



# Technical Note

## Principles, Norms and Standards for Evaluations

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose of this note</b>	<b>UNEG Norms by Evaluation Phase</b>	<b>UNEG standards by evaluation phase</b>

### 1. Purpose of this note

1. The United Nations Evaluation Network (UNEG) norms and standards for evaluation seek to facilitate system-wide collaboration on evaluation by ensuring that UN agencies follow agreed-upon basic principles<sup>1</sup>. UNEG Standards are based on best practices regarding the set-up of institutional framework, evaluation management and conduct and use of evaluation.
2. The WFP Evaluation Policy reaffirms WFP's commitment to UNEG evaluation principles, norms and standards which provided the foundation for WFP's evaluation function normative framework. They guided the formulation of WFP Evaluation Charter which confirms the mandate and governance of the evaluation function and the Corporate Evaluation Strategy, which sets a phased implementation plan to building a high-quality centralised and decentralised evaluation function.
3. WFP Evaluation Quality Assurance System for both centralized evaluations (CEQAS) and decentralized evaluations ([DEQAS](#)) is aligned with the UNEG norms and standards. The consistent application of those across all WFP evaluations will contribute to enhance further the quality, independence, credibility and utility of WFP evaluations. Using UNEG norms and standards will also facilitate a common understanding of expected standards among internal and external stakeholders (commissioners and evaluation managers who are internal; and evaluators who are always external) and contribute to continuous improvement in evaluation practice.

<sup>1</sup> [UNEG 2016 Norms and Standards](#)

4. The purpose of this note is to provide WFP staff who commission and/or manage evaluations and evaluators with information to help them apply the UNEG norms and standards in the design, conduct and management of high-quality evaluations.
5. More specifically, this note is intended to:
  - Provide further clarity on the UNEG evaluation norms and standards, unpacking them in an accessible language for staff who may not be evaluation specialists.
  - Indicate when and how to address these norms and standards during the evaluation process.

## 2. UNEG Norms by Evaluation Phase

6. Table 1 describes the UNEG norms and how these are addressed within the different phases of an evaluation as per WFP Evaluation Policy.

**Table 1: UNEG Norms and how they are addressed at each evaluation phase**

### **UNEG Definition of Evaluation**

*An evaluation is an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.*

#### **Phase 1: Planning**

- It is important for potential commissioners of an evaluation to understand the purpose and characteristics of evaluation, as opposed to monitoring, review, audit, operational research and other accountability mechanisms so that an informed decision is made, and the most appropriate exercise is planned.

Additional resources include:

- [Decision tool](#) to guide the choice between an evaluation or review.
- [Glossary of terms](#) for definitions of evaluation and other performance and accountability mechanisms.
- [Technical notes on types](#) of decentralized evaluations.
- [Technical note on country-specific evaluation planning and budgeting.](#)

### **UNEG Norm 1: Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets**

*Within the United Nations system, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*

#### **All Phases:**

- The Office of Evaluation (OEV) continuously engages with and monitors the evolution of internationally agreed principles, norms and standards and updates the normative framework as necessary, taking account of the commitments made as part of the Agenda 2030.
- OEV and commissioning offices of decentralized evaluations have increased ability to build evaluation partnerships (including through joint evaluations) that contribute to more effective interventions and progress towards achieving national SDG goals and targets

## **UNEG Norm 2: Utility**

*In commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning, informed decision-making processes and accountability for results. Evaluations could also be used to contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders. (See also UNEG Norm 14 on Evaluation Use and Follow up)*

### **Phase 1: Planning**

- The timing of centralized and decentralized evaluations is determined so that evidence can inform in a timely manner key policy or programmatic decisions.
- COs, RBs and OEV collaborate to minimize overlaps/encourage complementarity between DEs and centrally managed Country Strategic Plan Evaluations or Corporate Emergency Evaluations both in terms of timing and scope and ensure a balanced coverage.
- Country Offices define the type and scope of their decentralized evaluations based on an analysis of evidence gaps and COs' learning needs. Relevant stakeholders should be involved in this decision to ensure the high relevance of the evaluation and get their buy-in and support. OEV decisions regarding what, when and how to evaluate in centralized evaluations are based on considerations of strategic relevance, demand, timeliness for decision making, risks, knowledge gaps, feasibility and evaluability.

### **Phase 2: Preparation**

- An explicit discussion on the intended use of the evaluation takes place with internal and external stakeholders. The evaluation questions should be focussed, appropriate and relevant to the users' needs and linked to the evaluation's objective(s) (accountability and/or learning).
- The evaluation TOR sets out clearly the evaluation's purpose, scope, and intended use(s) by various stakeholders.
- The Evaluation Manager steers effectively the evaluation process to ensure adherence to planned timeline and timely completion of the evaluation.

### **Phase 4: Data Collection**

- The evaluators organize a debrief at the end of the evaluation mission with the support of the Evaluation Manager and participation of CO/RB/HQ as appropriate to further engage with stakeholders, encourage reflection on the preliminary findings and increase their utility.

### **Phase 5: Reporting**

- A learning workshop is organized to present initial findings, conclusions and recommendations to internal stakeholders.

### **Phase 6: Dissemination & Follow-up**

- A management response is prepared for all evaluations detailing how the evaluation recommendations will be addressed.
- The implementation of the follow-up actions is monitored by CO, RB and HQ Divisions Management. Opportunities for wider organizational learning are pursued including tabling key discussions on evaluation results in key workshops and contributing to the internal PRP process.

## **UNEG Norm 3: Credibility**

*Evaluations must be credible. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results and recommendations are derived from—or informed by—the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence. Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted and managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies.*

Credibility of evaluation is determined by its independence, impartiality, transparency and methodological appropriateness and rigour. Implications of the principles of independence, impartiality, ethics and

transparency are detailed under norms 4, 5, 6 and 7. To avoid redundancy, we will focus here on the methodological rigour:

#### **Phase 1: Planning**

- Evaluation planning is embedded into programme design and closely integrated with the monitoring plan in order to ensure a solid evidence base. When this is not the case, appropriate evaluability assessment is carried out when defining the scope of an evaluation.

#### **Phase 2: Preparation**

- The drafting of the terms of reference (ToR) benefits from inputs from a range of internal and external stakeholders (in some types of evaluation, this is done through the establishment of an Evaluation / Internal Reference Group).
- 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. The selected evaluators have a track record of producing high quality evaluations.

#### **Phase 3: Inception**

- All internally available data is consolidated and made accessible to the evaluators at the start of the inception phase.
- The evaluation methodology is appropriate to respond to the evaluation questions, giving due consideration to limitations, risks and mitigation strategies, and the methods for data collection, analysis and interpretation are transparently documented in the inception report.
- The sites and stakeholders are selected according to a sound rationale and explicit objective criteria.
- The inception report benefits from inputs from key stakeholders and a rigorous quality assurance process.

#### **Phase 4: Data Collection**

- The Evaluation Manager ensures that the evaluation is implemented as per design. If challenges arise during the field mission, adjustments are made ensuring that those do not undermine credibility .
- Strong evidence is generated to respond to the evaluation questions, using appropriate and multiple methods and checking consistency across data sets contributes credibility, in a credible and transparent process.

#### **Phase 5: Reporting**

- Findings are based on triangulated evidence; clear connections are made between findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Findings and conclusions are fair and acknowledge the existence of differing views.
- The evaluation report explains the methodology and any limitations; and presents evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations in a complete and balanced way.
- The evaluation report benefits from inputs from key stakeholders and a rigorous quality assurance process.
- All comments from stakeholders and the response from the evaluators are recorded in a matrix.

The final evaluation report is subject to a Post-Hoc Quality Assessment which provides an independent assessment of the evaluation quality.

#### **UNEG Norm 4: Independence**

*Independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. Evaluators must have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on their career development and must be able to freely express their assessment.*

#### **Phase 1: Planning**

- The Director of the commissioning office appoints an Evaluation Manager who has not been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of the evaluation nor expects to be involved in the near future.

## **Phase 2: Preparation**

- 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.

## **Phase 3: Inception & Phase 4: Data Collection**

- The Evaluation Manager provides the evaluators with access to key informants and all relevant available internal data (as per WFP Directive on information disclosure).<sup>2</sup>
- Evaluators have full freedom to conduct their evaluative work without interference or fear for their career.
- The evaluators make independent decisions about country selection, site sampling and selection of key informants to interview.
- The evaluators ensure that WFP staff responsible for the design or implementation of the subject of the evaluation does not attend interviews.

## **Phase 5: Reporting**

- The evaluators must be free from pressure to alter conclusions and recommendations in any way that is not supported by the evaluation's findings.

## **Phase 6: Dissemination & Follow-up**

- All final evaluation reports, management response and Post Hoc Quality Assessment results are published on WFP websites and disseminated through various channels.

**Additional provisions were set up for decentralized evaluations to safeguard their independence as outlined in the [DEQAS Process Guide](#).**

### **UNEG Norm 5: Impartiality**

*The key elements of impartiality are objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning, formulating the mandate and scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation and formulating findings and recommendations. Evaluators need to be impartial, implying that evaluation team members 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.*

The implications of the Impartiality norm listed below apply to both centralized and decentralized evaluations.

### **Phase 1: Planning**

- The choice of the subject to be evaluated is made on the basis of objectives considerations regarding learning needs and accountability requirements.
- The Evaluation Manager has demonstrated his/her ability to maintain an impartial behaviour towards the evaluated subject..

### **Phase 2: Preparation**

- The Evaluation Manager prepares the ToR following the DEQAS / CEQAS process guides to ensure absence of bias in terms of scope and design. An evaluation reference group (ERG)<sup>3</sup>, which includes internal and external stakeholders, is formed to help steer the evaluation and reduce risk of bias.
- The Evaluation Manager maintains a clear audit trail of stakeholders' comments on the ToR and the responses from the Evaluation Manager.

### **Phase 3: Inception**

- The Evaluation Manager and stakeholders provide the evaluation team's access to key informants and all available data.
- The evaluation team develops methods and data collection tools and selection of sites and key informants based on objective criteria to ensure absence of bias.

<sup>2</sup> See [WFP Directive on Information Disclosure](#).

<sup>3</sup> For some CEs, there can be 2 evaluation reference groups (internal and external) or only one reference group comprised of internal stakeholders only.

- The Evaluation Manager maintains a clear audit trail of stakeholders' comments on the Inception Report and the evaluators' responses.

#### **Phase 4: Data Collection**

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

#### **Phase 5: Reporting**

- The evaluation team analyses data and presents findings transparently, reflecting where various stakeholders held different views while ensuring confidentiality.
- The evaluation team must provide explicit rationale when they do not incorporate stakeholder feedback.

#### **Phase 6: Dissemination and Follow-up**

- Final evaluation report reflecting all findings and recommendations, management response and PHQA results are published on WFP websites and disseminated through various networks.

**Additional provisions were set up for decentralized evaluations to safeguard their impartiality as outlined in the [DEQAS Process Guide](#).**

#### **UNEG Norm 6: Ethics**

*Evaluation must systemically pay attention to the right or agreed principles and values that govern the behaviour of an individual within the specific, culturally defined context within which an evaluation is commissioned or undertaken. Systematic and ongoing ethical thinking implies (i) integrity, or active adherence to moral values and professional standards, which are essential for responsible evaluation practice; (ii) accountability, or the obligation to be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken, and to be responsible for honouring commitments, without qualification or exception as well as to report potential or actual harms observed through the appropriate channels; (iii) respect, or engaging with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, wellbeing and personal agency while being responsive to their sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQI+ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability and cultural, economic and physical environment; and (iv) beneficence, or striving to do good for people and planet while minimizing harms arising from evaluation as an intervention.*

#### **All Phases<sup>4</sup>:**

- The evaluation process adequately considers ethical issues during each evaluation phase as per the [2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#) Checklist (Annex 2 and 3).

#### **Phase 1: Planning**

- The Evaluation Manager has signed the [UNEG 2020 Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation](#) and has submitted it to the REO for CO and RB led DEs, and to OEV Admin Head for the HQ-led DEs and Centralized Evaluations.<sup>5</sup>

#### **Phase 2: Preparation**

- All evaluators sign the [UNEG 2020 Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation](#) before their contract is finalised. The Evaluation Manager is responsible to confirm that this has been done and signed copies are filed.
- Ethical requirements are clearly spelled out in the ToR.
- The Evaluation Manager explicitly includes in the ToR any ethical issues that are anticipated or have already been identified, with a proposal on how they should be managed. Contractors are also expected to reflect on these and propose mitigating measures as part of their proposal.

#### **Phase 3: Inception and Phase 4: Data Collection**

- Evaluators behave ethically in all interactions with stakeholders and beneficiaries. They abide by the UNEG 2020 [Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation](#). This should include, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair recruitment of participants

<sup>4</sup> This section will be updated following a self-assessment against the UNEG ethical guidelines.

<sup>5</sup> This will be implemented in the course of 2021.

(including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results in no harm to participants or their communities.

- Adequate ethical safeguards are indicated in the inception report<sup>6</sup>.
- Evaluators are 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.
- The Evaluation Manager clarifies to the evaluation team the procedures for reporting any wrongdoing that might be uncovered (see more details under phase 5 below).
- Evaluators focus on performance of functions and systems in relation to the subject of evaluation and not on the personal performance of individuals.

#### **Phase 5: Reporting and Phase 6: Dissemination and Follow-up**

- The confidentiality of informants is preserved in analysis and reporting, and in all dissemination and follow-up activities.

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 leader should report those allegations to WFP Office of Inspection and Investigation (OIGI) through WFP hotline.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, for a CE, the team leader should inform the Evaluation Manager and the Director of Evaluation that there are allegations of wrongdoing and misconduct without breaking confidentiality. In case of a decentralized evaluation, CO management and the REO should also be informed.

#### **UNEG Norm 7: Transparency**

*Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. Evaluation products should be publicly accessible.*

#### **Phases 2: Preparation and Phase 3: Inception**

- A range of internal and for some evaluation types external stakeholders review and comment on draft deliverables (ToR, Inception Report and Evaluation Report).
- Major stakeholders and their interests, both in the subject of evaluation and the evaluation itself, are clearly set out in the ToR (Phase 2), along with a plan for their consultation and engagement during the evaluation; and this is updated, consolidated and confirmed in the Inception Report (Phase 3).
- The Evaluation Manager maintains a clear audit trail of stakeholder's comments on the ToR and inception report along with responses.

#### **Phases 5: Reporting**

- The evaluators prepare the evaluation report in line with templates, standards and expectations for accessibility (readability).

#### **Phase 6: Dissemination and Follow-up**

The Evaluation Manager ensures publication of the evaluation report on relevant WFP sites and networks and circulates the evaluation report to all stakeholders.

#### **UNEG Norm 8: Human Rights and Gender Equality**

*The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.*

#### **Phase 2: Preparation**

- The ToR templates and checklists for all evaluation types integrate gender equality and women empowerment, equity and wider inclusion considerations as per the [technical note on gender](#).

<sup>6</sup> Refer to checklist of UNEG Ethical Guidelines in Evaluation.

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.wfpHotline.ethicspoint.com>

### **Phase 3: Inception**

- The evaluators ensure that gender equality and women empowerment, equity and wider inclusion issues are considered carefully in the design of the evaluation, including stakeholder analysis and engagement plan, and data collection/analysis tools and methods. This is reflected in the inception report.

### **Phase 4: Data Collection**

- The data collection tools and methods are applied as per the design in the inception report, ensuring sufficient data is collected to answer key questions related to gender equality and women empowerment, equity and wider inclusion issues.

### **Phase 5: Reporting**

The analysis, findings and conclusions in the evaluation report covers adequately gender equality and women empowerment, equity and wider inclusion issues, including specific recommendations on these issues as appropriate.

### **UNEG Norm 14: Evaluation use and follow up**

*Organizations should promote evaluation use and follow-up, using an interactive process that involves all stakeholders. Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and/or management addressed by its recommendations that clearly states responsibilities and accountabilities. Management should integrate evaluation results and recommendations into its policies and programmes. The implementation of evaluation recommendations should be systematically followed up. A periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations should be presented to the governing bodies and/or the head of the organization. (See also UNEG Norm 4 on Utility)*

### **Phase 1: Planning**

- Evaluations should be planned and commissioned with intention to use the results. This intentionality should influence the timing and scope of the evaluation as well as the definition of the evaluation questions.

### **Phase 2: Preparation**

- A Communication and Knowledge Management Plan is developed at ToR stage and then refined and adapted throughout the evaluation to ensure that evaluation results will be widely disseminated among all relevant stakeholders and adequate follow-up and knowledge building.

### **Phase 6: Dissemination and follow-up**

- The Commissioning Office develops key products tailored to different audiences and key findings through various channels.
- Commissioning Office organizes a learning workshop with selected audience for knowledge dissemination and use.
- RB, HQ units and OEV collaborate to develop synthesis of evaluations and other learning products.
- For DEs: The director of the commissioning office with the inputs from the Evaluation Committee, prepares a management response defining the follow-up actions to the recommendations.
- For CEs: The Corporate Planning and Performance Division (CPP) coordinates the process of preparing management responses seeking inputs from the Oversight and Policy Committee.
- The evaluation report along with the management response are publicly available and proactively shared with key stakeholders.

The implementation of agreed follow-actions for both CEs and DEs is tracked in WFP corporate R2 system and overall status is reported to the Executive Board on an annual basis.

7. Table 2 describes the UNEG norms related to the evaluation function as a whole which are not specific to an evaluation process.

**Table 2: UNEG Norms related to the evaluation function and how they are addressed as per WFP Policy**

<p><b>UNEG Norm 9: National Evaluation Capacities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioning office engage with partners at an early stage to identify opportunities for learning from evaluations, so that appropriate decisions are made on the type, scope and timing of the evaluation. This includes consideration for joint evaluations, especially in the case of joint programmes</li> <li>• If relevant, commissioning office involves partners, including national counterparts, in WFP evaluation capacity development activities (Eval Pro).</li> <li>• The recruitment of local evaluators can contribute to strengthening the evaluation capacities of national evaluators and the pool of evaluation expertise</li> <li>• Internal and external stakeholders, including from national and sub-national levels as appropriate; comment on all products - ToR, inception and report- and participate in debriefings. With time, such engagement is expected to contribute to building national partners' evaluation capacity.</li> <li>• To maximize learning, joint dissemination activities may be organised as appropriate, allowing national partners to own the findings and generate learning that goes beyond WFP. With time, this practice would contribute to building capacity on the demand side (i.e. national and sub-national players seeing the value of evaluation, and therefore increasing demand).</li> </ul>
<p><b>UNEG Norm 10: Professionalism</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEQAS, CEQAS and WFP Evaluation Capacity Development Strategy are intended to support both evaluation specialists as well as non-evaluation specialists to manage an evaluation process professionally through all phases.</li> <li>• WFP Evaluation Managers are selected on the basis of the skills outlined in the UNEG evaluation competency framework. In addition to evaluation expertise, they should have a core set of skills related to planning, problem-solving and managing relationships. Those can be further developed through on the job training and other channels during the course of their career. Evaluators must have credible experience and reputation and an appropriate mix of complementary skills (such as technical, research, language and interpersonal) to meet the evaluation requirements</li> </ul>
<p><b>UNEG Norm 11: Enabling Environment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the DEQAS and CEQAS elements are intended to ensure that country offices, regional bureaus and HQ divisions have the framework to plan for, commission, manage and use evaluations. Early planning for evaluations ensures that adequate resources are allocated, and that the evaluations are timely to feed into decision-making. A link with the monitoring function at early stages also ensures that sufficient data is available to provide a solid evidence base upon which evaluations can build and arrive at credible conclusions and recommendations</li> </ul>
<p><b>UNEG Norm 12: Evaluation Policy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centralized and decentralized evaluations are planned and undertaken within the framework of WFP evaluation policy and in line with the evaluation quality assurance system. Systematic adherence to DEQAS and CEQAS is expected for all evaluations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UNEG Norm 13: Responsibility for the Evaluation Function</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directors of Headquarters divisions, regional bureaus and country offices are accountable, as commissioners of decentralized evaluations for several tasks in relation to planning, commissioning and using decentralized evaluations. The evaluation policy sets out in section VII the roles and accountabilities across WFP. The <a href="#">Evaluation Charter</a> provides further details on the governance framework and the institutional arrangements for the evaluation function across the organisation. The DEQAS and CEQAS further articulate the specific roles and responsibilities within an evaluation process, which should be contextualised as appropriate.</li> </ul>

### 3. UNEG standards by evaluation phase

Table 3. Mapping of Evaluation Standards in WFP Evaluations by Evaluation Phase<sup>8</sup>

UNEG Standards Relevant to Evaluation in WFP	Evaluation Phases					
	Phase 1 Planning	Phase 2 Preparation	Phase 3 Inception	Phase 4 Data Collection	Phase 5 Reporting	Phase 6 Dissemination & Follow up
<b>Standard 1: Institutional Framework</b>						
<b>1.3 Evaluation plan and reporting:</b> Evaluations should have a process to inform the governing body and/or management on the evaluation plan and on the progress made in plan implementation						
<b>1.4 Management response and follow up:</b> The organization should ensure that management responds to evaluation recommendations through mechanisms that outline concrete actions to follow up on recommendations.						
<b>1.5 Disclosure Policy:</b> The organization should have an explicit disclosure policy for evaluations. Evaluators should be informed about it. To ensure public accountability, key evaluation products (including annual reports, evaluation plans, terms of reference, evaluation reports and management responses) should be publicly accessible.						

<sup>8</sup> The shaded phases for each standard indicate at what stage in the evaluation process this standard applies the most.

UNEG Standards Relevant to Evaluation in WFP	Evaluation Phases					
	Phase 1 Planning	Phase 2 Preparation	Phase 3 Inception	Phase 4 Data Collection	Phase 5 Reporting	Phase 6 Dissemination & Follow up
<b>Standard 3: Evaluation Competencies</b>						
<b>3.1 Competencies:</b> Individuals engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess required core competencies.						
<b>3.2 Ethics:</b> All those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluations should conform to agreed ethical standards in order to ensure overall credibility and the responsible use of power and resources.						
<b>Standard 4: Conduct of Evaluations</b>						
<b>4.1 Timeliness and Intentionality:</b> Evaluations should provide timely, valid and reliable information that will be relevant to the subject being assessed and should clearly identify the underlying intentionality.						
<b>4.2 Evaluability Assessment:</b> Undertake this assessment to increase the likelihood that an evaluation will provide timely evidence for decision-making.						
<b>4.3 Terms of Reference:</b> The terms of reference should provide the evaluation purpose, scope, design and plan.						
<b>4.4 Evaluation Scope and Objectives:</b> Evaluation scope and objectives should follow from the evaluation purpose and be realistic and achievable in light of resources available and the information that can be collected.						

UNEG Standards Relevant to Evaluation in WFP	Evaluation Phases					
	Phase 1 Planning	Phase 2 Preparation	Phase 3 Inception	Phase 4 Data Collection	Phase 5 Reporting	Phase 6 Dissemination & Follow up
<b>4.5 Methodology:</b> Evaluation methodologies must be sufficiently rigorous as to respond to the scope and objectives, answer evaluation questions, and lead to a complete, fair and unbiased assessment.						
<b>4.6 Stakeholder engagement and reference groups:</b> Inclusive and diverse stakeholder engagement in planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations helps ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and use. Design reference groups and other stakeholder engagement for this purpose.						
<b>4.7 Human rights-based approach and gender mainstreaming strategy:</b> The evaluation design should consider the extent to which the UN system's commitment to rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming strategy was incorporated in the design of the evaluation subject.						
<b>4.8 Selection and composition of evaluation teams:</b> The evaluation team should be selected through an open and transparent process, taking into account required competencies, diversity in perspectives and accessibility to the local population. Core team members should be experienced evaluators.						
<b>4.9 Evaluation Report and products:</b> Evaluation reports should be logically structured and contain evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations. Reports and other products should be designed for the needs of intended users						
<b>4.10 Recommendations:</b> should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear, results-oriented and realistic in terms of implementation.						

UNEG Standards Relevant to Evaluation in WFP	Evaluation Phases					
	Phase 1 Planning	Phase 2 Preparation	Phase 3 Inception	Phase 4 Data Collection	Phase 5 Reporting	Phase 6 Dissemination & Follow up
<b>4.11 Communication and dissemination:</b> Evaluation functions require a strategy for communication and dissemination, focused on enhancing use.						
<b>Standard 5: Quality</b>						
<b>5.1 Quality assurance system</b>						
<b>5.2 Quality control of the evaluation design</b>						
<b>5.3 Quality control at the final stage of evaluation</b>						

For more information, visit our [external](#) and [internal](#) webpages,  
or contact OEV Cap/Qual Unit at: [wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org](mailto:wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org)