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**Maintaining stable formatting in Microsoft Word can be challenging, especially in long or complex documents. However, here are some best practices to help ensure formatting stability:**

**Use MS Word Styles function**: Styles are a collection of formatting settings that can be applied to text or paragraphs. They help maintain consistency and efficiency in formatting documents by allowing you to apply predefined sets of formatting attributes quickly and easily. Utilize Word's built-in styles for consistent formatting throughout the document. Apply styles such as Numbered Paragaph, Heading 1, Heading 2, Normal, etc., instead of manually formatting text. This helps maintain consistency and makes it easier to update formatting globally if needed. Switch back to Normal or to Bullet list style, if you want to insert paragraphs that are not numbered or bullet lists. Remember you can also create new styles as needed.

**Avoid direct formatting**: Minimize the use of direct formatting for individual instances (e.g., bolding, italicizing, changing font size manually from the ‘Paragraph’ options) as much as possible. Instead, rely on styles to apply formatting consistently. When users apply formatting changes directly to text instead of using styles, it can lead to inconsistency and instability. Direct formatting overrides the underlying style settings and can cause unexpected changes or conflicts when editing the document. Remember that WFP style guide recommends ‘not using italic or bold fonts in text to denote emphasis, which should be reflected in the phrasing.’

**Update styles**: If you need to modify the formatting of a particular style, update the style definition rather than manually changing individual instances. This ensures that all text formatted with that style is updated automatically.

**Clean formatting before pasting from external sources**: When copying text from external sources (e.g., websites, PDFs), paste it into Notepad or another plain text editor first to remove any hidden formatting. Then, paste it into Word and apply the appropriate styles. If you paste directly into Word, instead of using the standard paste (CTRL+V), use the ‘Paste special’ option. Right-click and select the Paste option: ‘Keep text only’ and re-apply the style as needed.

**Avoid floating boxes:** Minimize the use of boxes. Instead of creating small floating boxes for sidebars or side content, opt for full-page sized boxes. Select the following option for the layout: ‘In line with text’. This layout ensures that the box remains integrated with the flow of the document. Instead of relying on text boxes, you can also use one-column tables to achieve a similar effect. One-column tables can serve as containers while maintaining a stable position.

**Use ‘Insert captions’ to number figures, tables and boxes**. The "Insert Captions" function in MS Word allows you to easily add captions to figures, tables, equations, and other objects within your document while ensuring their numbering stays updated.

**Check compatibility**: Be mindful of compatibility issues when sharing documents with others who may be using different versions of Word or other word processing software. Save the document in a compatible format (e.g., .docx) and consider using the "Compatibility Mode" if necessary.

**This template applies to all decentralized evaluations (DEs)**

**Who is this template for?** This template should be used by staff managing a DE during the preparation phase.

**What is the purpose of this template?** This template provides a suggested structure and guidance on content for developing the terms of reference (ToR).

**How should this template be used?** This template is used alongside the [Quality Checklist for the ToR](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/c0bf4f75d09842b9a4ae2e1715006616/download/) to help ensure that all the elements of the ToR are adequately addressed. The ToR needs to be tailored to the specific scope and objectives of each evaluation. Hence, before starting drafting the ToR, the evaluation manager should consult with key stakeholders within and outside WFP on the following points:

* What is the main purpose of the evaluation?
* What are its main objectives (balance between accountability and learning)?
* Which key questions do different stakeholders want answered?
* Whose needs and interests will the evaluation serve?
* How will the evaluation be used? By whom and when?

**How is this template structured?**

* Guidance is provided in each section, bolded and in brackets [ ]. This should be removed once the draft ToR is completed.
* Text in standard format is suggested content for the ToR, which can be edited as appropriate.
* Text in [square brackets] indicates that this part should be completed by the user.
* Reference to various elements of the guidance is underlined.

**Other key materials?** Additional relevant guidance is available at the following links:

* The [Process Guide for Decentralized Evaluations](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002653/download/), which sets out the phases of a DE and how to implement each one
* Relevant Technical Notes, notably:
* [TN on evaluation principles, norms and standards](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003179/download/)
* [TN on decentralized evaluation types](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000121995/download/)
* [TN on options for contracting evaluation teams](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/007b64aed65e42b68d970d6c817dc3e4/download/) in Decentralized Evaluations

* [TN on evaluation approaches, methods and tools](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000123978/download/)
* [TN on stakeholder analysis](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002694/download/)
* [TN on evaluation criteria and questions](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002694/download/)
* [TN on gender](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002691/download/); [gender quality checklist](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023366/download/) and [quick guide](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023365/download/)
* [TN on evaluation committee](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003174/download/)
* [TN on evaluation reference group](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003175/download/)
* [TN on planning and conducting evaluations during COVID-19](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000115094/download/)
* [TN on joint evaluations](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002695/download/)
* [Communication and knowledge management plan](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002692/download/)
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# Introduction

1. Use the ‘Numbered Paragraph’ style from the MS Word Styles if you want to keep the paragraphs numbered throughout.
2. If you want to insert bullet lists, consider using the MS Word Style ‘Bullet level 1’ or going back to the ‘Normal’ style. Do not create bullet lists or a new numbered list when you are typing with the ‘Numbered paragraph’ style.
* Bullet list
* Bullet list
* Bullet list
1. These terms of reference (ToR) were prepared by the [WFP commissioning team/office] based upon an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders. The purpose of these terms of reference is to provide key information to stakeholders about the evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and to specify expectations during the various phases of the evaluation.

**[Provide a brief description of the evaluation (i.e., type of subject, period of implementation, geographical coverage, activities, target group)]**

1. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

# Reasons for the evaluation

## Rationale

1. The evaluation is being commissioned for the following reasons: [describe the reasons why the evaluation is being commissioned and needed at this time.]
2. The evaluation will have the following uses for the [WFP commissioning office and other key stakeholders]

**[Include a brief statement on the expected use/utility of the evaluation, such as informing the design of a new intervention, the scale up of or adjustment to an ongoing intervention, other specific decision-making processes, etc]**

## Objectives

1. Evaluations serve the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning. [If the weight is more on accountability or learning or if one of the two objectives is not included, nuance the standard text, providing a clear explanation.].
* **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the [evaluation subject].
* **Learning** – The evaluation will assess whether implementation unfolded as was planned, explore reasons why intended results occurred or did not occur and whether there were any unintended results (positive or negative). The evaluation will draw lessons, derive good practices and provide pointers for learning. It will also provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. Findings will be actively disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson-sharing systems.
1. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

## Key stakeholders

**[Specify for whom the evaluation is being done and who are the intended users of the evaluation based on the evaluation objectives and rationale. Include:**

* **Who are the main internal and external primary stakeholders i.e., those with they have a direct interest/influence/involvement in the intervention**
* **Who are the main internal and external secondary stakeholders i.e., those with indirect involvement/interest/influence in the intervention**
* **What are the stakeholders’ interest, role and relative power to influence the evaluation process and results**
* **How and when the stakeholders should be involved in the evaluation.**

**Also, indicate whether and how beneficiaries’ perspectives will be included in the evaluation process and disaggregated in a way that reflects diversity. Consider the differences within target groups (like age, gender, disabilities).]**

1. The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a broad range of WFP internal and external stakeholders. A number of stakeholders will play a role in the evaluation process in light of their role in the design and implementation of the [subject of evaluation], their interest in the results of the evaluation and relative power to influence the design, funding and implementation of the programme being evaluated. Table 1 provides a preliminary stakeholder analysis, which should be deepened by the evaluation team as part of the inception phase.
2. Accountability to affected populations, is tied to WFP commitments to include beneficiaries as key stakeholders in WFP work. WFP is committed to ensuring gender equality, equity and inclusion in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups (including persons with disabilities, the elderly and persons with other diversities such as ethnic and linguistic).

Table 1: Preliminary stakeholder analysis

(Add/delete rows as appropriate and revise the categorization as key informant/primary/secondary stakeholders as needed)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholders** | **Interest and involvement in the evaluation**  |
| **Internal (WFP) stakeholders**  |
| **WFP country office (CO) in [location]** | **Key informant and primary stakeholder** - Responsible for the planning and implementation of WFP interventions at country level. The country office has an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries and partners for performance and results of its programmes. The country office will be involved in using evaluation findings for programme implementation and/or in deciding on the next programme and partnerships. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable]. |
| **WFP field offices in [locations]** | **Key informant and primary stakeholder** - Responsible for day-to-day programme implementation. The field offices liaise with stakeholders at decentralized levels and has direct beneficiary contact. It will be affected by the outcome of the evaluation. |
| **Regional bureau (RB) for [location]** | **Key informant and primary stakeholder** - Responsible for both oversight of country offices and technical guidance and support, the regional bureau has an interest in an independent/impartial account of operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings the extent to which the subject is contributing to overall regional priorities and where applicable to apply this learning to other country offices. The regional bureau will be involved in the planning of the next programme, thus it is expected to use the evaluation findings to provide strategic guidance, programme support, and oversight. The regional evaluation team support country office/regional bureau to ensure quality, credible and useful DEs. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable]. |
| **WFP HQ divisions** | **Key informant and primary stakeholder** - WFP headquarters divisions are responsible for issuing and overseeing the rollout of normative guidance on corporate programme themes, activities and modalities, as well as of overarching corporate policies and strategies. They also have an interest in the lessons that emerge from evaluations, as many may have relevance beyond the geographical area of focus. Relevant headquarters units should be consulted from the planning phase to ensure that key policy, strategic and programmatic considerations are understood from the onset of the evaluation. They may use the evaluation for wider organizational learning accountability as well as advocacy. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable]  |
| **WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV)** | **Primary stakeholder** – OEV has a stake in ensuring that DEs deliver quality, credible and useful evaluations respecting provisions for impartiality as well as roles and accountabilities of various DE stakeholders as identified in the evaluation policy. It may use the evaluation findings, as appropriate, to feed into centralized evaluations, evaluation syntheses or other learning products. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable]. |
| **WFP Executive Board (EB)** | **Primary stakeholder** – the Executive Board provides final oversight of WFP programmes and guidance to programmes. The WFP governing body has an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of WFP programmes. This evaluation will not be presented to the Executive Board, but its findings may feed into thematic and/or regional syntheses and corporate learning processes. It will contribute to evaluation coverage of WFP work which is reported to the EB through the annual evaluation report [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable]. |
| **External stakeholders**  |
| **Beneficiaries** [where appropriate disaggregate them by target group] | **Key informants and [primary/secondary] stakeholders -** As the ultimate recipients of food assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable]. |
| **Government** [if applicable, disaggregate it by central/local level /ministry] | **Key informants and [primary/Secondary] stakeholder** - The Government has a direct interest in knowing whether WFP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonized with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. Issues related to capacity development, handover and sustainability will be of particular interest. [If relevant, various ministries are partners in the design and implementation of WFP activities]. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as applicable, for example if the subject of evaluation was designed and/or implemented jointly with some government institutions, such institutions will have a direct interest]. |
| **United Nations country team (UNCT)** [List specific agencies, as relevant] | **[Primary/Secondary] stakeholder** - The harmonized action of the UNCT should contribute to the realization of the government developmental objectives. It has therefore an interest in ensuring that WFP programmes are effective in contributing to the United Nations concerted efforts. Various agencies are also direct partners of WFP at policy and activity level. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as relevant, for example if the subject of evaluation was designed and/or implemented jointly with some United Nations agencies, such agencies will have a direct interest]. |
| **Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)** [List specific NGOs, if relevant] | **Key informants and [primary/secondary] stakeholder** - NGOs are WFP partners for the implementation of some activities while at the same time having their own interventions. The results of the evaluation might affect future implementation modalities, strategic orientations and partnerships. They will be involved in using evaluation findings for programme implementation. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as relevant]. |
| **Donors** [List specific donors] | **Primary/secondary stakeholders** - WFP interventions are voluntarily funded by a number of donors. They have an interest in knowing whether their funds have been spent efficiently and if WFP work has been effective and contributed to their own strategies and programmes. [Add additional interest in the evaluation as relevant]. |
| [Add as relevant, e.g. private sector] |  |

# Context and subject of the evaluation

## Context

**[Provide a brief overview of the context with focused and concise information to understand the context within which the subject of the evaluation was designed and implemented, data included should be relevant to the subject, up to date and contextualised, not simply listed; where possible trend data should be used. This section should include:**

* **Poverty and food and nutrition security in relation to the subject of the evaluation.**
* **Key data and trends related to relevant SDGs in the context (region, country subnational/local level).**
* **Government policies, priorities and institutional capacities in relation to the subject of the evaluation, including whether they are conducive to the advancement of human rights and gender equality and equity.**
* **Humanitarian issues [if relevant] as they relate to food security and the subject of the evaluation, including for example, migration patterns and host community/social tensions and social protection programmes.**
* **Gender equality and empowerment of women, equity and wider inclusion dimensions of the context and related to the programmatic area of the intervention. Include gender-based differences in poverty, food security and nutrition, structural gender barriers/dynamics and specific vulnerabilities as they relate to the subject under evaluation. Include relevant information on the country context and whether the normative instruments (gender architecture, national policies and programmes) are conducive to the advancement of human rights, gender equality and equity**
* **Any relevant Key external events that led to significant changes in WFP work**
* **Features of international assistance from other actors in the area: long-standing donors/agencies in the country, level of resources, humanitarian and development assistance etc.**
* **Other relevant WFP work in the area. ]**
1. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

## Subject of the evaluation

**[Use WFP country strategic plan, country portfolio budget/budget revisions, logical framework, Line of sight and/or theory of change and resourcing updates to provide sufficient information to understand the nature of the evaluation subject, including:**

* **Type of intervention/programme (the evaluation subject)**
* **Geographic scope of the evaluation subject [insert and refer to map in Annex X]**
* **Relevant dates: approval date; start date; expected end date of the evaluation subject. If evaluation spans across more than one activity, with different implementation periods, indicate start/end dates for all activities covered**
* **Planned outputs (e.g. for an activity, planned and revised percentage of beneficiaries by activity/component disaggregated by sex and age; amount of transfers (food, cash, vouchers) by activity/component if applicable)**
* **Planned outcomes as per the design of the intervention**
* **Key activities, including what is provided to whom and why**
* **Main partners (government; NGO; bilateral; multilateral)**
* **Resources: budget (approved and funded for the subject of the evaluation for the subject being evaluated by year), percent funded of total requirements; If subject is a joint programme or is funded from pooled funds, show resource allocated by agency if information is available**
* **Other relevant preceding/concurrent activities/interventions**
* **Amendments to initial design (i.e. extension in time, programme increase, technical adjustments etc)**
* **The logical framework, theory of change or similar tool (or its reconstruction) that explains the design of the subject of evaluation. If not available and not reconstructed, this should be an expected deliverable by the evaluation team during the inception phase**
* **Relevant conclusions/recommendations from past monitoring, evaluations and review reports that are relevant to this evaluation. If there was no past evaluation, the ToR should say so**
* **Describe the gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEWE), equity and wider inclusion dimensions relevant to the subject of the evaluation and context. State whether a GEWE analysis has been undertaken (either as a standard alone exercise or as part of CSP formulation or programme design) to inform the programme and the extent to which it has been integrated in the design. If no gender analysis was carried out, acknowledge this fact.]**
1. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

# Evaluation scope, criteria and questions

**[Describe the scope/parameters of the evaluation focusing on what the evaluation will and will not cover. Ensure scope is realistic given the time and resources available for implementing the evaluation, and justify any elements excluded. This should include:**

* **Temporal coverage /time frame: start and cut off dates of the period under evaluation**
* **Geographic coverage**
* **Components e.g. whether all or part of an activity or thematic area; whether the whole of a pilot project or transfer modality**
* **Specific target groups (including women and girls) that will be included or excluded from the evaluation. Ensure that gender and equity/inclusion dimensions are integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis. This will require a certain degree of disaggregation in the way data will be collected and analysed.**

**List the main evaluation questions that will be answered o address each of the objective of the evaluation – accountability and learning, avoiding a long list of questions. Questions should be clear and be relevant to the subject, purpose and intended use of the evaluation. They should be adequate and realistic in view of the time and resource available. It is important that they balance adequately comprehensiveness and depth and cover unintended results. For each evaluation subquestion, identify the international evaluation criteria that it addresses, consistent with the subject, purpose and objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation does not need to cover all the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. If the evaluation is in a humanitarian context, consider including questions that address appropriateness, coverage and connectedness criteria. Gender can be included as a stand-alone criterion or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria.**

**Gender equality and women’s empowerment should be mainstreamed throughout the evaluation questions and sub-questions with consideration of how the perspectives of men, women, boys and girls will be sought in the evaluation process. Data requires disaggregation by gender. Similarly, equity and wider inclusion dimensions should be considered.]**

1. To address the learning objective, the evaluation will answer the following main questions:
* List the main learning questions
1. To address the accountability objective, the evaluation will address the following key questions,
* List the main accountability questions
1. The evaluation will apply the international evaluation criteria of [use the guidance provided in the technical note on evaluation criteria and questions to select the appropriate criteria]. The evaluation will not cover [list the criteria omitted] because [Briefly justify the selection of the criteria and explain why some might be disregarded].
2. The evaluation should analyse how gender, equity and wider inclusion objectives and GEWE mainstreaming principles were included in the intervention design, and whether the evaluation subject has been guided by WFP and system-wide objectives on GEWE. The gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions should be integrated into all evaluation criteria as appropriate. [Briefly explain whether and how gender, equity and wider inclusion are mainstreamed across the criteria or include a specific criterion for it].
3. The questions are summarised in Table 1 and will be further developed and tailored by the evaluation team in a detailed evaluation matrix during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim at highlighting the key lessons (learning) and performance of the [subject of evaluation] (accountability), with a view to informing future strategic and operational decisions.

Table 2: Evaluation questions and criteria

**[Adapt as needed]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation questions** | **Criteria [select among relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability / connectedness, coverage, coherence]** |
| **EQ1 –** [include learning or accountability question from the list above; ] |  |
| 1.1. | Add sub-question |  |
| 1.2 | Add sub-question |  |
| **EQ2 –** [include learning or accountability question from the list] above] |  |
| 2.1 | Add sub-question |  |
| 2.2. | Add sub-question |  |
| **EQ3 –** [include learning or accountability question from the list] above] |  |
| 3.1 | Add sub-question |  |
| 3.2 | Add sub-question |  |
| **EQ4 –** [include learning or accountability question from the list] above] |  |
| 3.1 | Add sub-question |  |
| 3.2 | Add sub-question |  |

# Methodological approach and ethical considerations

## Evaluation approach

**[Describe in broad terms the overall approach for the evaluation (experimental, quasi-experimental, developmental, theory-based etc)[[1]](#footnote-1). Based on this approach, the methodology will be further developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. If relevant, note that the analysis should be conducted against the international humanitarian principles.]**

1. The methodology will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:
* Employ the relevant evaluation criteria above
* Apply an evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints
* Ensure through the use of mixed methods that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholders groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used
* [Include any additional methodological requirements that may be applicable to this evaluation].
1. The methodology chosen should demonstrate attention to impartiality and reduction of bias by relying on mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative, participatory etc.) and different primary and secondary data sources that are systematically triangulated (documents from different sources; a range of stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries; direct observation in different locations; across evaluators; across methods etc.). It will take into account any challenges to data availability, validity or reliability, as well as any budget and timing constraints. The evaluation questions, lines of inquiry, indicators, data sources and data collection methods will be brought together in an evaluation matrix, which will form the basis of the sampling approach and data collection and analysis instruments (desk review, interview and observation guides, survey questionnaires etc.).
2. 10. The methodology should be sensitive in terms of GEWE, equity and inclusion, indicating how the perspectives and voices of diverse groups (men and women, boys, girls, the elderly, people living with disabilities and other marginalized groups) will be sought and considered. The methodology should ensure that primary data collected is disaggregated by sex and age; an explanation should be provided if this is not possible. [Further specify whether and how the evaluation methodology, sampling frame and data analysis will be gender-responsive depending on the subject of evaluation, and how it will fully address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention in particular the most vulnerable. See [TN on integrating gender in WFP evaluations](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002691/download/), [checklist](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023366/download/), and [quick guide.](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023365/download/)]
3. Looking for explicit consideration of gender and equity/inclusion in the data after fieldwork is too late; the evaluation team must have a clear and detailed plan for collecting data from women and men in gender and equity-sensitive ways before fieldwork begins.
4. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations must reflect gender and equity analysis as appropriate within the context of the subject of evaluation. The findings should include a discussion on intended and unintended effects of the intervention, including along gender equality and equity dimensions. The report should provide lessons/ challenges/recommendations for conducting gender and equity-responsive evaluations in the future.
5. The following mechanisms for independence and impartiality will be employed: the evaluation team will work independently in the design and implementation of the evaluation, final decisions on and approval of evaluation products will be made by the evaluation committee; and an evaluation reference group will review and provide feedback, in relation to data collection and the methodology [refer to the [TN on principles, norms and standards](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003179/download/)].
6. The following potential risks likely to affect proposed approach have been identified [list limitations such as lack of availability of key data, difficulties in accessing affected populations. Mitigation measures for the proposed approach should also be identified].
7. The evaluation team will expand on the methodology presented above and develop a detailed evaluation matrix in the inception report.

## Preliminary considerations on evaluability and methodological implications

**[Identify the main sources of information available to the evaluation team (e.g. annual country report (ACR), previous evaluations, monitoring data, surveys, etc.) and whether these are mainly qualitative or quantitative. Clarify which corporate and country office-specific indicators have been regularly monitored and what type of data has been collected for these. Also identify relevant non-WFP data sources e.g. government data, surveys, information from other United Nations agencies, cooperating partners etc.**

**Identify explicitly any issue in relation to data availability and/or reliability so that the evaluation team is aware of challenges to evaluability and can develop strategies to help mitigate these. Examples include:**

* **Lack of, limited or unreliable datasets (including baseline)**
* **Issues related to comparability of data sets**
* **Data only available in local languages**
* **Availability and quality of gender-disaggregated data, including data related to gender-specific outcomes**
* **High staff turnover meaning limited institutional memory.**

**Assess clarity of the frame of reference against which to evaluate and asses the usability of the subject of the evaluation’s theory of chance or logic model or logical framework (if available). Assess availability of:**

* **Relevant and quantifiable indicators**
* **Measurable objectives**
* **Clear targets**
* **Output and outcome data (monitoring) and any reviews**
* **Documentation of assumptions made and testing of these over time.**

**Check whether the sampling and data collection tools and methods used to generate existing datasets were gender and equity-sensitive. Can they bring the different perspectives from women, girls, men and boys, people with disabilities and other marginalized groups?**

**Indicate the implications that the limitation to evaluability has on the evaluation and how the evaluation will address these limitations.]**

1. Main source of data for evaluation will be [note the sources]
2. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will be expected to critically assess data availability, quality and gaps expanding on the information provided above. This assessment will inform the data collection and the choice of evaluation methods. The evaluation team will need to systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data during the reporting phase.

## Ethical considerations

1. The evaluation must conform to [UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation](https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Guidelines/UNEG_Ethical_Guidelines_for_Evaluation_2020.pdf) (Integrity, Accountability, Respect, Beneficence[[2]](#footnote-2) ). Accordingly, the evaluation team is responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation process. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of stakeholders (the evaluators have the obligation to safeguard sensitive information that stakeholders do not want to disclose to others), ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of respondents, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups), ensuring appropriate and inclusive representation and treatment of the various stakeholder groups in the evaluation process (and that sufficient resources and time are allocated for it),and ensuring that the evaluation results do no harm to respondents or their communities.
2. The evaluation team will be responsible for managing any potential ethical risks and issues and must put in place, in consultation with the evaluation manager, processes and systems to identify, report and resolve any ethical issues that might arise during the implementation of the evaluation. Ethical approvals and reviews by relevant national and institutional review boards must be sought where required.
3. Should the evaluators uncover allegations of wrongdoing and misconduct in the implementation of a programme either by a WFP staff or a partner (including fraud, food diversions, misuse of WFP assets, harassment, sexual harassment, etc), the evaluation team should report those allegations to WFP Office of Inspection and Investigation (OIGI) through WFP hotline (<http://www.wfphotline.ethicspoint.com>)[[3]](#footnote-3). At the same time, commission office management and the REU should also be informed.
4. [Include here any other ethical issues that are anticipated or have already been identified, with a proposal on how they should be managed. If there is no specific issue, this fact should be indicated. Evaluators should be asked to reflect on these ethical issues and propose mitigating/safeguarding measures as part of their proposal].

22. The commissioning office has ensured that the evaluation team and evaluation manager will not have been and/or are not currently involved in the design, implementation or financial management of the WFP [topic being evaluated], have no vested interest, nor have any other potential or perceived conflicts of interest.

1. 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 (UNEG 2020 Guidelines). 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. A conflict of interest can also occur when, because of possibilities for future contracts, the evaluator's ability to provide an impartial analysis is compromised. Cases of upstream conflict of interest are those in which consultants could influence the analysis or recommendations so that they are consistent with findings previously stated by themselves. Cases of downstream conflict of interest are those in which evaluators could artificially create favourable conditions for consideration in future assignments (e.g. making recommendations for additional work with aim of being contracted to conduct that work). The potential for bias increases when an evaluator's work is solely focused on one agency. During the evaluation process, the evaluators are not allowed to have another contract with the evaluand/ unit subject to evaluation. To avoid conflicts of interest, particular care should be taken to ensure that independence and impartiality are maintained.
2. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the [2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866), including the Pledge of Ethical Conduct, the 2014 Guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the [WFP technical note on gender](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002691/download/). The evaluation team and individuals who participate directly in the evaluation at the time of issuance of the purchase order ( or individual contracts) are expected to sign a confidentiality agreement and a commitment to ethical conduct.[[4]](#footnote-4) These templates will be provided by the country office when signing the contract.

## Quality assurance

1. The WFP evaluation quality assurance system sets out processes with steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products based on a set of [Quality Assurance Checklists](http://newgo.wfp.org/documents/process-guide-for-decentralized-evaluations). The quality assurance will be systematically applied during this evaluation and relevant documents will be provided to the evaluation team. This includes checklists for feedback on quality for each of the evaluation products. The relevant checklist will be applied at each stage, to ensure the quality of the evaluation process and outputs.
2. The WFP Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (DEQAS) is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community and aims to ensure that the evaluation process and products conform to best practice. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views or independence of the evaluation team but ensures that the report provides credible evidence and analysis in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.
3. The WFP evaluation manager will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation progresses as per the [DEQAS Process Guide](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000002653/download/) and for conducting a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their finalization. There will be several rounds of reviews and feedback until draft deliverables are up to the expected quality.
4. To enhance the quality and credibility of DEs, an outsourced quality support (QS) service directly managed by the OEV reviews the draft ToR, the draft inception and evaluation reports, and provides a systematic assessment of their quality from an evaluation perspective, along with recommendations.
5. The evaluation manager will share the assessment and recommendations from the quality support service with the team leader, who will address the recommendations when finalizing the inception and evaluation reports. To ensure transparency and credibility of the process in line with the [UNEG norms and standards](https://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2601)[[5]](#footnote-5),a rationale should be provided for comments that the team does not take into account when finalizing the report.
6. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the data collection, synthesis, analysis and reporting phases.
7. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the directive on disclosure of information [WFP Directive CP2010/001 on information disclosure](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/08ed0919a7f64acc80cf58c93c04ad6d/download/).
8. [if a firm is contracted] WFP expects that all deliverables from the evaluation team are subject to a thorough quality assurance review by the evaluation firm in line with the WFP evaluation quality assurance system prior to submission of the deliverables to WFP. In case evaluators are contracted directly as individuals, the team leader is responsible for thorough QA before submission of drafts.
9. [Indicate any additional intended measures to assure the quality of the process and product at different stages of the evaluation process, and thus increase the credibility and impartiality of the evaluation].
10. All final evaluation reports will be subject to a post hoc quality assessment (PHQA) by an independent entity through a process that is managed by the Office of Evaluation. The overall PHQA results will be published on the WFP website alongside the evaluation report.

# Organization of the evaluation

## Phases and deliverables

**[Include an indicative time frame, including milestones/deadlines; and highlight deliverables for each stage. Ensure a reasonable amount of time is provided for each phase. See DEQAS Process Guide and Annex 2 for further details.]**

1. Table X presents the structure of the main phases of the evaluation, along with the deliverables and deadlines for each phase. Annex 2 presents a more detailed timeline.

Table 3 Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones

[It is recommended to first fill in the detailed timeline in Annex 2 which includes mimimum time required for each phase and than fill in the summary timeline below]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Main phases** | **Indicative timeline** | **Tasks and deliverables** | **Responsible** |
| 1. Preparation
 | [Add key dates] | Preparation of ToRFinal ToRSelection of the evaluation team & contractingLibrary of key documents  | Evaluation manager |
| 1. Inception
 |  | Document review/ briefingInception mission [in person or remote]Inception report[Add key tasks as needed] | [Identify responsible persons] |
| 1. Data collection
 |  | FieldworkExit debriefing  |  |
| 1. Reporting
 |  | Data analysis and report draftingComments processLearning workshop (if planned)Final evaluation report |  |
| 1. Dissemination and follow-up
 |  | Management response Dissemination of the evaluation report |  |

## Evaluation team composition

1. The evaluation team is expected to include [specify number or range] members, including the team leader, with a mix of national/regional and international evaluator(s) with relevant expertise. To the extent possible, the evaluation will be conducted by a gender, geographically, culturally and linguistically diverse and balanced team who can effectively cover the areas of evaluation. The evaluation team should have good knowledge of gender, equity, wider inclusion issues and, to the extent possible, power dynamics. It will have strong methodological competencies in designing feasible data collection and analysis as well as synthesis and reporting skills. At least one team member should have demonstrated recent experience with WFP evaluation. At least one team members should have relevant subject matter expertise.

Table 4: Summary of evaluation team and areas of expertise required

|  | Expertise required |
| --- | --- |
| Team Leadership (Senior level evaluator) | **MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS*** Excellent team management skills (coordination, planning, ability to resolve problems and deliver on time).
* Strong experience in leading evaluations at country level, such as evaluations of [add thematic area].
* Experience with applying the [state the approach proposed in section 5.1] including reconstruction, and use of theories of change in evaluations, if applicable
* Strong presentation skills and excellent writing and synthesis skills.
* Experience facilitating in-person and hybrid meetings and workshops.
* Experience in [humanitarian and/or development] contexts.
* Expertise in one or more of the technical areas below.

**DESIRABLE*** Familiarity with WFP programmes and modalities of intervention.
* Good knowledge of country context, proved by previous experience in the country.
* Previous experience leading or conducting WFP evaluation(s).
* Good knowledge of gender, equity, wider inclusion issues and, to the extent possible, power dynamics
 |
| Thematic expertise - Evaluator  | **MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS*** Fluency and excellent writing skills in [add language].
* Demonstrable analytical skills relevant to [name the topic/area of evaluation]
* Experience in [humanitarian and/or development] contexts.
* Prior experience in evaluating design, implementation, outputs, and outcomes in the following areas:
	+ [add thematic expertise required].
	+ [add thematic expertise required].
	+ [add thematic expertise required].

**DESIRABLE*** Familiarity with WFP programmes and modalities of intervention.
* Previous experience leading or conducting WFP evaluation(s).
* Good knowledge of country context, proved by previous experience in the country.
* Good knowledge of gender, equity, wider inclusion issues and, to the extent possible, power dynamics
* Administrative and logistical experience
 |
| Quality assurance Evaluator | **MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS*** Experience in quality assurance of evaluations.

**DESIRABLE*** Familiarity with WFP programmes and modalities of intervention.
* Previous experience with WFP evaluation(s).
 |

1. The team leader will have expertise in one of the key competencies listed above as well as demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations, including designing methodology and data collection tools. She/he will also have leadership, analytical and communication skills, including a track record of excellent [language] writing, synthesis and presentation skills. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i) defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team; and iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception report, the end of field work (i.e. exit) debriefing presentation and evaluation report in line with DEQAS.
2. Team members will: i) contribute to the methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; and iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s).

39. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and in close communication with [the WFP evaluation manager]. The team will be hired following agreement with WFP on its composition.

## Roles and responsibilities

**[Describe the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders in the evaluation (amending standard text as needed), and reporting mechanisms including who is responsible for managing the evaluation throughout and signing off on the evaluation products. Indicate how stakeholders will provide feedback on draft reports and how this feedback will be presented to the evaluation team.]**

1. The [name of WFP commissioning office] **management (**Director or Deputy Director) will take responsibility to:
* Assign an evaluation manager for the evaluation [Name, title]
* Establish the internal evaluation committee (EC) and the evaluation reference group (ERG)
* Approve the final ToR, inception and evaluation reports
* Approve the evaluation team selection
* Ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation at all stages through EC and ERG
* Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and the evaluation subject, its performance and results with the evaluation manager and the evaluation team
* Organize and participate in debriefings with internal and external stakeholders
* Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes, including the preparation of a management response to the evaluation recommendations.
1. The **evaluation manage**r manages the evaluation process through all phases including:
* Acting as the main interlocutor between the evaluation team, represented by the team leader, [if appropriate] the firm’s focal point, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process
* Drafting this evaluation Terms of Reference in consultation with key stakeholders
* Identifying and contracting the evaluation team and preparing and managing the evaluation budget;
* Preparing the terms of reference and schedule of engagement for the EC and ERG ;
* Ensuring quality assurance mechanisms are operational and effectively used;
* Consolidating and sharing comments on draft inception and evaluation reports with the evaluation team;
* Ensuring that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; facilitating the team’s contacts with local stakeholders;
* Supporting the preparation of the field mission by setting up meetings and field visits, providing logistic support during the fieldwork and arranging for interpretation, if required;
* Organizing security briefings for the evaluation team and providing any materials as required;
* Ensuring EC and ERG are kept informed on progress, and escalating issues to the EC as appropriate
* Conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products.
* Submit all drafts to the REU for second level quality assurance before submission for approval

42. An internal Evaluation Committee (EC) is formed to steer the evaluation process and ensure it is independent and impartial. [The roles and responsibilities of the EC include overseeing the evaluation process, making key decisions and reviewing evaluation products. Annex 3 provides further information on the membership/composition of the evaluation committee and roles and responsibilities [specify composition/membership and key roles and responsibilities of EC in Annex 3 as per the [TN on Evaluation Committee](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003175/download/)].

1. [If commissioning office is the regional bureau or a headquarters division, state briefly what the envisaged responsibilities of concerned country office(s) will be.]

45. The regional bureau [When not the commissioning office] will take responsibility to:

* Advise the evaluation manager and provide technical support to the evaluation throughout the process through the REU
* Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the evaluation subject as required through the [name the technical units relevant for the subject of evaluation]
* Provide comments on the draft ToR, inception and evaluation reports from a subject-contents perspective through the [name the relevant RB technical units]
* Provide second level quality assurance of all evaluation products through the regional evaluation unit before they are approved
* Support the preparation of a management response to the evaluation and track the implementation of the recommendations.
1. While [Name and, title of the REU focal person for the evaluation] is the RB focal person for this DE and will perform most of the above responsibilities, other regional bureau-relevant technical staff may participate in the ERG and/or comment on evaluation products as appropriate.

**[Depending on whether the ERG also include staff from HQ Divisions: retain or delete the paragraph below]**

47. **Relevant WFP Headquarters divisions** will take responsibility to:

* Discuss WFP strategies, policies or systems in their area of responsibility and subject of evaluation.
* Comment on the evaluation TOR, inception and evaluation reports, as required.
1. **Other Stakeholders (National Government including relevant ministries, implementing partners / NGOs, partner UN agencies)** will [add the specific roles and responsibilities, if any, of other stakeholders]
2. **The Office of Evaluation (OEV)**. OEV is responsible for overseeing WFP DE function, defining evaluation norms and standards, managing the outsourced quality support service, publishing as well submitting the final evaluation report to the PHQA. OEV also ensures a help desk function and advises the REU, EM and Evaluation teams when required. Internal and external stakeholders and/or the evaluators are encouraged to reach out to the REU and the Office of Evaluation helpdesk (wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org) in case of potential impartiality breaches or non-adherence to UNEG ethical guidelines or other risks to the credibility of the evaluation process

50. [Add brief description of the roles and responsibilities of any other relevant stakeholders such as national government partners, United Nations agencies, NGO partners, and reporting mechanisms for the evaluation.]

## Security considerations

**[Security considerations will vary depending upon the nature of the context and the nature of the contracting arrangements with WFP. Depending on whether the team will be hired through a service provider or as individual consultants, delete one of the below bullet points. Contextualize it based on the country security situation.]**

1. **Security clearance** where required is to be obtained from [the designated duty station.]
* Consultants hired by WFP are covered by the United Nations Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for United Nations personnel, which covers WFP staff and consultants contracted directly by WFP. Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance for travelling from the designated duty station and complete the United Nations basic and advance security trainings (BSAFE & SSAFE) in advance, print out their certificates and take them with them.
* As an “independent supplier” of evaluation services to WFP, the contracted firm will be responsible for ensuring the security of the evaluation team, and adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. However, to avoid any security incidents, the evaluation manager will ensure that the WFP country office registers the team members with the security officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground. The evaluation team must observe applicable United Nations Department of Safety and Security rules and regulations including taking security training (BSAFE & SSAFE), curfews (when applicable) and attending in-country briefings.
1. [List any additional specific security considerations, if known, for the team. Indicate any specific security considerations for women visiting the field sites and women respondents to the evaluation, and how measures will be put in place to mitigate them.]

## Communication

**[One of the key norms of evaluation is transparency which requires that the process is transparently conducted with open communication and that the findings of the evaluation are published for the purpose of transparency with internal and external stakeholders. The communication and knowledge management plan describes the channels for communication throughout the evaluation process, channels for distribution of evaluation products and the timeline for the products that will be disseminated (e.g. inception report, evaluation report). It makes clear the respective roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team and commissioning office.]**

1. To ensure a smooth and efficient evaluation process and enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders throughout the process. This will be achieved by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders. [specify roles and responsibilities for communication]. The evaluation team will propose/explore communication/feedback channels to appropriate audiences (including affected populations as relevant) during the inception phase.
2. Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation firm will make arrangements and include the cost in the budget proposal [to be adjusted as needed].
3. Based on the stakeholder analysis, the draft communication and knowledge management plan (in Annex 5) identifies the users of the evaluation to involve in the process and to whom the various products should be disseminated. The communication and knowledge management plan indicates how findings including gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be disseminated and how stakeholders interested in, or affected by, gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be engaged.
4. As per norms and standards for evaluation, WFP requires that all evaluations are made publicly available. It is important that evaluation reports are accessible to a wide audience, thereby contributing to the credibility of WFP – through transparent reporting – and the use of evaluation. Following the approval of the final evaluation report, the evaluation will be published in WFP internal and public websites. [describe additional elements of the communication and knowledge management plan and any requirements for editing and translation of evaluation products].
5. [Specify any additional communication-related products].
6. Evaluators shall provide a copy of the evaluation reports that is free of personally identifiable information (PII) and proprietary information. Final versions of evaluation reports ready for publication should be accessible to persons with disabilities. For guidance on creating documents accessible to persons with disabilities, please see the following resources: <https://www.section508.gov/create/documents>; <https://www.section508.gov/create/pdfs>

## Proposal

**[It is recommended that the following budget template is used to estimate the overall budget for the evaluation prior to requesting for proposals (if firms are sued) or recruiting evaluators (if individuals are used). The way travel/subsistence/other direct expenses are budgeted will vary depending on whether the evaluation team is recruited as individual consultants or through service providers. The ToR should not provide information on the estimated evaluation budget.**

**For evaluation of McGovernDole funded programme, it should be noted that the evaluation team conducting the baseline study will only be contracted for the mid-term and final evaluations based upon satisfactory performance in previous exercises.]**

1. The evaluation will be financed from [indicate budget source: programme funds? Or any additional budget from partners in case of a joint evaluation].
2. The offer will include a detailed budget for the evaluation, including consultant fees, travel costs and other costs (interpreters, etc.). The budget should be submitted as excel file separate from the technical proposal document.
3. [Clarify how travel/subsistence/other direct expenses should be accounted for in the proposed budget noting that this will vary depending on the contracting option.]
4. Following the technical and financial assessment, an improved offer could be requested by WFP to the preferred bid(s) to better respond to the TOR requirements. WFP may conduct reference checks and interviews with proposed team members as part of the decision-making process and selection,
5. Please send any queries to [name and title of CO/HQ division EM], at [email] and [name and title of REU focal person] at [email]

# Annex 1. Map

# Annex 2. Timeline

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Phases, deliverables and timeline** | **Level of effort**  | **Total time required for the step** |
| **Phase 1 - Preparation (total duration: Recommended – 2.25 months; Average: 4.4 months)** |  |
| EM | Desk review, draft ToR and quality assure (QA) using ToR QC | (2 weeks) | (1 month) |
| REU | Quality assurance by REU |  | (1 week) |
| EM | Revise draft ToR based on feedback received | (3 days) | (1 week) |
| EM | Share draft ToR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS, if required | N/A | (1 week) |
| EM | Revise draft ToR based on DEQS and share with ERG | (3 days) | (1 week) |
| ERG | Review and comment on draft ToR  | (1 day) | (2 weeks) |
| EM | Revise draft ToR based on comments received and submit final ToR to EC Chair | (3 days) | (1 week) |
| EM | Start recruitment process  | (0.5 day) | (0.5 day) |
| EC Chair | **Approve the final ToR and share with ERG and key stakeholders** | (0.5 day) | (1 week) |
| EM | Assess evaluation proposals/ Conduct interviews and recommend team selection | (2 days) | (1 week) |
| EC Chair | **Approve evaluation team selection**  | (0.5 day | (1 week) |
| EM | Evaluation team contracting and PO issuance | (1 day) | (3 weeks) |
| **Phase 2 - Inception (total duration: Recommended – 1.75 months; Average: 2.1 months)** |  |
| ET | Desk review of key documents  | (5 days) | (2 weeks) |
| EM/ET | Inception briefings, with REU support as needed | (1-2 days) | (1-2 days) |
| ET | Inception mission in the country (if applicable) | (1 week) | (1 week) |
| ET | Draft inception report | (2 weeks) | (3 weeks) |
| EM | Quality assure draft IR by EM and REU using QC | (2 days)  | (1 week) |
| ET | Revise draft IR based on feedback received by EM and REU | (2-3 days) | (1 week) |
| REU | Share draft IR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS, if required | (0.5 day) | (2 weeks) |
| ET | Revise draft IR based on feedback received by DEQS | (2 days) | (1 week) |
| EM | Share revised IR with ERG | (0.5 day) | (0.5 day) |
| ERG | Review and comment on draft IR  | (1 day) | (2 weeks) |
| EM | Consolidate comments | (0.5 day) | (0.5 day) |
| ET | Revise draft IR based on feedback received and submit final revised IR | (3 days) | (1 week) |
| EM | Review final IR and submit to the evaluation committee for approval  | (2 days) | (1 week) |
| EC Chair | **Approve final IR and share with ERG for information** | (1 week) | (1 week) |
| **Phase 3 – Data collection (total duration: Recommended – 0.75 months; Average: 1 month)** |  |
| ET | **Data collection** | (3 weeks) | (3 weeks) |
| ET | **In-country debriefing (s)** | (1.5 day) | (1 week) |
| **Phase 4 – Reporting (total duration: Recommended – 2.75 months; Average: 5.8 months)** |  |
| ET | Draft evaluation report | (3 weeks) | (4-5 weeks) |
| EM | Quality assurance of draft ER by EM and REU using the QC,  | (2-3 days) | (1 week) |
| ET | Revise and submit draft ER based on feedback received by EM and REU | (2-3 days) | (1 week) |
| EM | Share draft ER with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS, if required | (0.5 day) | (2 weeks) |
| ET | Revise and submit draft ER based on feedback received by DEQS | (2-3 days) | (1 week) |
| ERG | Review and comment on draft ER  | (0.5 day) | (2 weeks) |
| ET | Learning workshop | (1 day) | (1 day) |
| EM | Consolidate comments received | (0.5 day) | (0.5 day) |
| ET | Revise draft ER based on feedback received  | (2-3 days) | (2 weeks) |
| EM | Review final revised ER and submit to the evaluation committee  | (2-3 days) | (1 week) |
| EC Chair | **Approve final evaluation report and share with key stakeholders**  | (1 day) | (1 week) |
| **Phase 5 - Dissemination (total duration: Recommended – 1 month; Average: 1.9 months)** |  |
| EC Chair | Prepare management response | (5 days) | (4 weeks) |
| EM | **Share final evaluation report and management response with the REU and OEV for publication and participate in end-of-evaluation lessons learned call** | (0.5 day) | (3 weeks) |

# Annex 3. Role and composition of the evaluation committee

**[See** [**TN on Evaluation Committee**](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003174/download/)**]**

1. Purpose and role: The purpose of the evaluation committee (EC) is to ensure a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation in accordance with WFP evaluation policy. It will achieve this by supporting the evaluation manager in making decisions, reviewing draft deliverables (ToR, inception report and evaluation report) and submitting them for approval by the Country Director/Deputy Country Director (CD/DCD) who will be the chair of the committee.
2. Composition: The evaluation committee will be composed of the following staff:
* The Country Director or Deputy Country Director (Chair of the Evaluation Committee)
* Evaluation manager (Evaluation Committee Secretariat)
* Head of Programme or programme officer(s) directly in charge of the subject(s) of evaluation
* Regional evaluation officer (REO)
* Country office monitoring and evaluation (M&E) officer (if different from the evaluation manager)
* Country office procurement officer (if the evaluation is contracted to a firm)
* [ADD Other staff considered useful for this process]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Phase and engagement task** | **Estimate level of effort in days** | **Tentative Dates** |
| **Preparation Phase*** Select and establish ERG membership.
* Reviews the revised draft ToR prepared by the EM
* Approves the final TOR
* Approves the final evaluation team and budget
 | **1 day**  | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Inception Phase*** Brief the evaluation team on the subject of the evaluation.
* Inform evaluation design through discussions with the evaluators.
* Support identifying field visit sites on the basis of selection criteria
* Review the revised draft IR
* Approve the final IR
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Data Collection Phase*** Act as key informants: responds to interview questions
* Facilitate access to sources of contextual information and data, and to stakeholders
* Attend the end of field work debriefing(s) meeting
* Support the team in clarifying emerging issues/gaps how to fill them
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Analysis and Reporting Phase*** Review final evaluation report after quality assurance by ET + EM
* Approve the final ER
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Dissemination and Follow-up Phase*** Decide whether management agrees, partially agrees or does not agree with the recommendations and provides justification
* Lead preparation of the management response to the evaluation recommendations
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |

# Annex IV. Role, composition and schedule of engagement of the evaluation reference group

**[See** [**TN Evaluation Reference Group**](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003175/download/)**]**

1. **Purpose and role**: The evaluation reference group (ERG) is an advisory group providing advice and feedback to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team at key moments during the evaluation process. It is established during the preparatory stage of the evaluation and is mandatory for all DEs.
2. The overall purpose of the evaluation reference group is to contribute to the credibility, utility and impartiality of the evaluation. For this purpose, its composition and role are guided by the following principles:
* **Transparency**: Keeping relevant stakeholders engaged and informed during key steps ensures transparency throughout the evaluation process
* **Ownership and Use**: Stakeholders’ participation enhances ownership of the evaluation process and products, which in turn may impact on its use
* **Accuracy**: Feedback from stakeholders at key steps of the preparatory, data collection and reporting phases contributes to accuracy of the facts and figures reported in the evaluation and of its analysis.

**Composition [Adjust table as required]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country office** | **Name** |
| Core members:* Country Director or Deputy Country Director (Chair)
* Evaluation Manager (secretary or delegated chair)
* Head of Programme
* Head of M&E (if different from EM)
* Head of Supply Chain Unit
* Other CO staff with relevant expertise e.g. nutrition, resilience, gender, school feeding, partnerships
* Area/Field Office Representative(s)
* Government, NGOs and donor partner(s) (with knowledge of the intervention and ideally an M&E profile)
 |  |
| **Regional bureau** | **Name** |
| Core members:* Regional Evaluation Officer
* Regional Monitoring Advisor
* A member of the Regional Programme Unit
* Regional Gender Adviser

Other possible complementary members as relevant to the evaluation subject:* Regional Supply Chain Officer
* Regional Head of VAM and/or Monitoring
* Regional Emergency Preparedness & Response Unit Officer
* Regional Humanitarian Adviser (or Protection Adviser)
* Senior Regional Nutrition Adviser
* Regional School Feeding Officer
* Regional Partnerships Officer
* Regional Programme Officers (cash-based transfers/social protection/resilience and livelihoods)
* Regional HR Officer
* Regional Risk Management Officer
 |  |
| **Headquarters (optional)** | **Name** |
|  |  |

**Schedule of ERG engagement and Time commitments**

**[Below is a typical schedule for engaging the ERG. The EM should adjust the estimated level of effort to suit the context of the specific evaluation.]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Phase and engagement task** | **Estimate level of effort in days** | **Tentative Dates** |
| **Preparation Phase*** Review and comment on the draft ToR
* Where appropriate, provide input on the evaluation questions.
* Identify source documents useful to the evaluation team
* Attend ERG meeting/conference call etc
 | **1 day**  | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Inception Phase*** Meet with evaluation team to discuss how the evaluation team can design a realistic/practical, relevant and useful evaluation.
* Identify and facilitate dialogues with key stakeholders for interviews
* Identify and access documents and data
* Help identify appropriate field sites according to selection criteria set up by the evaluation team in the inception report.
* Review and comment on the draft Inception Report
 | **1 days** | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Data Collection Phase*** Act as a key informant: respond to interview questions
* Provide information sources and facilitate access to data
* Attend the evaluation team’s end of field work debriefing
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Analysis and Reporting Phase*** Review and comment on the draft evaluation report focusing on accuracy, quality and comprehensiveness of findings, and of links to conclusions and recommendations.
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |
| **Dissemination and Follow-up Phase*** Disseminate final report internally and externally, as relevant;
* Share findings within units, organizations, networks and at events;
* Provide input to management response and its implementation
 | **2 days** | **Add Month/Year** |

# Annex 5. Communication and knowledge management plan

1. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum

# Annex 6. Bibliography
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# Annex 7. Acronyms and abbreviations

| **Abbreviation** | Definition  |
| --- | --- |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |
| **AAA** | Acronyms Acronyms Acronyms  |

# Annex 8: Add other relevant annexes as required (including Logical Framework or Theory of Change)

1. See description of different approaches here https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/approaches. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Beneficence means striving to do good for people and planet while minimizing harms arising from evaluation as an intervention. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For further information on how to apply the [UNEG norms and standards](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914) in each step of the evaluation, the evaluation team can also consult the [Technical Note on Principles, Norms and Standards for evaluations](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000003179/download/). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If there are changes in the evaluation team or a sub-contracting for some of the planned evaluation activities, the confidentiality agreement and ethics pledge should also be signed by those additional members. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [UNEG](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2601) Norm #7 states “that transparency is an essential element that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability” [↑](#footnote-ref-5)