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**Country Office/Commissioning Unit:** [ ]

**Mandatory documents to be attached:**

|  |
| --- |
| [ ]  ***Final Terms of Reference of Decentralized Evaluation*** ([template](http://newgo.wfp.org/documents/process-guide-for-decentralized-evaluations)***)*** |
| [ ]  ***Evaluation Budget and Timeline, as per final ToR*** *(*[template](http://newgo.wfp.org/documents/process-guide-for-decentralized-evaluations)*)* |
| [ ]  ***Evidence of adequate DE planning & budgeting (Country Portfolio Budget needs based and implementation plan)*** |

**Section 1: Application form (to be filled in by Commissioning Unit)**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. general info on the applicant AND PLANNED EVALUATION** |
| **1.1 Country Office/ Commissioning unit**: [ ] |
| **1.2 Evaluation Manager** | Name: [ ] |
| **1.3 Evaluation Committee Chair** | Name: [ ] |
| **1.4 Finance Officer responsible for CEF Funds** | Name: [ ] |
| **1.5 Evaluation Title** | [ ] |
| **1.6 Evaluation Type** | [ ] Activity | [ ] Pilot |
| [ ] Transfer modality | [ ] Thematic |
| [ ] Other (if so, specify: ) |
| **1.7 Regional Evaluation** [ ] If so, specify which countries: [ ] | **1.8 Joint Evaluation** [ ] If so, specify which partners: [ ] |
| **1.9 Planned completion date** (i.e. approval of Evaluation Report):[ ] | **1.10 Latest possible completion date** (i.e. approval of Evaluation Report): [ ] |
| **1.11 Tentative date of commitment of CEF resources, if granted:** [ ] | **1.12 Tentative date of expenditure of CEF resources, if granted:** [ ] |
| **1.13 Evaluation Scope**Specify below the activities covered by the evaluation - there may be more than one especially in the case of thematic and transfer modality evaluations |
| **CSP Activity(ies) Title** |  **CSP Activity(ies) Number/ Activity WBS code[[1]](#footnote-2)** |
| [ ] | [ ] |
| [ ] | [ ] |
| [ ] | [ ] |
| [ ] | [ ] |
| **1.14 Period covered by the evaluation (indicate years of implementation included in the evaluation scope)**  | From [ ] to [ ] |
| **1.15 If the CO plans to undertake a mid-term review (MTR) and/or a country strategic plan evaluation (CSPE), please elaborate on:****i) the complementarity of the DE with the MTR and/or CSPE in terms of scope** **ii) how potential overlaps between the various exercises will be avoided or managed.** **Please provide details on respective timeline and sequencing of the DE vs MTR and/or CSPE.** |
| [ ] |
| **1.16 Describe the decisions that the evaluation will inform** (Design, revision, implementation of interventions, scale-up of pilot, etc) and **the timing for taking these key decisions** |
| [ ] |
| **2. BUDGETING AND RESOURCING**  |
| **2.1. Total amount budgeted for this evaluation in the CPB**[[2]](#footnote-3) **Implementation Plan [year][[3]](#footnote-4)**Source: WINGS report “CPB Project Plan Comparison”, report code ZMPR138\_CPB. *[Note: Eligibility criterion: DE must have been planned and budgeted in the CPB]* | **US$**: [ ] |
| **2.2 Total evaluation budget based on final TOR and as per approval of the EC Chair [[4]](#footnote-5)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Amount (US$)** | **%** |
| DE budget funded by commissioning unit |  |  |
| DE budget funded by partner(s)  |  |  |
| DE budget to be funded by CEF |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |

*[Note: Eligibility criterion: Commissioning unit and partners must cover at least 30% of the DE budget]* |
| **2.3 Please provide name(s) of evaluation co-funder(s) if any:**  | [ ] |
| **2.4 Provide background information on the CO funding situation and reasons for shortfalls**  |
| [ ] |

|  |
| --- |
| **3. RECENT EVALUATION COVERAGE**  |
| **3.1 List below all WFP country-level evaluation(s) commissioned in the last 2 years in the same country[[5]](#footnote-6)** |
| **Year** | **Title of evaluation** | **CE/DE** | **Type***(e.g. Activity, Thematic, Country Strategic Plan evaluation, etc.)* |
| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
| **3.2 Indicate if any of the above listed evaluations covered the activity(ies) or themes that are part of the scope of the planned DE**  |
| [ ] |

**Section 2: Review of the Eligibility and Assessment Criteria and prioritization of the application by the RB**

|  |
| --- |
| **Eligibility Criteria**[To be filled in by Regional Evaluation Officer with inputs from the Regional Budget & Programming Officer ] |
| **1.1** The DE was actually planned and budgeted in the Implementation Plan [year] I/CSP[[6]](#footnote-7): [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
| **1.2** The DE does not focus on a specific donor grant: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| **1.3** The funding level of activity(ies)*[[7]](#footnote-8)* to be evaluatedfor the years covered by the evaluation is at least 30% but below 80%: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ %] *[Note: Kindly follow the instructions provided in footnote 13 and in Annex 5 to extract the requested information]*[[8]](#footnote-9) |
| **1.4** The CO and partners will contribute at least 30% of total DE budget: [ ]  Yes [ ]  No [ %] |
| **1.5** DE TOR were finalized on [dd/mm/yyyy] [*Insert approval date*] |
| **ASSESSMENT Criteria** [To be filled in by Regional Evaluation Officer] |
| **Key Question** | **RB assessment** |
| **2.1** The DE is timely to inform key decisions  | [ ]  0 = Disagree[ ]  1 = Partially agree[ ]  2 = Agree  |
| Please specify which decision(s) and anticipated date of decision(s): [ ] |
| **2.2** The DE budget is reasonable and adequate in view of the type, scope and complexity of the evaluation[[9]](#footnote-10) | [ ]  0 = Disagree[ ]  1 = Partially agree[ ]  2 = Agree |
| **2.3** The TOR include the majority of the elements required to support the delivery of a quality evaluation and is feasible in terms of 1) clear purpose and set of questions; 2) realistic timeline and 3) data availability  | [ ]  0 = Disagree[ ]  1 = Partially agree[ ]  2 = Agree |
| **2.4** There is no or limited evaluative evidence to inform the key decision(s) mentioned above  | [ ]  0 = Other CEs and DEs contribute in large part to decision-making[ ]  1 = Other CEs or DEs contribute only partially to decision making[ ]  2 = There is no DE/CE contributing to decision-making |
| Please specify which CEs or DEs can inform the key decision(s) mentioned above (if any)[ ] |
| **2.5** The CO has commissioned a DE in the past | [ ]  0 = Yes within the current CSP cycle[ ]  1 = Yes, before its current CSP cycle[ ]  2 = No DEs has been commissioned by the CO  |
| If CO has commissioned a DE in the past, please specify which DE and completion date[ ] |
| **TOTAL** | [Sum of score] |
| **REGIONAL DIRECTOR PRIORITIZATION**[To be filled in by the Regional Director/Deputy Regional Director] |
| **3.1 Please indicate level of priority for this CEF application**: [ ]  **High** [ ]  **Medium** [ ]  **Low** |
| **3.2 Please provide a short rationale for RD prioritization** [ ]  |
| **Submission date to OEV:** [dd/mm/aaaa] |

**For more information on Decentralised Evaluations visit our webpage**http://newgo.wfp.org/how-do-i/do-an-evaluation

1. Activity WBS Code identifies the specific activity in Country Portfolio Budget (CPB) structure in WINGS. It is automatically created in WINGS when the project log-frame is approved in COMET. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Annex V provides an example on WINGS report ZMPR138\_CPB “CPB Project Plan Comparison”. DEs are usually budgeted under implementation costs, hence this information should be retrieved looking at the implementation costs for the specific activity(ies) covered by this evaluation. If exceptionally DE costs were budgeted under DSC, ensure that only the budget for the Decentralized evaluation under the DSC line is taken into consideration (i.e do not consider the CSPE budget). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Source: Country Portfolio Budget, Approved implementation plan. If the implementation plan is not available or the DE budget was not retained in the IP, indicate if the DE was planned and budgeted in the CPB Needs-Based Plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Please provide approved DE budget and final TOR as part of the application. If at the time of submitting this CEF application the CO has started the procurement process and has already reviewed evaluation proposals, the CO should communicate in the CEF application both the final DE budget approved by the EC Chair and the budget offered by the firm(s). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Reviews, baseline studies should not be included. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Source: Country Portfolio Budget, Approved implementation plan. If the implementation plan is not available or the DE budget was not retained in the IP, indicate if the DE was planned and budgeted in the CPB Needs-Based Plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Funding below 30% would raise evaluability issues while funding above 80% would raise eligibility issues. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Source: WINGS report ‘ZMPR041\_CPB’. How to extract information on funding level: 1) Select relevant fiscal years based on the period covered by the DE; 2) Insert r\_CPB under “Commitment Item”; 3) Insert the CPB code (not the activity code) under “Funded Program”; 4) When the report has run, select “Funded program” under “Variation: characteristics” and then the activity WBS element under “Variation” funded program”; 5) Scroll until the bottom - The result is obtained by doing Current Budget / Needs based plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Refer to [Technical Note on Country-specific Evaluation Planning and Budgeting](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000009459/download/) for additional guidance on average evaluation costs. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)