team and budget are approved by the Evaluation Committee Chair, the next steps will vary depending on the contracting option. See the Technical Note on Options for Contracting Evaluation Teams for more information. Regardless of the selected option, all evaluators must sign and submit the pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation and the confidentiality agreement to the Evaluation Manager before their contract is finalized. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for collecting and filing the signed copies along with all other contract documentation.

For joint evaluations, it is essential to build consensus on the evaluation team selection among the commissioning agencies to avoid challenges at a later stage.

**STEP 2.5 PREPARE AND SHARE A DOCUMENT LIBRARY**

Once the team is selected, it should be provided with a comprehensive document library. Providing full access to WFP information, documents and data is essential to guarantee the impartiality and credibility of the evaluation (see WFP Directive on Data Disclosure CP2010/001). This document library lays the foundation for the evaluation team in terms of its initial preparation and understanding of the evaluation subject. Having a comprehensive and well-organized library will also accelerate the inception phase and minimize evidence gaps. Be mindful of the time needed by the evaluation team to review these documents and only select relevant information/documents.
Building on the initial consolidation of documents made ahead of drafting the TOR, the Evaluation Manager, with support from relevant CO/RB staff, is responsible for ensuring that all relevant data sources are available to the evaluation team in an organized manner.

**STEP 2.6 PREPARE COMMUNICATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The communication and knowledge management plan is developed, refined and adapted throughout the evaluation, with the support of the programme team, reporting officer and partnership officer. It is a crucial step in ensuring adequate engagement during the process, follow-up and knowledge building (see Template on communication and knowledge management plan and Technical Note on stakeholder analysis). The plan should make clear the evaluation team and CO's respective roles and responsibilities, timing and means of communication. It helps ensure that evaluation results are widely disseminated among all relevant stakeholders. Relevant internal and external audiences should be identified and both content and communication approaches should be tailored to the respective audiences. Any translation needs should also be identified. The costs for dissemination products and translation should be included in the overall budget for the evaluation.

For joint evaluations, opportunities for wide dissemination can be explored by pooling resources and expertise; by expanding WFP's audiences with those of the other agencies; and by using partners' contacts and communication channels.
Phase 3: Inception

INTRODUCTION

The inception phase serves to ensure that the evaluation team develops an in-depth understanding of the subject of the evaluation and other requirements indicated in the TOR and can translate them into a workplan according to which the evaluation will be carried out. The workplan includes the process of the evaluation as well as the data collection and analysis methods selected to answer the evaluation questions.

The inception phase involves initial analyses of background materials from the document library and discussions with stakeholders (face-to-face or virtual e.g. teleconference, skype) to provide the evaluation team with a greater understanding of issues and concerns related to the subject of the evaluation. The evaluation team is also expected to analyse critically and further expand upon some elements of the TOR, notably ensuring that the evaluation subject, context and scope are correct, relevant, up-to-date, appropriately nuanced and politically sensitive.

The inception report clarifies the whole approach to the evaluation and together with the TOR constitutes the main reference tool for guiding the evaluation and checking its progress. The inception report helps establish clarity and mutual understanding between parties in the evaluation, and is meant to clearly articulate what the evaluation is focused on; how the work is to be performed; who does what; what is to be produced; and when deliverables are expected.

The inception phase requires that the TOR are final; the evaluation team is recruited; and the document library is in place. Typically, an inception phase for a DE should take approximately seven weeks. However, experience to date shows that it has taken longer for WFP DEs depending on the complexity of the subject of the evaluation and delays experienced while seeking feedback from stakeholders.

Within this framework, the main objectives of the inception phase are to:

- (Re)construct a theory of change related to the subject of the evaluation (or assess the theory of change if it already exists)
- Deepen and finalize stakeholder mapping and analysis
- Refine the communication and knowledge management plan
- Develop a detailed workplan with roles and responsibilities for the team and deadlines for each deliverable
- Elaborate a field visit schedule
- Enhance the field visit schedule

Enhance the knowledge of the evaluation team on WFP programming, processes and data systems, as relevant for the DE.

Table 6: Summary of responsibilities – inception phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps and 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>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Conduct evaluation team orientation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Undertake desk review of documents</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Conduct inception meetings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Prepare the draft inception report</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 14: Principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility

The principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, as well as ethics, have a number of specific implications at the inception phase as follows:

- **Independence**: To ensure the adequate implementation of evaluation standards and principles, the Evaluation Manager and stakeholders should provide the evaluation team with access to key informants and all available data at the start of the inception phase.

- **Credibility**: The evaluation methodology should be appropriate to respond to the evaluation questions. The methods for data collection, analysis and interpretation should be transparently documented in the inception report. The sites for field visits and stakeholders consulted should be selected according to explicit criteria. The inception report should benefit from inputs from key stakeholders and a rigorous quality assurance process.

- **Utility**: The evaluation team, with the support of the Evaluation Manager, should ensure an efficient evaluation process as per the timeline to avoid late completion of the evaluation.

- **Ethics**: Evaluators behave ethically in all interaction with stakeholders. Adequate ethical safeguards are indicated in the inception report.

**STEP 3.1 CONDUCT EVALUATION TEAM ORIENTATION**

The orientation meeting should take place prior to the inception mission (if one is planned), either in person or remotely. The Evaluation Manager, who is responsible for organizing it, should ensure the participation of the evaluation team, the Evaluation Committee Chair, the programme team and the M&E team. The orientation meeting’s key purpose is to present the TOR and CO’s expectations and should include:

- Key features of the subject of the evaluation.
- The main users of the evaluation and its purpose/intended use.
- Relevant data sources (including corporate policies and strategies; monitoring data; any previous evaluations or research; and any data sources on the context). Any gaps or limitations in the data should be made clear; those that are a priority should also be highlighted.
- The expected deliverables, timeline 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 and evaluation report templates, quality checklists and arrangements for quality assurance (including the role of the team leader, the firm quality assurance adviser, WFP Evaluation Manager, Regional Evaluation Officer and DEQS), and final post hoc quality assessment.
• Confirm that the evaluation team is aware of its obligations to all evaluation activities in line with standards set out in UNEG guidance, in particular the pledge of ethical conduct and confidentiality agreement (confirm that all team members have signed these documents and discuss key implications).

• The roles and responsibilities of all key stakeholders involved in the evaluation.

• The communication modalities and rules of engagement, including:
  a. To whom, how often and how the evaluation team will report to WFP.
  b. How the evaluation team is expected to engage with external stakeholders.
  c. To who, when and how the evaluation results will be disseminated.
  d. Reporting of wrongdoing: should the evaluators uncover allegations of wrongdoing and misconduct in the implementation of a programme either by a WFP staff member or partner (including fraud, food diversions, misuse of WFP assets, harassment, sexual harassment, etc.), the evaluation team leader should report the allegations to the WFP Office of Inspection and Investigation (OIGI) through the WFP hotline. At the same time, the team leader should inform the Evaluation Manager, CO management, the Regional Evaluation Officer and the Director of Evaluation that there are allegations of wrongdoing and misconduct, without breaking confidentiality.
  e. Conflict resolution modalities: Should there be conflicts within the evaluation team they should be discussed with the evaluation firm and the Evaluation Manager. Should there be a disagreement with the Evaluation Manager, this should be brought to the attention of the Evaluation Committee Chair and the Regional Evaluation Officer. If the issue remains unresolved, the Office of Evaluation (Senior Evaluation Officer in charge of Capacity and Quality Unit) should be approached.

• Next steps, including scheduling inception meetings/teleconferences.

**STEP 3.2 UNDERTAKE DESK REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS**

It is very important that all evaluation team members are familiar with the main documents so that best use can be made of the inception mission and fieldwork time. The evaluation team is expected to conduct a desk review and analysis of the documents stored in the document library and particularly those signalled as priority by the Evaluation Manager.

Analysis of key design/implementation documents and the logical framework/theory of change (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 government programmes) if applicable.

While the document library should provide most of the key documents, the evaluation team is likely to require additional documents relevant to the subject of the evaluation during the evaluation to fill evidence gaps and triangulate information. Any additional information required should be provided by the Evaluation Manager with the support of the M&E and programme teams.

**STEP 3.3 CONDUCT INCEPTION MEETINGS**

The Evaluation Manager should organize a series of inception meetings for the evaluation team to meet with key internal and external stakeholders. S/he may participate in these meetings, provided that the team leader agrees. Should the Evaluation Manager be part of some inception meetings, it would be useful if the team leader clarifies at the start of the meeting that “this discussion is taking place during the inception phase; however, once the evaluation enters the data collection phase, WFP staff will not be participating in meetings to safeguard the principle of independence”.


Inception meetings may take place with:

- The Evaluation Committee Chair
- WFP staff directly involved in implementation of the evaluation subject
- The Evaluation Committee or Evaluation Reference Group members
- Regional Bureau staff
- Headquarters staff from relevant divisions
- External stakeholders who have an interest in the evaluation e.g. government, UN agencies, donor or cooperating partners.

The Regional Evaluation Officer can also provide useful support to the Evaluation Manager by participating in key meetings with the evaluation team and clarifying expectations.

The Evaluation Manager can decide to either conduct inception 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 in achieving the intended results of the inception phase (see Box 15). When inception missions are planned, this should be explicitly stated in the TOR with associated costs included in the budget. If an inception mission takes place, the Evaluation Committee and/or Evaluation Reference Group should: (i) provide a briefing at the start of the mission; and (ii) be debriefed by the team at the end of the mission.

**Box 15: Purpose and content of inception meetings**

- Clarify the TOR
- Clarify the context in which WFP operates
- Discuss key topics of interest to the commissioning office and stakeholders
- Conduct stakeholder analysis and how their perspectives will be included
- Discuss evaluation matrix and evaluation questions (see Technical Note on Evaluation Matrix and Technical Note on Evaluation Criteria and Questions)
- Agree field site mapping and sampling criteria to allow for a representative observation of the evaluation subject
- 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 on 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:

- Specificities of the interventions being evaluated
- Monitoring and evaluation processes.

**STEP 3.4 PREPARE THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT**

The evaluation team leader prepares the draft inception report with the support of the evaluation team. The inception report ensures the evaluation team’s ownership of the process. It remains internal to WFP (it is shared with the Evaluation Reference Group but is only published on WFP’s internal website).

The inception report should follow the structure and include the content provided in the template for Inception Report and should meet DEQAS quality standards (see Quality Checklist for Inception Report). To generate trust in the credibility of the evaluation, as well as its independence and impartiality, the inception report should be:

- Well-informed by analysis of the documentation provided and the inception meetings held.
• Technically sound with a robust methodology ([Technical Note on Evaluation Approaches, Methods and tools](#)) and based on reliable and triangulated data sources.

• Feasible and realistic based on inception discussions on resources, access, security, data availability, etc.

The evaluation matrix is the most critical part of the inception report. It breaks down the main evaluation questions from the TOR into key subquestions and includes indicators, methods and data sources. The matrix sets out how the evaluation's methodology will be operationalized by the evaluation team. More guidance is available from the [Technical Note on Evaluation Matrix](#).

**STEP 3.5 QUALITY ASSURE THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT**

When the evaluation team is contracted through a consultancy firm, the firm checks the quality of the draft inception report before submitting it to the Evaluation Manager. Upon receipt of the draft inception report, the Evaluation Manager follows the steps outlined in Table 7.

**Table 7: Process map for inception report quality assurance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation Manager          | • Reviews the draft inception report using the Quality Checklist for Inception Report as a guide, to ensure that it follows the structure; provides the main content; and that there are no major contextual and/or factual errors in the report, focusing only on major issues.  
  • In case s/he considers the draft inception report does not meet the standards, the Evaluation Manager provides feedback to the team leader who will submit a new version. |
| Regional Evaluation Officer  | • Reviews the draft inception report using the Quality Checklist for Inception Report and confirms that it meets the minimum requirements for submission to DEQS. |
| Evaluation Manager          | • Shares the draft inception report and service request form with the DE Quality Support Service (copying the Helpdesk, wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org, the Regional Evaluation Officer and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee).  
  • As the draft inception report is being reviewed by the DE Quality Support Service, the Evaluation Manager and Regional Evaluation Officer conduct a more thorough review of the draft report against the Quality Checklist for Inception Report and formulate systematic and constructive comments to be consolidated in a comments matrix. |
| DEQS                        | • Acknowledges receipt and confirms return date for the feedback within six working days.  
  • In some instances, the DEQS Project Manager may decide to conduct a peer-review to ensure that the assessment and feedback by the independent evaluation expert (the “reviewer”) is appropriate. This would eventually result in a few additional days for submitting the final DEQS feedback to the Evaluation Manager. |
| Evaluation Manager          | • For an effective DE Quality Support Service, the Evaluation Manager reviews the feedback received from the DE Quality Support Service before sharing it with the evaluation team leader. In case of issues with the feedback provided by the DE Quality Support Service, the Evaluation Manager seeks advice from the Regional Evaluation Officer.  
  • Requests a (mandatory) follow-up call with the DE Quality Support Service reviewer and the team leader to clarify any questions arising from the feedback received and to understand the reviewer's overall thinking on the quality of the inception report. The Regional Evaluation Officer should also take part in this call. |
| Evaluation Team Leader      | • Records in the DE Quality Support Service feedback form and comments matrix from the Evaluation Manager and Regional Evaluation Officer how each comment has been addressed and, for those that have not been addressed, the reasoning. The completed comments help ensure a transparent and credible process. |
- Revises the inception report according to feedback from the Evaluation Manager, the Regional Evaluation Officer and the DE Quality Support Service; submits a second draft inception report to the Evaluation Manager along with the completed DE Quality Support Service feedback form with the comment's matrix from the Evaluation Manager.

**Evaluation Manager**

- Ensures that comments have been adequately addressed and that the inception report is of good quality prior to sharing it with the Evaluation Reference Group for review and comments. When communicating with the Evaluation Reference Group, the Evaluation Manager is advised to describe the previous steps taken to enhance the quality of the draft inception report, and provide some suggestions about what they should be focusing on (see Box 16).

In case a baseline is included as part of the contract for the end line evaluation (as opposed to being part of the CO's normal monitoring work), the baseline report should also be submitted to the DE Quality Support Service.

To ease the inception report review process, some practical hints on areas to focus on are provided in Box 16, so that comments focus on the accuracy of information presented.

**Box 16: Suggestions to ease the inception report review process**

- **Context**: Are there any major factual errors to bring to the team's attention?
- **Site selection**: The selection of field site visits has been made to allow a broad representativeness of WFP operational areas. Do you have any reservations about the selection as is presented in the draft report? If so, why? What adjustments do you suggest? Has the team missed any main areas/sites?
- **Mission schedule**: Has the team prioritized external stakeholders to be interviewed based on available information? Have any major stakeholders been missed? If so, which should be included? Are the assumptions for travel time from one location to another realistic? The CO may make suggestions for grouping site visits or interviews in different ways to contribute to efficiencies, noting that the team leader will make the final decision.
- **Evaluation matrix**: Are there any specific questions of interest as per the TOR that are not addressed in the evaluation matrix? Are there any sources of data missing from the evaluation matrix that would help answer the evaluation questions? Does the evaluation matrix include sources of data that don't exist or are not accessible?
STEP 3.6 finalize and approve the inception report

On receipt of the comments for the inception report, the Evaluation Manager follows the steps outlined in Table 8.

Table 8: Process map for inception report finalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation Manager            | • Collates all comments in a comments matrix, sorted into groups, according to the section of the report that they relate to. If there are contradictions between comments, the Evaluation Manager should discuss how these should be addressed most appropriately with the evaluation team leader.  
• Checks if any of the comments appear ambiguous, in which case the Evaluation Manager should seek clarification from the reviewer.  
• Shares the comments with the evaluation team leader and discusses them with him/her during a meeting or teleconference to deepen mutual understanding of the issues raised. |
| Evaluation Team Leader        | • Records in the comments matrix how each comment has been addressed and, for those that have not been addressed, the reasoning. The completed comments help ensure a transparent and credible process.  
• Revises the inception report accordingly and submits the final inception report and the completed matrix of comments to the Evaluation Manager. |
| Evaluation Manager            | • Reviews the final inception report 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 finalized and the evaluation can move forward. In case of diverging views with the evaluation team, the Evaluation Manager consults the Regional Evaluation Officer.  
• Submits the final inception report to the Evaluation Committee for final review and approval by the Evaluation Committee Chair. |
| Evaluation Committee Chair    | • Approves the final inception report. |
| Evaluation Manager            | • Shares the approved inception report with the Regional Evaluation Officer and ensures the approved inception report is proactively shared with the Evaluation Reference Group and all evaluation stakeholders.  
• Processes payments as per contractual terms and contract management procedure. |
| Regional Evaluation Officer    | • Shares the approved inception report with OEV for publication on WFP's OEV internal website. |
Phase 4: Data Collection

INTRODUCTION

The data collection phase is where the evaluation team collects, synthesizes and starts analysing information and data, from primary and secondary sources as indicated in the inception report. The evaluation team pulls together the evidence to address the evaluation questions.

The details of the data collection phase are determined by the methodology chosen for a given evaluation; therefore, it may differ for each evaluation. The principles provided here are generic but apply to all DEs. The data collection phase requires that the inception report is approved. Data collection and analysis tasks are mostly conducted by the evaluation team; however, the CO should support the organization of field site visits and end of fieldwork debriefing to ensure that they are as effective as possible. Typically, the data collection phase lasts three weeks.

Table 9: Summary of responsibilities – data collection phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps and 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>4.1 Prepare evaluation fieldwork</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>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Present end of fieldwork debriefing(s)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: A: Approve; L: lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: participate actively in step; S: Support the process with specific tasks, if required
Box 17: Principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility

The principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, as well as ethics, have a number of specific implications at inception phase as follows:

- **Independence**: Ensuring independence and impartiality means that WFP and/or its partner organization staff do not participate in the evaluation team’s data collection activities with external stakeholders. The evaluation team leader has the final authority on who should attend data collection meetings. The Evaluation Manager and the team leader are responsible for anticipating different interests and counteracting attempts to avoid focus on particular issues or particular subgroups, or to influence the evaluation in any way. The Evaluation Manager ensures that evaluators have full access to available information and data as per the WFP Directive on information disclosure. Evaluators have full freedom to conduct their evaluative work without interference or fear for the career.

- **Credibility**: The Evaluation Manager ensures that the evaluation is implemented as per design. If challenges arise during the field mission, adjustments are made ensuring that they do not undermine impartiality.

- **Utility**: The evaluation team organizes a debrief at the end of the evaluation mission with the support of the Evaluation Manager and participation of CO/RB/headquarters as appropriate.

- **Ethics**: The evaluators behave ethically in all interactions with stakeholders and beneficiaries. They ensure informed consent, protecting the privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants, and that cultural sensitivity is maintained. The evaluators respect the autonomy of participants, ensuring their fair recruitment and that evaluation results do not harm them or their communities.

**STEP 4.1 PREPARE EVALUATION FIELDWORK**

The team leader briefs all team members to ensure they have understood the requirements of the evaluation and the operational plan in the inception report. The team briefing(s) should also serve to come to clear agreements on the reporting requirements from each team member.

The Evaluation Manager coordinates with the evaluation team to:

- Finalize the field site visit agenda in line with the requirements set out in the inception report.
- Organize the meetings (including entry briefing and debriefing meetings) and site visits.
- Identify the relevant stakeholders to meet.
- Prepare the field site visits.
- Provide administrative/logistical support to the evaluation team members including liaising with units/authorities for ticketing, payments, transport, visa, authorizations as relevant.

Communication and coordination mechanisms between the evaluation team and Evaluation Manager should be established for the duration of the data collection phase and made clear to all at the outset. If the evaluation team is travelling from abroad, this first step is undertaken prior to the arrival of the evaluation team in the country.

Security considerations will vary depending on the country context and the nature of the contracting arrangements with WFP (i.e. whether the team is recruited through an LTA or as individual consultants).
If the team members are directly recruited by the CO, they are covered by the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel, which covers WFP staff and consultants contracted directly by WFP. Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance and complete the UN system’s Basic and Advance Security in the Field courses in advance, print out their certificates and keep them with them.

If the team is contracted through a firm, the contracted firm will be responsible for ensuring the security of the evaluation team, and adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or security reasons. The WFP Commissioning Office should, however, take measures to support the security of the evaluation team while in country. The Evaluation Manager will ensure that the WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on their arrival in the country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground. The evaluation team must observe applicable UNDSS rules including completing online security training (BSAFE & SSAFE) and attending in-country briefings.

**Box 18: Security arrangements for evaluation teams**

If the team members are directly recruited by the CO, they are covered by the UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel, which covers WFP staff and consultants contracted directly by WFP. Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance and complete the UN system’s Basic and Advance Security in the Field courses in advance, print out their certificates and keep them with them.

If the team is contracted through a firm, the contracted firm will be responsible for ensuring the security of the evaluation team, and adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or security reasons. The WFP Commissioning Office should, however, take measures to support the security of the evaluation team while in country. The Evaluation Manager will ensure that the WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on their arrival in the country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground. The evaluation team must observe applicable UNDSS rules including completing online security training (BSAFE & SSAFE) and attending in-country briefings.

**STEP 4.2 CONDUCT FIELDWORK AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS**

It is recommended that the Evaluation Committee Chair participates in the entry meeting (or part of it). This meeting with key WFP staff who have a key role in facilitating the evaluation should include:

- A recap on mutual expectations between the CO and the evaluation team.
- The planned agenda for meetings and field site visits (who are the stakeholders, their interests, significance and role in making and/or implementing the subject under evaluation, etc.).
- Access to data.
- Dates of and expectations for the end of fieldwork debriefing(s). The evaluation team should be given access to the **End of Evaluation Debriefing Template**.
- Expected standards for the evaluation team when collecting data including the UNEG Pledge of Ethical Conduct and confidentiality agreement. 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.
- Recap on DEQAS quality standards including, but not limited to, GEWE requirements and their implications at the data collection phase, notably on data collection from both male and female participants.

The evaluation team starts the data collection work as per the agenda set with the Evaluation Manager, interacting with WFP and other stakeholders through interviews, focus group discussions, surveys and/or other participatory approaches depending on the evaluation design. As the evaluation team starts data collection, more questions may emerge related to monitoring processes etc. and the evaluation team is likely to request additional secondary data. The M&E team should be available to provide these in a timely manner when available.

The evaluation team travels to the selected field sites to carry out further stakeholder interviews, engage with beneficiaries and observe WFP interventions. The duration of these visits may vary depending on the number of activities, partners and ease of access. The evaluation methodology and design are one of the main determinants of field visit duration with, for example, a representative survey requiring significant time to conduct and 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/regions.
**STEP 4.3 PRESENT END OF FIELDWORK DEBRIEFING(S)**

The purpose of debriefing sessions is to provide an opportunity for the evaluation team to further engage with stakeholders, encourage reflection and validate the preliminary findings. The evaluation team should prepare and present a debriefing, based on data gathered and early analysis conducted. This should cover the team’s initial findings/early analysis, any information gaps and next steps. The presentation serves as a reference document to stakeholders but is not reviewed, commented on or revised. The evaluation team should be asked to keep the presentation concise using the [End of fieldwork Debriefing Template](#). Recommendations are not presented at this stage. It is good practice to allow one or two days without any meetings to allow the evaluation team to prepare the debriefing.

**Box 19: Recommended content of debriefing presentation**

- Purpose (evaluation objectives and uses)
- Context (country/area and operational)
- Methodology overview
- Any changes from the inception report that were made or need to be made as mitigating strategies
- List of field sites visited and rationale
- Stakeholders interviewed and rationale
- Preliminary findings by evaluation question
- Emerging themes for further analysis
- Remaining knowledge/data collection gaps
- Next steps

Depending on what was agreed during the inception phase, there may be up to three debriefing sessions held. The plan for the debriefings may be revisited after the team has conducted the preliminary analysis.

- **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 evaluation findings and provide management insights.

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

- **External debriefing**: The evaluation team presents an external debriefing to key external stakeholders (including all Evaluation Reference Group members), having absorbed feedback from the internal briefing participants.

The Evaluation Manager is responsible for providing a venue and facilities; sending invitations well in advance to the Evaluation Committee, Evaluation Reference Group and other relevant stakeholders; and sharing the debriefing presentation with all stakeholders ahead of the meeting, including the Regional Evaluation Officer.
Phase 5: Reporting

INTRODUCTION
The reporting phase brings together the evaluation team’s findings in a concise, analytical evaluation report, which is the main output of the reporting phase. The reporting phase starts once the evaluation team has completed data collection activities and conducted early analysis. The reporting phase should take approximately 11 weeks, depending on the scope and purpose of the evaluation and timely feedback from stakeholders. While reporting is mostly undertaken by the evaluation team, the WFP commissioning office, the OEV managed quality support service, its partners and other evaluation stakeholders must feed into the process to help ensure the quality and utility of the evaluation report.

Table 10: Summary of responsibilities – reporting phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps and 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>External stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Prepare draft evaluation report</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 evaluation report (using DEQS feedback and comments matrix)</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 evaluation report to stakeholders for comments</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Finalize and approve evaluation report</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: A: Approve; L: lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: participate actively in step; S: Support the process with specific tasks, if required
Engaging with evaluation users as early as possible in the formulation of recommendations will contribute to more relevant and actionable recommendations, as well as increase the level of ownership of the evaluation results by key users. Therefore, in addition to seeking feedback on the draft report via email, it is suggested that a meeting/workshop is organized to:

- Reflect on key evaluation findings and conclusions
- Discuss the draft recommendations and provide feedback to the evaluation team to enhance their clarity, relevance and feasibility
- Start reflecting on how the CO will address the recommendations and the management response.

The [Technical Note on Quality of Evaluation Recommendations](#) sets out WFP’s standards and expectations for the quality of recommendations in evaluation reports.
For joint evaluations, the set of recommendations should offer opportunities for programme enhancement for all commissioning agencies. Some recommendations from a joint evaluation may target an individual agency, others refer to all commissioning agencies (possibly with disaggregated sub-recommendations).

**STEP 5.2 QUALITY ASSURE THE DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT**

When the evaluation team is contracted through a consultancy firm, the firm checks the quality of the draft evaluation report before submitting it to the Evaluation Manager. Upon receipt of the draft evaluation report, the Evaluation Manager follows the steps outlined in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Process map for evaluation report quality assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews the draft evaluation report using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report as a guide, to ensure that it follows the structure; provides the main content; and that there are no major contextual and/or factual errors in the report, focusing only on major issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In case s/he considers the draft evaluation report does not meet the standards outlined above, the Evaluation Manager provides feedback to the team leader so that the report adheres to the quality standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Evaluation Officer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews the draft evaluation report using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report and confirms that it meets the minimum requirements for submission to the DE Quality Support Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shares the draft evaluation report and service request form with the DE Quality Support Service (copying the Helpdesk, <a href="mailto:wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org">wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org</a>, the Regional Evaluation Officer and the Chair of the Evaluation Committee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As the draft evaluation report is being reviewed by the DE Quality Support Service, the Evaluation Manager and Regional Evaluation Officer conduct a more thorough review of the draft report against the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report and formulate systematic and constructive comments to be consolidated in a comments matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEQS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledges receipt and confirms the return date for the feedback within six working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In some instances, the DE Quality Support Service Project Manager may decide to conduct a peer-review to ensure that the assessment and feedback by the independent evaluation expert (the “reviewer”) is appropriate. This would eventually result in a few additional days for submitting the final DE Quality Support Service feedback to the Evaluation Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For an effective DE Quality Support Service, the Evaluation Manager reviews the feedback received from the DE Quality Support Service before sharing it with the evaluation team leader. In case of issues with the feedback provided by the DE Quality Support Service, the Evaluation Manager seeks advice from the Regional Evaluation Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requests a (mandatory) follow-up call with the DE Quality Support Service reviewer and the team leader to clarify any questions arising from the feedback received and understand the reviewer’s overall thinking on the quality of the evaluation report. The Regional Evaluation Officer should also take part in this call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Team Leader</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Records in the DE Quality Support Service feedback form and comments matrix from the Evaluation Manager how each comment has been addressed and, for those that have not been addressed, the reasoning. The completed comments help ensure a transparent and credible process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revises the evaluation report according to feedback from the Evaluation Manager, the Regional Evaluation Officer and the DE Quality Support Service; submits a second draft evaluation report to the Evaluation Manager along with the completed DE Quality Support Service feedback form with the comment’s matrix from the Evaluation Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures that comments have been adequately addressed and that the evaluation report is of good quality prior to sharing the draft evaluation report with the Evaluation Reference Group for review along with the comment’s matrix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 5.3 CIRCULATE THE DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT TO STAKEHOLDERS (FOR COMMENTS)

The Evaluation Reference Group is normally given two weeks to review and provide comments on the draft evaluation report. Exceptionally, this may need to be shortened to five–eight working days in agreement with the reviewers to ensure that the report is available to decision makers when required. When communicating with the Evaluation Reference Group, the Evaluation Manager should describe the previous steps taken to enhance the quality of the evaluation report.

The risk that the quality assurance process becomes overly cumbersome is high in the case of joint evaluations. Mitigation strategies need to be pursued, such as the rationalization of the number of Evaluation Reference Group members; the organization of multi-stakeholder review workshops; or the establishment of cascade review systems to avoid Evaluation Managers receiving an excessive number of comments.

To ease the report review process, some practical hints for the Evaluation Manager are provided in Box 22.

Box 22: Suggestions to ease the report review process

- Establish in advance a circulation list (in addition to Evaluation Reference Group members) in collaboration with the evaluation team and RB focal points and discuss the modalities and timing to elicit stakeholder comments.
- 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.
- Provide clear guidance on how stakeholders should share their comments and let people know that their comments will be consolidated in a matrix of comments, responded to and circulated back to all reviewers to encourage considered feedback.
- Provide guidance to reviewers so that their comments focus on the accuracy of information presented. See below for some examples:
  - Is the data accurate? If not, please provide additional materials for consideration.
  - Are the findings consistent with the data presented?
  - Do the conclusions logically follow the findings?
  - Are the recommendations feasible and follow logically from the findings and conclusions?
  - Are there significant gaps in the data presented?
  - Is the data presented in a clear, unbiased and objective manner?

The Evaluation Manager should consolidate all comments into a comment’s matrix using the template provided, sorted into groups, according to the section of the report that they relate to. If there are contradictions between several comments, the Evaluation Manager should discuss how these should be addressed with the evaluation team. If any of the comments appear ambiguous, the Evaluation Manager should seek clarification from the reviewer first before sharing them with the evaluation team leader.

Time invested at this stage helps improve the quality of the draft evaluation report, making for a more efficient reporting process. A dialogue between the Evaluation Manager and the evaluation team is required to:

- Enhance mutual understanding of the feedback received from Evaluation Reference Group members.
- Provide clarification on specific areas when requested.
- Discuss the main areas of findings, conclusions and recommendations as they are developed.

The evaluation team must consider comments received but has the discretion to accept or reject management comments and any requests for changes. Where there is pressure to alter conclusions or
recommendations, while still consistent with findings, such requests should be judged on their merits. Should any differences arise, which cannot be resolved through discussions between the Evaluation Manager and team leader, the Evaluation Reference Group should be asked to intervene, and contact the OEV DE help desk as appropriate. In case of diverging views within the evaluation team, the Evaluation Manager should consult the Regional Evaluation Officer and OEV for advice.

**STEP 5.4 FINALIZE AND APPROVE THE EVALUATION REPORT**

A completed comments matrix helps ensure a transparent and credible process. It is important that the evaluation team leader acts on stakeholders’ comments to correct factual errors, avoid misrepresentation and provide additional information as the evaluation report is finalized. The evaluation team should exercise judgement as to which comments merit follow-up. For any comments not addressed, the team should provide adequate rationale. This supports transparency and credibility in analysis.

To ensure standardization and compliance with the corporate communications policy, the formatting guidelines should be followed when finalizing the evaluation report.

If the Evaluation Manager finds that some of the comments have not been duly considered, the evaluation team should be asked to address the comments and resubmit the final report and comments matrix. Any disagreement between WFP, evaluation stakeholders and the evaluation team should be addressed and resolved before the evaluation report is considered finalized. The Evaluation Manager can consult the Regional Evaluation Officer or OEV for advice.

**Table 12: Process map for evaluation report finalization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Evaluation Team Leader**  | • Records in the comment’s matrix how each comment from the Evaluation Reference Group has been addressed and, for those that have not been addressed, the reasoning. The completed comments help ensure a transparent and credible process.  
• Revises the evaluation report accordingly and submits the final evaluation report and the completed matrix of comments to the Evaluation Manager. |
| **Evaluation Manager**      | • Reviews the final evaluation report and the comments matrix with the evaluation team’s feedback.  
• Submits the final evaluation report to the Evaluation Committee for final review and approval by the Evaluation Committee Chair. |
| **Evaluation Committee Chair** | • Approves the final evaluation report.                              |
| **Evaluation Manager**      | • Shares the approved evaluation report with the Regional Evaluation Officer and ensures the final report is proactively shared with the Evaluation Reference Group and all evaluation stakeholders.  
• Processes payments as per contractual terms and contract management procedure. |
| **Regional Evaluation Officer** | • Shares the final evaluation report with the Office of Evaluation for publication on WFP’s internal and external evaluation websites. |

For joint evaluations, coordination of feedback to draft evaluation deliverables risks becoming very complex. For controversial issues, bilateral preparatory meetings with key decision makers among the participating agencies should take place in advance of the formal consultation. Both the Evaluation Manager and CO management have a role to play in ensuring that the concerns of the commissioning agencies have been taken into consideration while not undermining the impartiality of the evaluation. Ample time to review the final report should be allowed, requesting comments on a ‘non-objection’ basis (no response = agree) so that the process is not halted for an unnecessarily long period of time. To avoid an unexpected buy-out of one or more of the commissioning agencies at evaluation dissemination and follow-up stages, it is important to ensure that written approval of the evaluation report is provided by all members of the evaluation steering group, circulating a PDF file that cannot easily be modified.
Phase 6: Dissemination and Follow-up

INTRODUCTION

This section provides an overview of the final steps in the evaluation process. The dissemination and follow-up phase aims to maximize the use of the evaluation findings by:

- Developing a management response to the evaluation recommendations.
- Disseminating the evaluation report and WFP management response to a wide audience; this may include the development of learning products tailored to specific audiences (as per the communication and knowledge management plan).
- Submitting the evaluation report for post hoc evaluation quality assessment (PHQA).
- Identify opportunities/entry points for promoting the uptake of evaluation recommendations.

Table 13: Summary of responsibilities – dissemination and follow-up phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps and 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 &amp; upload in R2 system</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Publish evaluation report and WFP management response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Hold end of evaluation lessons learned debriefing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Submit the evaluation report for post hoc quality assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Disseminate and use evaluation results</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>6.6 Track implementation of follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations in R2 System</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L (CO R2 focal point)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The dissemination 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, strategies and policies. Timeframes for this phase will vary, but around four weeks should be planned for.
Box 23: Principles of independence and utility

The principles of independence, impartiality, credibility and utility, as well as ethics, have a number of specific implications at the dissemination and follow up phase as follows:

- **Independence**: All final evaluation reports, management response and post hoc quality assessment results are published on WFP websites and disseminated through various channels.

- **Utility**: A management response is prepared for all evaluations detailing how the evaluation recommendations will be addressed. The implementation of follow-up actions is monitored. Opportunities for wider organizational learning are pursued including incorporating key discussions on evaluation results in key workshops and programme, strategy or policy-making processes.

### STEP 6.1 PREPARE MANAGEMENT RESPONSE AND UPLOAD IN R2 SYSTEM

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. To enhance accountability and learning, the evaluation recommendations and corresponding management response should be recorded in WFP’s R2 system (WFP corporate system for management responses), and the responsible office then tracks and updates the implementation status of recommendation accordingly.

For joint evaluations, a joint management response to evaluation recommendations should be issued, ideally complemented by agency-specific recommendations. Agreed follow-up actions should be agency-specific to ensure adequate commitment for their implementation.

#### Table 14: Process map for the preparation of management response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Evaluation Committee Chair** |  - Leads preparation of a management response to the evaluation, with the support of the Evaluation Manager, using the [Template for Management Response](#).  
  - Decides whether to agree, partially agree or not agree with the recommendations.  
  - 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, who must be involved in the preparation of any follow-up actions. If a recommendation is targeted to the RB or a headquarters division, inputs from the offices concerned should be sought.  
  - Approves the management response. |
| **Evaluation Manager** |  - Submits the approved management response to the RB. |
| **Regional Evaluation Officer** |  - Reviews the management response jointly with the Regional Senior Programme Adviser and in consultation with other relevant Regional Advisers to check that: (i) all recommendations are adequately reflected in the management response; (ii) justifications provided for partially accepting or rejecting a recommendation are relevant and adequate; and (iii) the proposed follow-up actions adequately address each recommendation (and sub-recommendations if any). This review process may involve further discussion with CO management.  
  - Seeks the endorsement of the final management response by RB management (Regional Director or Deputy Regional Director).  
  - Proposes that strategic issues related to the management response that are of relevance to other COs are placed on the agenda of the Regional Evaluation Committee or other regional meetings. |
Regional Monitoring Adviser
- Ensures that the approved management response is entered into R2.

Evaluation Committee Chair
- Nominates a CO staff member responsible for tracking the implementation of follow-up actions to the evaluation recommendations (it should be the CO R2 focal point).
- Oversees implementation of agreed follow-up actions for this and other evaluations/management responses and approves actions for closure in R2 based on implementation updates and evidence provided by the nominated staff.

**STEP 6.2 PUBLISH EVALUATION REPORT AND WFP MANAGEMENT RESPONSE**

The Evaluation Manager is responsible for sharing the final evaluation report, management response and other learning products with the Regional Evaluation Officer for publication on WFP’s internal and external websites; and for posting the report on the [WFP Evaluation Community](#).

When sharing the evaluation report for publication, the report should be accompanied by an evaluation “blurb” to introduce and describe the evaluation product on the website. This helps to generate interest and facilitate the visibility and announcement of the publication.

**Box 24: Evaluation blurb template**

This decentralized evaluation was commissioned by the [Country Office](#) and covers the ‘topic’ and ‘evaluation period’ (year-year). It was carried out in ‘year’. The evaluation was commissioned to (e.g. fill an evidence gap, inform the scaling up of a pilot, inform the design of the Country Strategic Plan, etc.) and was intended for both accountability and learning purposes. It focused on assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coherence and connectedness of the X (edit as required selecting only the relevant evaluation criteria). Overarching evaluation questions focused on xxxx (insert main top-level overarching questions). The evaluation covered the following activities (or themes depending on the evaluation type): a) School Feeding; b) Nutrition; c) Food Assistance for Assets; d) Food and nutrition security analysis & diagnostic; and e) Capacity strengthening. Key evaluation findings included (add maximum five bullet points). Key recommendations from the evaluation included (add maximum five bullet points).

**STEP 6.3 HOLD END OF EVALUATION LESSONS LEARNED DEBRIEFING**

End of evaluation lessons learned debriefing sessions are an opportunity to jointly reflect and discuss the completed evaluation, along with identifying and documenting key lessons on the process. These sessions are also intended to inform the commissioning of future evaluations, adjustments to the DEQAS guidance and WFP’s support mechanisms for DEs.

OEV has developed a set of guiding questions to facilitate the discussion. These are available through the Regional Evaluation Officer and should be shared with participants ahead of the debriefing.

The debriefing should be scheduled once the management response is approved and participants should include the Evaluation Manager, the Chair of the Evaluation Committee, the Regional Evaluation Officer and OEV. The Regional Evaluation Officer is responsible for scheduling the debriefing and circulating the note for record to participants.

**STEP 6.4 SUBMIT EVALUATION REPORT FOR POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

In line with the WFP Evaluation Policy’s provisions of independence and impartiality, OEV ensures independent post hoc quality assessment of all centralized and decentralized evaluations, contributing to enhancing the quality and credibility of WFP evaluations and strengthening organizational accountability and transparency.

Independent assessors rate the quality of completed evaluation reports against DEQAS quality standards, including the requirements for evaluation set by the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan on Gender
Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP). As such, the post hoc quality assessment should not be regarded as a quality assurance mechanism, because it comes at the end of the evaluation process and does not contribute to the improvement in quality of draft evaluation reports.

Box 25: Post hoc quality assessment criteria

The post hoc quality assessment is designed to assess the extent to which WFP evaluation reports are based upon appropriate evaluation methods; present a sound analysis and credible findings; and provide valid conclusions and useful recommendations. Quality is assessed against eight criteria, with gender, equity and inclusion elements being mainstreamed throughout:

1. Report summary
2. Context and overview of the evaluation subject
3. Rationale, objectives and scope
4. Methodology
5. Findings
6. Conclusions and lessons learned
7. Recommendations
8. Accessibility and clarity.

Each criterion is associated with a score reflecting its relative importance regarding the production of a good report. The post hoc quality assessment tool also automatically provides a score for the report’s integration of gender, as per the standards outlined in the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator (UN-SWAP EPI).

Table 15: Process map for the post hoc quality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Evaluation Officer</th>
<th>OEV</th>
<th>Evaluation Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Shares the final word version of the inception and evaluation report with OEV. | • Submits the final evaluation report for post hoc quality assessment.  
• Shares the draft post hoc quality assessment results with the Regional Evaluation Officer for feedback.  
• Shares the final post hoc quality assessment results with the commissioning office, publishes them on WFP’s internal and external evaluation websites, and consolidates all post hoc quality assessment results in the Annual Evaluation Report.  
• On receipt of the post hoc quality assessment results, shares final evaluation reports with UNEG and ALNAP (unless the report was rated as unsatisfactory). | • Shares the summary results of the quality assessment with the evaluation team who performed the evaluation. |

STEP 6.5 DISSEMINATE AND USE EVALUATION RESULTS

It is important that evaluation reports are accessible to a wide audience, as foreseen in the Evaluation Policy, to ensure the credibility of WFP through transparent reporting and the usefulness of evaluations.

The Communication and Knowledge Management Plan 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, an evaluation brief, a video etc.), to whom, how, when and why. Systematically planning for the dissemination of the evaluation results is the best way to ensure evaluations go beyond a mere internal exercise. 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 should be 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, including all donors that contributed to the intervention being evaluated, and with other colleagues in CO, RB and headquarters to inform similar interventions, in other places.

To maximize the use of the evaluation findings, different products should be developed for different groups of users depending on their information needs. The Evaluation Manager should consider and use audience-appropriate means for sharing the evaluation results so that stakeholders understand and participate in plans to act on recommendations. For example, language, internet accessibility and connectivity issues need to be explored when matching the type of product to the audience. Evaluation dissemination should specifically consider GEWE dimensions. A GEWE-responsive dissemination strategy might include: (i) dissemination of evaluation findings on GEWE to diverse groups of stakeholders who have an interest in, and are affected by, GEWE issues; and (ii) promoting the fullest possible use of GEWE issues of the evaluations within the United Nations system, NGO partners and the government ministries among stakeholders. Alternative ways to present GEWE-responsive evaluation findings to women and individuals/groups who are marginalized should be considered.

Box 26 highlights effective ways to disseminate evaluation evidence and results, and best practices on enhancing the use of evaluation.

**Box 26: 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 Knowledge Management Plan.
- Hold workshops in the country – interactive events are more likely to be effective in disseminating 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 headquarters levels.
- Identify creative methods to further disseminate the evaluation findings and stimulate discussions including with the affected population, e.g. evaluation briefs/pamphlets/posters/PowerPoint/drawings/illustrations/presentations which summarize key evaluation information.
- Making use of audio-visual technology to produce videos and radio clips, short movies, songs, computer animation, community consultation etc. is encouraged. These methods may be particularly useful in reaching stakeholders with low literacy levels. Innovative formats such as graphic novels, cartoons or live storytelling may also be an effective way of disseminating results.

**See as examples the following videos:**

- [WFP mid-term decentralized evaluation of school feeding in Bangladesh](#)
- [WFP thematic decentralized evaluation on gender in El Salvador](#)
- [The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations in the Philippines, South Sudan and Central African Republic](#)
- [WFP mid-term decentralized evaluation of the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation 200708 in Colombia](#)
- [WFP decentralized evaluation of the Cash-based transfer modality in school feeding activities in Senegal](#)
• Ask partner organizations 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 (including the ALNAP evaluation evidence map, Evalmapper).

• Use evaluation evidence in the design of new Country Strategic Plans/Interim Country Strategic Plans and revisions.

**STEP 6.6 TRACK IMPLEMENTATION OF FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS TO THE EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS IN R2 SYSTEM**

Implementation of the follow-up actions related to the evaluation recommendations is reviewed by the CO R2 focal point, who also uploads updates in the R2 system.

The Regional Monitoring Adviser should coordinate the follow-up tracking process of agreed actions in R2 at least twice a year (in June and December) and recommend the closure of recommendations to the Deputy Regional Director on closure of related actions. When required, he/she also reports to RB management and the Performance Management and Reporting Division on the status of recommendations and follow-up actions and uses information from R2 as inputs for the mid and end-of-year RB performance planning and reviews. To enhance learning, analysis of the actions taken to implement evaluation recommendations as reported in R2 are also conducted by the Regional Monitoring Adviser in collaboration with Regional Evaluation Unit and shared with RB programme staff.

To ensure optimal use of joint evaluations, it is important to make sure that the commissioning agencies define the responsibilities and frequency for tracking the follow-up actions related to the evaluation recommendations. This will complement the regular tracking procedures on WFP-assigned follow-up actions within the organization.
## List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>Contingency Evaluation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Country Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCD</td>
<td>Deputy Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEQS</td>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation Outsourced Quality Support Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQAS</td>
<td>Evaluation Quality Assurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEWE</td>
<td>Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSP</td>
<td>Interim Country Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Long-Term Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Office of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Performance Assessment and Competency Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQA</td>
<td>Post-Hoc Evaluation Quality Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Regional Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDY</td>
<td>Temporary Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-SWAP</td>
<td>United Nations System-Wide Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>