EVALUATION QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Office of Evaluation
Measuring Results, Sharing Lessons

TERMS OF REFERENCE
STRATEGIC EVALUATION OF THE CSP PILOTS
TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Background

1.1. Introduction

1.   Strategic evaluations focus on strategic and systemic issues of corporate relevance, including the new WFP strategic direction and associated policy, operations and activities. They evaluate the quality of the work being done related to the new strategic direction as well as its results, and seek to explain why and how these results occurred. This strategic evaluation was included in the Office of Evaluation (OEV) Work Plan 2017-2019 presented to the Executive Board at the Second Regular Session in November 2016.[1]

2.   The Terms of Reference (TOR) were prepared by the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV) evaluation manager Michael Reynolds, Senior Evaluation Advisor, based on a document review and discussions with stakeholders.

3.   The purpose of these TOR is to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and specify expectations that the evaluation team should fulfil. The TOR are structured as follows: Chapter 1 provides information on the context; Chapter 2 sets out the rationale, objectives, stakeholders and main users of the evaluation; Chapter 3 provides an overview of WFP's new country strategic planning approach, and defines the scope of the evaluation; Chapter 4 presents the evaluation approach and methodology; and Chapter 5 indicates how the evaluation will be organized.

4.   The annexes provide additional information on the evaluation timeline (Annex 1), the communication and learning plan (Annex 2), a summary of the CSP process (Annex 3), CSPs/ICSPs in the scope of the evaluation by region (Annex 4), the criteria for country selection (Annex 5), the evaluation e-library (Annex 6), proposed composition of the Internal Reference Group (IRG) and the External Advisory Group (Annexes 7 and 8).

5.   The evaluation is scheduled to take place from January to November 2018. It will be managed by the OEV and conducted by an independent evaluation team. The evaluation report will be presented to the WFP Executive Board at the Second Regular Session in November 2018 together with the Management Response.

1.2. Context

6.   The United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development sets forth an ambitious, people-centred framework of action for achieving sustainable development, and requires moving beyond saving lives to changing lives, focusing first on the people in greatest need. The 2030 Agenda and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are intended to be all encompassing and define global actions for the period up to end of 2030 including humanitarian assistance within the context of broader development progress objectives.

7.   These actions will be carried out at the country level, where national contexts, priorities and strategies will guide the work of governments, other partners and WFP. To strengthen WFP's contribution to the 2030 Agenda, the WFP Executive Board approved, in November 2016, an integrated package of actions that make up the Integrated Road Map (IRM). This package re-aligns WFP's strategy, programme structure, financial management and reporting in order to transform WFP's ability to

---

[1] Annex V of the WFP Work Plan 2017-2019 (WFP/EB.2/2016/5-A/1/Rev.2)

help countries achieve the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030, prioritizing SDG 2, "End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture" and SDG 17, "Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development."

8. The new and comprehensive architecture of the IRM links four inter-related corporate components – the Strategic Plan (2017-2021), the Policy on Country Strategic Plans, the Financial Framework Review and the Corporate Results Framework. These four components are further described below.

9. **Strategic Plan 2017-2021.** The Strategic Plan and its objectives are aligned with the relevant Sustainable Development Goals, prioritizing emergency, life-saving and development work that benefits the poorest and most marginal people. The Plan outlines how WFP will operationalize its efforts to support national leadership and SDG achievement at the country level.

10. **Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CSP).** CSPs define WFP's role and portfolio of assistance at the country level and are WFP's strategic, programmatic and governance instrument in a country for a period of up to five years, replacing the previous suite of project documents.

11. **Financial Framework Review (FFR).** The FFR introduces a new framework that aims to better align resources and results to improve decision-making. The redesigned budget structure will replace the current project-based model to support the country portfolio approach to strategy, planning, implementation, budgeting and reporting to enhance results-based management.

12. **Corporate Results Framework (CRF).** The CRF lays out results and indicators to help WFP plan, implement, monitor and report on WFP's programmes and measure management performance. The framework builds on the Stratgeic Plan and links WFP's activities to nationally defined SDG targets, as defined in CSPs. In turn, the CRF allows WFP to assess progress made towards achieving the Strategic Plan and the SDGs.

13. The integrated approach of the IRM aims at helping WFP to design better programmes aligned with national priorities in order to:

- Enable WFP to serve people in need more effectively and efficiently

- Support government policies, actions and resource allocations for eliminating hunger in their countries

- Clearly communicate what WFP is delivering and its distinct added value

- Efficiently plan and implement WFP programmes for those in greatest need by being focused on the results WFP needs to achieve

- Better allocate resources to achieve, measure and understand results and impacts

- Learn from performance management and accountability systems to improve WFP programme design and implementation

- Work in a flexible manner, responding to changing country needs while balancing addressing humanitarian needs and development

- Move away from fragmentation in WFP's work and reduce transaction costs

- Improve transparency in donor reporting

- Harmonize with external partners in the public and private sectors as well as other United Nations (UN) agencies

14. Although the original timeline for implementation of the IRM envisaged completing the transition process by 2018, a more flexible approach to implementation of the IRM was agreed with the Executive Board at the Annual Session in June 2017. The November 2017 IRM update notes that by 1 January 2018, a majority of country offices – representing nearly two thirds of WFP's programme of work – will have completed the transition to the new CSP framework. Under the flexible approach, 16 country offices will continue to use the current system on an exceptional basis beyond that date and will transition to the country strategic plan framework by mid-2019.

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1. Rationale

15. The IRM is expected to lead to a major transformation of WFP. Such a reform was developed based upon wide consultation and lessons learned from WFP's experiences. It was also developed knowing that further learning from pilots would be required before some of the key elements could be finalized. The evaluation comes at a critical time in this process of learning from the initial implementation of the IRM, and specifically from the pilot CSPs. It complements the ongoing process of learning with an impartial in-depth assessment of the CSP framework, including the relevant elements of the FFR and CRF.

2.2. Objectives

16. Evaluations serve the dual objectives of accountability and learning. As such, the evaluation will:

- Assess and report on the quality and results of WFP's implementation of the new strategic direction related to country strategic planning (accountability)

- Determine the reasons why the changes resulting from implementation of the new approach to country strategic planning occurred or not, to draw lessons that should help in further implementation of the new strategic direction (learning).

17. Findings will be actively disseminated and OEV will seek opportunities to present the results at internal and external events as appropriate. A detailed strategy will be developed in the Evaluation Communication and Learning Plans (an initial version can be found in Annex 2).

2.3. Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

18. There are various groups of stakeholders in this evaluation: the members of the Executive Board, WFP senior management and country-level programme colleagues and partners are the primary audiences.

19. Key internal stakeholders and users with varied normative, technical and programming perspectives are expected across the organization. More specifically, key users at Headquarters level will include: The Policy and Programme Division (OSZ); the Performance Management and Monitoring Division (RPM); the Budget and Programming Division (RMB); the IRM Implementation Division (IRM); the

Gender Office (GEN); the Nutrition Division (OSN); the Human Resources Division (HRM); the Government Partnership Division (PGG); and the Division for Emergency Preparedness and Support Response (OSE). At the decentralized level, key users will include WFP regional bureaux and country office staff working on the formulation and implementation of CSPs at the country-level, including the 38 countries that have transitional I-CSPs.[2]

20.   It is expected that the results (findings, conclusions and recommendations) of the evaluation will be used to strengthen the understanding and quality of CSPs and contribute to: (a) revision to the CSP policy and guidance as necessary; (b) revision of the CRF and guidance as necessary, and; (c) revisions to the FFR as necessary including finalization of amendments to the WFP General Rules and Financial Regulations.

21.   Potential global stakeholders and users of the evaluation will include humanitarian and development actors, academics, consortia and networks working on issues related to WFP's mandate. National governments and implementing agencies in the countries where WFP works are important potential users of the evaluation. Within the UN development system, those entities with country strategic plans are also important potential users, both in terms of learning from the WFP experience as well as in relation to the impact of the new CSP framework on their own response as clients of WFP common services. The UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) may use the evaluation when considering United Nations system-wide planning mechanisms at the country level. Finally, other potential users include the World Bank and regional development banks, donor countries and/or their aid/development agencies, national/international NGOs, regional entities, universities and research institutions. The inception report to be prepared by the evaluation team at the start of the process, will include a more in-depth stakeholder analysis.

3. Subject of the Evaluation

3.1. WFP's Country Strategic Plan Framework

22.   In the past, different forms of county level programming were used within WFP.   Until the end of 2002, country strategy outlines were presented to the Executive Board for information and guidance in tandem with development projects. Country strategy documents were introduced in 2009 and used to guide WFP's delivery of coherent and strategically focused assistance through its operations in a country. These documents, which focused on strategic direction, were voluntary, endorsed internally and not submitted to the Board for approval.

23.   The process of developing the new CSP approach started in 2014 and led to the development of a concept note and identification of early lessons from piloting the country strategic planning process in Zimbabwe and Indonesia. This was followed by the development of the CSP policy and its subsequent approval in November 2016. According to the Policy, the CSPs will be WFP's strategic, programmatic and governance instrument in a country for a period of up to five years, and will replace the current suite of project documents. All CSPs are submitted for Executive Board approval and this can be at any session.

---

[2] See paragraph 28 for an description of the transitional I-CSP.

24. The CSP framework aims to facilitate implementation of results-focused portfolios, which should include outcomes and activities addressing humanitarian and development needs, as required by the country's context. The specific projected results of the CSP approach as set out in the CSP policy are:

- Increased effectiveness and efficiency in emergencies and protracted crises

- Improved alignment with national SDG targets and partners

- Greater focus, improved visibility and communication

- Integration of operational support, technical assistance and resource mobilization

- Flexibility to plan for and respond to dynamic operational contexts while better linking humanitarian and development work

- Increased strategic guidance and reduced transaction costs

- Harmonization with the humanitarian programme cycle and other United Nations agencies and processes

- Enhanced performance management, reporting and accountability

25. In order to inform WFP's strategic orientation in a country and support the alignment of WFP's portfolio of assistance with those of key stakeholders, the development of a CSP requires the input of a National Zero Hunger Strategic Review (NZHSR). The review is intended to be an inclusive, consultative and country-led exercise providing comprehensive analysis of the challenges a country faces in achieving SDG 2 by 2030. It should do this through extensive analysis and consultations involving a wide range of government stakeholders as well as civil society, private sector, donors and international organizations.

26. WFP's new programmatic framework focuses first and foremost on strengthening the effectiveness of WFP's response in emergency and crisis situations. Country Strategic Plans are designed to enable WFP to respond effectively and efficiently in emergencies as well as in other contexts. Existing emergency response mechanisms will be preserved and embedded in the overall WFP country framework to ensure that speed and effectiveness are not compromised while the benefits of internal coordination, as well as transition and exit planning, are pursued.

27. Protracted emergency responses foreseen during the development of the CSP will be reflected in the programmatic framework through WFP Strategic Outcomes with specific outputs and related activities. Unforeseen and sudden onset emergencies will be handled by adding or augmenting a WFP Strategic Outcome(s) specific to the emergency response through a dedicated template aligned with the WFP country framework and the country portfolio budget or by revising the CSP document itself (as was recently done in Bangladesh), depending on the specific country context, scope of the response and required speed. By embedding the emergency response operation within an integrated WFP country framework, WFP will help ensure effective integration and coherence of its activities in country and a realistic transition plan and exit strategy.

28. In addition to the basic CSP, the CSP framework also includes three further elements. First, where a NZHSR has not been completed, WFP operations in a country will be delivered through an "interim" CSP (ICSP). Second, country offices where the ICSP or CSP was not going to be ready for approval by February 2018 prepared 'transitional' ICSPs. These plans were largely based on existing projects but

packaged to conform to new corporate guidance to the extent possible. Third, in countries where there is no established WFP operational presence or country framework, at the onset of an unforeseen emergency, WFP may implement Limited Emergency Operations. The LEO is planned for an initial period of up to 6 months and if a further response is needed will be integrated into a new ICSP. A summary of the CSP framework can be found in Annex 3 of this TOR.

29.   Although the CSP policy is a separate component of the IRM, all components are interrelated and the CRF and new financial arrangements set out in the FFR are integral parts of the CSP. The CRF should link the activities undertaken within the CSP to nationally defined SDG targets defined in the CSP. The linkages between results and resources should also strengthen country-level accountability. Regarding the FFR, the Country Portfolio Budget, resource-based planning and macro-advance financing are integral parts of the CSP framework.

3.2. Overview of relevant WFP Activities

30.   Field testing the CSPs as programmatic frameworks started in Zimbabwe and Indonesia in 2014. The "early pilots" were designed to provide important lessons on the programmatic framework as well as the alternative budgeting and performance monitoring processes, prior to finalizing the CSP policy in 2016. Both countries undertook a strategic reviews of national food security producing lessons that fed in to guidance on facilitating future NZHSRs.

31.   The two early pilot plans were approved as CSPs by the Executive Board at the First Regular Session in February 2017 together with six other pilot CSPs (all together known as Wave 1a). Five more CSPs and one ICSP were then approved at the Annual Session in June 2017 (Wave 1b). Countries in these two waves are collectively known as the "pioneers". The full list of the countries with CSPs approved by the Executive Board in these waves can be found in Annex 4.

32.   The introduction of pilot country portfolio budgets has required some temporary waivers to the WFP General Rules and Financial Regulations and it is expected that amendments to these regulations will be submitted to the Second Regular Session of the executive board of 2018 and, if approved will take effect from 1 January 2019.

3.3. Scope of the Evaluation

33.   The evaluation will cover the parts of the IRM framework that relate to CSPs, specifically the CSP Policy as well as the relevant elements of the CRF and FFR. The evaluation will cover three interrelated components. First, the formulation and approval of the CSPs and ICSPs, which will include engagement with national and international stakeholders and the development of the NZHSR. Second, the implementation of the CSPs and ICSPs and a preliminary assessment of the likelihood of achieving the goals set out in the CSP policy, CRF and FFR as well as other ambitions expressed by WFP management. Third, the evaluation will assess the institutional arrangements for supporting formulation and implementation of the CSPs/ICSPs within the framework of the IRM, including the arrangements for learning from the CSP/ICSP formulation and implementation process and facilitating adaptation when appropriate. More details can be found in Section 4.2 on evaluation questions.

34.   The distinction between formulation/approval and implementation has implications for the CSPs and ICSPs that will be covered. For the first component on

formulation, it is expected that 31 CSPs and 6 ICSPs will have been formulated by the time data collection starts in March 2018. This will include those CSPs and ICSPs that will be presented to the Executive Board at the Annual Session in June 2018. For the second component, assessment of the implementation of the CSPs, only the 11 CSPs and one ICSP that started implementation by mid-2017 will be included. Annex 4 lists the countries with CSPs within the scope of the evaluation by region.

4. Evaluation Approach, Questions and Methodology

4.1. Overview of Evaluation Approach

35.   Although the evaluation includes both accountability and learning objectives, it will be formative in nature and will primarily focus on organizational learning. The CSPs are a key element of the Integrated Road Map to ensuring that WFP will be effective and efficient in its contribution to the SDGs. These lessons will therefore feed into the process of changing WFP through IRM implementation.

36.   This evaluation will follow OEV's Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) guidance for strategic evaluations. To maximize the evaluation's quality, credibility and utility, a mixed methods approach will be used with triangulation of evidence to ensure transparency, impartiality and minimize bias. The evaluation questions and sub-questions will be systematically addressed to meet both the accountability and learning goals.

37.   During the inception phase, the evaluation team will conduct an inception mission to one of the WFP Country Offices piloting the CSP to deepen its understanding of the CSP process, gather information on data availability and quality, and test data collection instruments. There will be a validation workshop following the mission as an integral part of the inception phase. The inception report will include a constructed theory of change, a detailed evaluation matrix and a description of the proposed methodological approach. An assessment of gender and equity-related data gaps will be included in the evaluation approach.

38.   The design of the evaluation is also considering the Internal Audit of the Transition to the IRM being conducted by the Office of Internal Audit of the Inspector General and Oversight Office (OIGA). There is ongoing cooperation with the OIGA during the design of both exercises, including establishing the scope of the evaluation and audit in a collaborative manner. The audit will be completed before the end of the evaluation inception phase and will therefore be able to inform the detailed design of the evaluation in the inception report. In addition, special efforts will be made to ensure, to the extent possible, that data collection efforts do not overlap and result in unnecessary burden of stakeholders. The evaluation will build on the data collected by the audit where appropriate, providing the opportunity for the evaluation to make a wider and deeper assessment than would otherwise have been possible.

39.   The evaluation will take into account the independent assessment of the CRF being managed by RMP that is also due to be completed before the end of the evaluation inception phase. At the same time, the evaluation will consider relevant parts of ongoing efforts aimed at UN reform including the 2016 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review and the more recent initiatives of the UN Secretary General. Other UN initiatives that will be considered in the evaluation include evolving UN Development Group (UNDG) guidance on the UNDAF and the development of common results framework indicators across the UN development

system.

4.2. Evaluability Assessment

40.   The Executive Board approved documents related to the relevant components of the IRM, and the CSP Policy in particular, form the basis for identifying the expected results and assessing the evaluability of the pilot countries. These documents set out the challenges of the system that existed before as well as expected results from implementing the CSP framework. Indicators can be developed in consultation with WFP stakeholders during the inception phase to assist the evaluation. However, while this may be useful for learning, the original pilots were developed before the approval of the CSP Policy and therefore cannot be held accountable for contributing to the expected results. In addition, the timeframe for the contribution to expected results is missing in the IRM documents including the CSP policy. In some cases, the contribution to expected results will be immediate; in others, it may be too early to assess the results of the recent changes introduced in the pilot CSPs.

41.   The evaluation will build on the evidence collected through the Internal Audit of the Transition to the IRM and the independent assessment of the CRF mentioned above. It will also draw on a wide body of documentation available to the evaluation team, including a set of lessons learned that has been collected since the start of the CSP pilot process. Annex 6 contains the evaluation e-library which provides an indication of the documentation available.

4.3. Evaluation Questions.

42.   The evaluation will address the following questions, which will be detailed further by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim to generate evaluation insights and evidence that will help WFP colleagues adapt the policy, processes and procedures on country strategic plans as required and strengthen their contribution to the SDGs.

43.   **Question 1: What progress is observable towards the intended organizational change set out in the CSP Policy?** This would assess progress towards the specific projected results derived from the CSP Policy and listed in section 3.1 of this TOR. It would also try to identify and assess the unintended results that occur as the result of formulating, approving and implementing the CSPs. It covers both formulation and implementation of the CSPs including the relevant aspects of the FFR and CRF. The evaluation will not just be examining the CSP/ICSP itself but rather the processes and tools that surround and support the formulation and implementation of the CSP. For example, country portfolio budgets, country operation management plans, partnership action plans, and the relevant information platforms.

44.   **Question 2: From what we observe of the implementation of the pilot CSPs, is WFP likely to achieve the intended long-term results envisaged in the IRM?** The second question is related to the first but would require an assessment and judgement on the likelihood of achieving these projected results. During the inception phase the evaluation team will develop a framework to set out the path between the changes introduced in the IRM and its components and the objectives of these changes. In so doing it is possible to identify assumptions and risks that can be tested and as a result an assessment can be made as to the

likelihood that these objectives will be achieved.

45.   **Question 3: To what extent have WFP Headquarters and regional offices undertaken appropriate processes in developing the CSP framework and provided adequate support to country offices in the formulation and implementation of the 2017 CSPs?** The question would lead to the identification of explanatory factors related to WFP Headquarters and regional office support for CSP formulation and implementation. Support would be interpreted widely to include guidance and learning materials, seminars, workshops, etc. Examination of processes could include the extent to which they are transparent, inclusive and timely.

46.   **Question 4: Was WFP able to adequately capture and utilize lessons from formulation and implementation of the CSPs in a timely manner?** At the core of the IRM is a process of learning and this question assesses if lessons were learned and, if so, how they were utilized in the process of undertaking the changes envisaged and, more specifically, during the formulation and implementation of the CSPs.

47.   **Question 5: What were the country-level factors that inhibited and enhanced the achievement of the intended results of the CSP policy?** This question captures the country level explanatory factors, some of which may be assumed in advance and others will be identified during data collection. Examples of key factors include: (a) the existence of strong and broad partnerships, identified as central to success of the CSPs in the CSP policy; (b) the ability of country office staff to adapt to the new approach in the time allowed (in terms of both capacities and mindsets); (c) the appropriateness of WFP's regional and county level organizational structures; (d) the challenges to adequate resource mobilization; (e) the national ownership of the NZHSR and its role in supporting CSP implementation through strengthening partnerships, transforming the food security and nutrition landscape and pushing SDG implementation forward; (f) whether the data processes and systems in place will enable WFP to sufficiently monitor, measure and demonstrate achievement of strategic outcomes and WFP contribution to SDGs, and; (g) the extent to which the different CSP elements, including the relevant elements of the FFR and CRF, were aligned and how they have been influencing each other in terms of CSP design and implementation.

48.   **Question 6: What opportunities and risks have been encountered that could influence results from future implementation of the CSP framework?** Based on the formulation and implementation experience to date, the question would help understand the potential risks and opportunities for both processes in future rounds of CSPs.

49.   The detailed sub-questions that will be developed during the inception phase will also be listed in an evaluation matrix linking the questions/sub-questions to the data sources and data collection methods.

4.4. Methodology

50.   The evaluation will employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria including those of relevance, coherence (internal and external), efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and connectedness. It will also examine the

extent to which gender and equity dimensions are integrated into WFP's policies, systems and processes. The methodology should:

- Build on the logic that is the basis of the new strategic direction and its objectives;

- Be geared towards addressing the evaluation questions presented in section 4.3.

- Take into account the limitations to evaluability pointed out in 4.2 as well as budget and timing constraints.

51.   The methodology should also demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups) and using a mixed methodological approach (e.g. quantitative, qualitative) to ensure triangulation of information collected through a variety of means. The sampling technique to impartially select stakeholders to be interviewed should be specified in the inception report. The evaluation will employ multiple methods of data collection including interviews, desk reviews and surveys. Desk reviews will cover a wide variety of background material available including related assessments such as strategic reviews. An initial mapping of relevant documents can be found in the evaluation e-library in Annex 6.

52.   Within the time available for data collection, of the 12 countries that will be studied for CSP/ICSP implementation, six will have field missions, five will be undertaken by desk review and telephone interviews, and one will be covered by an inception mission. For the larger number of countries that can be studied for CSP/ICSP formulation, most will be covered by desk review and telephone interviews but with missions to three of the countries. All six regional bureaux will also be visited. The selection of countries will be purposive but drawing on a number of criteria in order to achieve a representative sample to the extent possible and ensure that specific contexts are covered.

53.   The criteria for identifying the countries are listed in Annex 5 together with the tentative list of countries selected. First, criteria indicating where it is necessary to include at least one of certain types of country. These include at least one: (a) ICSP; (b) emergency context; (c) new emergency since the start of the CSP, and; (d) Delivery as One (DAO) country. Based on these criteria, Bangladesh (new emergency since the start of the CSP) and Sudan (the only ICSP in the group) were selected. Second, criteria indicating where it was important to achieve balance, to the extent possible. These include a balance of countries within regions, national income categories and sizes of the WFP portfolio. Since the regional bureaus in Cairo and Nairobi will be visited, this will also allow examination of the CSP formulation in Egypt and Kenya. The third country with a CSP/ICSP formulated but not yet started implementation will be selected form the West Africa region to ensure that all regions are covered by at least one mission.

4.5. Quality Assurance

54.   WFP's evaluation quality assurance system (EQAS) is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community.[3] It sets out processes with in-built steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products. It also includes quality assurance of evaluation reports

---

[3] For example, the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) and the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)

(inception, full and summary reports) based on standardised checklists. EQAS will be systematically applied during the course of this evaluation and relevant documents provided to the evaluation team. There will be two levels of quality assurance used in the evaluation process. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team, rather it ensures the report provides the necessary evidence in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.

55.   The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.

5. Organization of the Evaluation

5.1. Phases and Deliverables

56.   In order to present the evaluation to the Executive Board Second Regular Session in November 2018, the following timetable will be used.

Table 1: Timeline summary of the key evaluation milestones

Main Phases	Timeline	Tasks and Deliverables
1.Preparatory	September to December 2017	Last draft and final TOR Selection of evaluation team, contract and briefing.
2. Inception	January and February 2018	Evaluation team meeting at Headquarters Inception mission Inception report
3. Fieldwork	March and April 2018	Evaluation missions and data collection. Exit debriefing at Headquarters Analysis
4. Reporting/Reviews	May to August 2018	Report drafting Comments process Final evaluation report Learning workshop
5. Executive Board follow up. For EB.2/2018 (November)	September to November 2018	Summary evaluation report editing/evaluation report formatting Management response and Executive Board preparation Dissemination event

5.2. OEV Roles and Responsibilities

57.   This evaluation is managed by OEV. Michael Reynolds, Senior Evaluation Advisor (consultant) has been appointed as evaluation manager. In a departure from the usual management arrangements for a strategic evaluation, the evaluation team will have two co-team leaders, one of whom will be the OEV evaluation manager.

These arrangements have been put in place to ensure that the evaluation is conducted on a timely basis and is anchored in the realities of WFP. The evaluation manager is responsible for drafting the TOR; selecting and contracting the evaluation team; preparing and managing the budget; setting up the review group; organizing the team briefing in Headquarters; assisting in the preparation of the field missions; conducting ongoing quality assurance of the evaluation products and consolidating comments from stakeholders on the various evaluation products.

5.3. Evaluation Team Composition

58.   Evaluation team members with appropriate evaluation and technical capacities will be hired to undertake the evaluation. The co-team leaders bear ultimate responsibility for all team outputs, overall team functioning, and client relations. The OEV evaluation manager/co-team leader brings extensive experience of evaluation in the UN system including of strategic evaluations and evaluation of UN work at the country level.

59.   The other co-team leader position requires a minimum of 15 years' experience in evaluation, with extensive experience in strategic-level evaluations. Knowledge/experience of humanitarian and development contexts and of the UN system is essential. Understanding of strategic planning, accountability systems and organizational change, preferably in UN contexts, is also important. The co-team leader must also have experience in leading teams, excellent analytical and communication skills (written and verbal) and demonstrated skills in mixed qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques. The primary responsibilities of the co-team leaders will be:
- setting out the methodology and approach in the inception report
- guiding and managing the team during the inception and evaluation phase and overseeing the preparation of working papers
- consolidating team members' inputs to the evaluation products
- representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders
- delivering the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports (including the Executive Board summary report) and evaluation tools in line with agreed EQAS standards and agreed timelines.

60.   Members of the evaluation team, including the evaluation manager, will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of any programme for WFP or any of its key collaborating partners nor have any conflicts of interest. The evaluation manager/co-team leader will also be the main interlocutor between the rest of the evaluation team and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process.

61.   The evaluation team should have strong capacity in conducting global, thematic evaluations that incorporate country-level studies and in the use of mixed methods in evaluation. The team will be multi-disciplinary including an appropriate balance of extensive knowledge, skill and expertise in evaluating organizational strategies at global and country levels as well as in analysis and synthesis of both qualitative and quantitative data and information. Across the team there must be a good understanding of global UN policy architecture and humanitarian institutional architecture. Team members must have experience with development or humanitarian contexts, and preferably the team will include at least one or two members who know both contexts.

62.   Other specific skills necessary across the team include experience with organizational change, human resource systems, performance measurement, data systems and results-based management in a UN context. Between the team members, there should be qualifications, knowledge and/or considerable experience of the following technical areas related to WFP's mandate: food security; nutrition; gender; livelihoods, and; capacity development.

63.   The evaluation team must ensure a gender equality and equity focus in all phases of its implementation. The team itself should comprise men and women of mixed cultural backgrounds. A core team of between 4 and 6 people is expected including the two co-team leaders. When conducting country studies, core team members should be complemented by national expertise. The team members should be able to communicate clearly both verbally and in writing in English. The team should also have additional language capacities (specifically, French and Spanish). The evaluation team members should:

- contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise
- undertake documentary review prior to fieldwork
- conduct field work to generate additional evidence from a cross-section of stakeholders, including carrying out site visits, collect and analyse information
- participate in team meetings with stakeholders
- prepare inputs in their technical area for the evaluation products
- contribute to the preparation of the evaluation report.

64.   Support will be provided by OEV to collect and compile relevant documentation not available in public domain, facilitate the evaluation team's engagement with respondents and provide support to the logistics of field visits. A Research Analyst has been recruited to perform these tasks.

5.4. WFP Roles and Responsibilities

65.   WFP stakeholders at country office, regional bureau and headquarters levels are expected to provide information necessary to the evaluation; be available to the evaluation team to discuss the programme, its performance and results; facilitate the evaluation team's contacts with stakeholders for country visits; set up meetings and field visits, organise for interpretation if required and provide logistic support during the fieldwork. A detailed consultation schedule will be presented by the evaluation team in the inception report. To ensure the independence of the evaluation, WFP staff will not participate in meetings where their presence could bias the responses of the stakeholders.

5.5. Evaluation governance

66.   WFP colleagues from the key divisions and offices will be asked to be members of the Internal Reference Group (IRG). A small number of external experts from other UN development system entities with experience of country-level programming, as well as from academia, research institutes, international NGOs and foundations will be invited to be members of an Expert Advisory Group (EAG). Members of both groups will be requested to review and provide comments on the draft inception and evaluation reports. Attention will be paid to ensure gender balance in the IRG and EAG.

5.6. Communication

67.   Emphasizing transparent and open communication, the evaluation manager

will ensure consultation with stakeholders on each of the key evaluation phases. The evaluation TOR and relevant research tools will be summarized to better inform stakeholders about the process of the evaluation and what is expected of them. In all cases the stakeholders' role is advisory. Briefings and de-briefings will include participants from country, regional and global levels. Participants unable to attend a face-to-face meeting will be invited to participate by telephone. A Communication and Learning Plan for the Evaluation can be found in Annex 2. A more detailed plan for the findings and evaluation report will be drawn up by the evaluation manager during the inception phase, based on the operational plan for the evaluation contained in the inception report.

68. OEV will make use of a file sharing platform (Dropbox) to assist in communication and file transfer with the evaluation teams. In addition, regular teleconference and one-to-one telephone communication between the evaluation manager and the rest of the evaluation team will assist in discussion of any issue. The main deliverables during the evaluation phase will be produced in English. Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation team will make the necessary arrangements and include the cost in the budget proposal.

69. After completion of the field work, OEV will organize an exit de-briefing with internal stakeholders to discuss the draft evaluation findings (April/May 2018). After the completion of the evaluation report a learning workshop will be organized to discuss findings, conclusions and recommendations among a wide range of interested WFP stakeholders (August/September 2018).

70. The Summary Evaluation Report together with Management Response will be presented to WFP's Executive Board in all official WFP languages in November 2018. OEV will ensure dissemination of lessons through the annual evaluation report, presentations in relevant meetings, WFP internal and external web links. In addition, a specific dissemination event will be organized to engage with WFP staff and external stakeholders on the evaluation and facilitate further utilization of the evaluation findings and conclusions. The country offices and regional bureaux are encouraged to circulate the final evaluation report to external stakeholders.

5.5. Budget

71. The evaluation will be financed from OEV's Programme Support and Administrative budget.

Annex 1: Detailed Evaluation Timeline

	Name of the Evaluation	By Whom	Key Dates (deadlines)
Phase 1 - Preparation			**Sep-Dec 2017**
	Desk review. Draft TOR. OEV/D clearance for circulation to WFP staff	EM	16 Oct 13
	Review draft TOR on WFP feedback	EM	25 Oct 25
	Final TOR sent to WFP Stakeholders	EM	Before 3 Nov
	Contracting evaluation team/firm	EM	Before 5 Dec
Phase 2 - Inception			**Jan-Feb 2018**
	Team preparation prior to HQ briefing (reading Docs)	Team	Jan
	HQ briefing (WFP Rome)	EM & Team	1-2 Feb
	Inception Mission in the country	EM & TL	5-9 Feb
	Submit Draft inception report (IR) to OEV	TL	14 Feb
	OEV quality assurance and feedback	EM	21 Feb
	Submit revised IR to OEV	TL	26 Feb
	Circulate final IR to WFP key Stakeholders for their information + post a copy on intranet.	EM	28 Feb
Phase 3 - Evaluation Phase, including Fieldwork			**Mar-Apr 2018**
	Fieldwork & Desk Review. Field visits at RB + CO(s). Internal debriefing with the RB	Team	March- April
	Exit Debrief (ppt) Preparation	TL	
	Debriefing with HQ, RB and COs Staff.	EM&TL	30 April
Phase 4 - Reporting			**May-Aug 2018**
Draft 0	**Submit draft Evaluation Report (ER) to OEV** (after the company's quality check)	TL	31 May
	OEV quality feedback sent to the team	EM	8 June
Draft 1	**Submit revised draft ER to OEV**	TL	15 June
	EM seeks OEV Director's clearance prior to circulating the ER to WFP Stakeholders. When cleared, OEV shares draft evaluation report with WFP stakeholders for their feedback.	EM	**20 June**
	OEV consolidate all WFP's comments (matrix), and share them with team	EM	6 July
Draft 2	Submit revised draft ER to OEV based on the WFP's comments, and team's comments on the matrix of comments.	TL	13 July
	Review matrix and ER.	EM	**18 July**
	Seek for OEV Dir.'s clearance to send the Summary Evaluation Report (SER) to Executive Management.	EM	**20 July**
	OEV circulates the SER to WFP's Senior management for comments (upon clearance from OEV's Director)	EM	24 July
	Revise Executive Summary of evaluation report	EM	2 August
	OEV sends the comments on the SER to the team for revision	EM	17 Aug
Draft 3	Submit final draft ER (with the revised SER) to OE	TL	**24 Aug**
	Seek Final approval by OEV. Dir. Clarify last points/issues with the team if necessary	EM&TL	**31 Aug**
Phase 5 Executive Board (EB) and follow-up			**Sep-Nov 2018**
	Submit SER/recommendations to RMP for management response + SER to ERBT for editing and translation	EM	1 Sept
	Presentation of Summary Evaluation Report to the EB	D/OEV	
	Presentation of management response to the EB	D/Mgt	Nov 2018

Note: TL=Team Leader; EM=Evaluation Manager; OEV=Office of Evaluation. RMP = Performance and Accountability Management; RB=Regional Bureau; HQ=Headquarters

Annex 2: Initial Evaluation Communication and Learning Plans (to be further developed during the inception phase)

Internal (WFP) communication plan

When Evaluation phase with month/year	What Communication product	To whom Target group or individual	What level Purpose of communication	From whom Lead OEV staff with name/position	How Communication means e.g. meeting, interaction, etc.	Why Purpose of communication
Preparation (Sep-Dec 2017) TOR (Oct 2017)	Full TOR TOR summary	OEV, CO, RB, HQ,	Conceptualization & Strategic	Evaluation Manager (EM)	Consultations, meetings and written exchanges	Draft TOR for comments / Final for information
Inception (Jan-Feb 2018)	HQ Briefing + Inception Mission & Inception Report (IR)	HQ, RB, CO, stakeholders	Operational & Informative	EM	Written exchange	Draft IR for comments Final IR for information
Field work, debrief (Mar to Apr 2018)	PPT	CO, RB, HQ, stakeholders	Operational	Evaluation Team Leader (TL)	Meeting / Teleconference	For information and verbal feedback
Reporting (May to - Aug 2018)	Draft and Final Evaluation Report (ER), Workshop	CO, RB, HQ, EAG, stakeholders	All	EM, OEV Director	Written exchanges (+ matrix of comments on request) and presentations	Draft ER for written comments / Final ER for information
Learning workshop	PPT	CO, RB, HQ	Learning	EM, OEV Director	Workshop	Utilization of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation
Follow-up/EB (Sep to Nov 2017)	Evaluation Brief	CO, RB, HQ	Informative	EM, OEV Director	Written exchange	Dissemination of evaluation findings and conclusions.
Dissemination event	PPT	CO, RB, HQ	Informative	EM, OEV Director	Event	Dissemination of evaluation findings and conclusions.

External communications plan

When Evaluation phase with month/year	What Communication product	To whom Target group or individual	What level Purpose of communication	From whom Lead OEV staff with name/position	How Communication means e.g. meeting, interaction, etc.	Why Purpose of communication
TOR, Dec 2017	Final TOR TOR summary	Public, UNEG	Strategic	OEV	Websites	Public information
IR, Feb 2018	Final IR	Public, UNEG	Strategic	OEV	Websites	Public information
Formatted ER/Translated SER, Sept 2018	Final Report (incl. SER)	Public, UNEG	Strategic & Operational	OEV, EB Secretariat	Websites	Public information
Evaluation Brief, Oct 2018	2-page Evaluation Brief	Board Member & wider public	Strategic	OEV	Website	Public information
EB, Nov 2018	SER & Mgt Resp	Board Member	All	OEV & RMP	Formal presentation	For EB consideration

Annex 3: Summary of the CSP framework

Response	Requirements	Initial Duration	Approval	Review	Revision
1) Country Strategic Plan					
Country Strategic Plan (CSP) informed by national zero hunger strategic review	National Zero Hunger strategic review Assessments and consultations	Up to five years	Executive Board, any session	sPRP & e-PRP	Executive Board, for additional or deletion of Strategic Outcomes, except for emergency responses, including service provision, Strategic Outcomes.
Interim Country Strategic Plan (ICSP)	Assessments and consultations	Up to three years	Executive Board, any session	sPRP & e-PRP	Emergency responses are approved by Executive Director and if required, FAO Director -General (emergency response template). Other revisions approved in line with applicable General Regulations and Rules governing delegation of authority (CSP revision template)
Transitional ICSPs	ICSP or CSP not ready for approval by February 2018; Project documents cover duration, budget and activities of transitional ICSP	Up to 18 months	Executive Director	Electronic s-PRP (live meeting only if requested by Chief of Staff); e-PRP	Executive Director (TBC)
Special circumstances					
Technical assistance	Technical assistance from a country where WFP has no operational presence	Up to three years	Executive Director; unless host government elects to have CSP/Strategic Outcome approved by EB	sPRP & e-PRP	Executive Director; unless host government elects to have CSP/Strategic Outcome approved through the regular CSP approval process
CSP/SO funded by entirely by host country	CSP/new Strategic Outcome entirely funded by the host country	Up to five years		sPRP & e-PRP	

2) WFP response to emergencies in countries where an ICSP/CSP do not exist					
Limited Emergency Operation	WFP has neither an operational presence nor a CSP/ICSP	Up to six months	Executive Director and if required FAO DG	ePRP	Executive Director and if required FAO Director General
ICSP following Limited Emergency Operation	WFP presence still needed after Limited Emergency Operation	Up to 18 months	Executive Director and if required FAO DG for emergency outcomes	sPRP & e-PRP	

Annex 4: CSPs and ICSPs within the scope of the evaluation by region

Regional Office	Bangkok	Cairo	Dakar	Johannesburg	Nairobi	Panama
Region	Asia and the Pacific Region	Middle East, North Africa, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia	West Africa	Southern Africa	Eastern and Central Africa	Latin American and Caribbean
Original Pilots (EB.1 2017)	Bangladesh Indonesia			Zimbabwe		Colombia
Other Wave 1a (EB.1 2017)	China Lao PDR					Ecuador El Salvador
Wave 1b (EB.A 2017) Start 1/7/2017		*Sudan*		Mozambique Namibia Tanzania		
Wave 1b Start 1/1/2018		Lebanon	Cameroon			
Wave 2 (EB.2 2017)	Myanmar Sri Lanka	Kyrgyzstan Palestine *Iran*	*CAR*	*DRC*	Uganda *South Sudan*	Guatemala Peru
Wave 2 (EB.1 2018)	Pakistan Timor-Leste	Tunisia			*Burundi*	Honduras
Wave 3 (EB.A 2018)	Afghanistan Philippines	Egypt	Nigeria		Kenya Rwanda	Bolivia

Key: *ICSPs*

Countries covered by assessment of CSP or ICSP implementation

Annex 5: Criteria for country selection (countries tentatively selected in upper case)

		Bangkok	Cairo	Johannesburg	Panama
IRM context	**First wave of pilots**	BANGLADESH INDONESIA		ZIMBABWE	Colombia
	ICSP		SUDAN		
Humanitarian Context	**L3**	BANGLADESH	SUDAN		
	New L3	BANGLADESH			
UN Context	**Delivery as One**	INDONESIA Lao PDR		Mozambique Namibia TANZANIA	EL SALVADOR
National Income	**Low-Income Countries**			ZIMBABWE Mozambique TANZANIA	
	Lower-Middle-Income Countries	BANGLADESH INDONESIA Lao PDR	SUDAN		EL SALVADOR
	Upper-Middle-Income Countries	China		Namibia	Colombia ECUADOR
Portfolio Size 2012-2017	**< $ 10m**			Namibia	EL SALVADOR
	>$10m<$100m	China INDONESIA Lao PDR			Colombia ECUADOR
	>$100m<$1,000m	BANGLADESH		Mozambique TANZANIA ZIMBABWE	
	>$1,000m		SUDAN		

Annex 6: Evaluation e-library

Core documents indicated: (CD)

Folder name / File name	Author	Date
Evaluation Process		
CEQAS		
I. Guidance for process and content	WFP	2014
II. Template for TOR	WFP	2014
III. Quality Checklist for TOR	WFP	2014
IV. Template for Inception Report (CD)	WFP	2014
V. Quality Checklist for Inception Report (CD)	WFP	2014
VI. Template for Evaluation Report (CD)	WFP	2014
VII. Quality Checklist for Evaluation Report (CD)	WFP	2014
VIII. Template for Summary Evaluation Report (CD)	WFP	2014
IX. Quality Checklist for Summary Evaluation Report (CD)	WFP	2014
Examples		
Strategic Evaluation on REACH		
Final Evaluation Brief	WFP	2015
Final Summary Evaluation Report	WFP	2015
Evaluation Report Volume 1	WFP	2015
Evaluation Report Volume 2- Annexes	WFP	2015
Evaluability Report	WFP	2015
Summary Terms of Reference	WFP	2015
Inception Report	WFP	2015
Terms of Reference	WFP	2015
Preparation		
CSP Pilot -initial analysis	OEV	2017
Integrated Road Map (IRM) Documents and Guidance		
Four Pillars		
1. Strategic Plan		
WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021 (CD)	WFP	2016
2. Country Strategic Plan Policy		
Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CD)	WFP	2016
Guidance	WFP	2016
Concept Note sPRP Routing Slip Guidance	WFP	2016
Concept Note Template	WFP	2016
CSP Guidance on Positioning, Partnership, and Resource Mobilization	WFP	2016
Guidance Note on Strategic Outcomes, Outputs and Activities	WFP	2016
M&E Plan	WFP	2016
Policy on CSP Plans Implementation Guidelines	WFP	2016
Pro Forma for Country Strategic Plan Documents	WFP	2016
Summary of CSP Framework	WFP	2016
3. Financial Framework Review		

Financial Framework Review (CD)	WFP	2016
4. Corporate Result Framework		
Corporate Results Framework (2017-2021) (CD)	WFP	2016
Executive Board Documents		
2016		
EB		
EB Doc Update on the IRM February 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Update on the IRM June 2016	WFP	2016
Informal Consultations		
EB Doc IRM- Positioning for a Changing World (PPT) January 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc IRM- Positioning for a Changing World January 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the CRF (PPT) July 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the CRF July 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR (PPT) April 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR (PPT) July 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR (PPT) June 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR April 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR July 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the IRM (PPT) April 2016	WFP	2016
August - October	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the CRF 5 September 2016	WFP	2016
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the CRF September 2016		
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR 5 September 2016		
EB Doc Informal Consultation Update on the FFR September 2016		
2017		
EB		
EB Doc Update on the IRM June 2017 (CD)		
Informal Consultations		
January- March		
EB Doc Informal Consultation Progress Update on the IRM PPT March 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation Progress Update on the IRM March 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM (PPT) January 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM January 2017		
April- August		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on Reporting with the CRF May 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM Interim Gov Arrangements July 2017		

EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM Interim Gov Arrangements July (PPT) 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM May 2017		
August- December		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM (PPT) October 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM Interim Gov Arrangements (PPT) September 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM Interim Gov Arrangements COR September 2017		
EB Doc Informal Consultation on the IRM Interim Gov Arrangements September 2017		
Communication Tools		
Communication Tools for External Partners		
IRM Guide for NGOs	WFP	2017
IRM Accompanying Narrative- Annexes	WFP	2017
IRM Accompanying Narrative	WFP	2017
IRM in Brief (CD)	WFP	2017
Partnering with the IRM	WFP	2017
Communication Tools for Staff		
IRM Leaflet	WFP	2017
IRM Narrative	WFP	2016
IRM Talk Track	WFP	2016
The Integrated Road Map in Detail (CD)	WFP	2017
Understanding the IRM	WFP	2016
Donor Positions (for internal use only)		
Australia	WFP	2017
Canada	WFP	2017
China	WFP	2017
Denmark	WFP	2017
EU	WFP	2017
Finland	WFP	2017
France	WFP	2017
Germany	WFP	2017
Iceland	WFP	2017
Japan	WFP	2017
Netherlands	WFP	2017
Norway	WFP	2017
Russia	WFP	2017
Spain	WFP	2017
Sweden	WFP	2017
Switzerland	WFP	2017
UK	WFP	2017
USA	WFP	2017
IRM Pulse Check		
IRM Pulse Check Zimbabwe Mission Report	WFP	2017
IRM Pulse Check DRD Workshop	WFP	2017

IRM Pulse Check Colombia Mission Report	WFP	2017
IRM Pulse Check Ecuador Mission Report	WFP	2017
National Zero Hunger Strategic Review		
The Interim Guidance for the National Zero Hunger Review	WFP	2016
Example of documents for CSP Pilot Countries		
Bangladesh		
Bangladesh Country Strategic Plan (2017-2020) (CD)	WFP	2017
Bangladesh Milestone List	WFP	2017
SPA Documents		
Bangladesh Line of Sight	WFP	2017
Bangladesh COMP Extract	WFP	2017
Bangladesh CSP 2017-2020 approved	WFP	2017
Bangladesh CSP Logical Framework	WFP	2017
Routing Slip 1 Final	WFP	2016
Routing Slip 1	WFP	2016
Country Portfolio Budget Final +ePRP	WFP	2017
BDCO - CPB November 2016	WFP	2016
Budget Overview 31 Aug 2016	WFP	2016
CSP draft as of 1 Dec 2016 for ePRP	WFP	2016
CSP draft as of 17 November 2016	WFP	2016
CSP draft as of 16 August 2017	WFP	2016
CPB Plan Explanation 17 November 2016	WFP	2016
s-PRP 07 September 2016	WFP	2016
Strategic Review of Food Security and Nutrition in Bangladesh	WFP	2016
ED Endorsement	WFP	2017
National Zero Hunger Strategic Review		
Executive Summary Strategic Review (CD)		2016
Strategic Review		2016
UN General		
UN Reform		
Repositioning the United Nations development system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda: ensuring a better future for all. Report of the Secretary-General. (CD)	UN GA	2017
Report for Accountability Review	UN DESA	2017
UNDS Outline of Functions and Capacities	Dalberg	2017
QCPR		
QCPR Resolution 21.12.16	UNGA	2016
QCPR Resolution adopted 21.12.16	UNGA	2016
Report on UNDS QCPR	UNGA	2017
UNDAF/CCA		
UNDAF		
UNDAF Desk Review	DOCO	2017
UNDAF Guidance	UNDG	2017
Capacity Development Companion Pieces	UNDG	2017
CCA Companion Pieces	UNDG	2017

Communication Advocacy UNDAF Companion Guidance	UNDG	2017
Funding to Financing Companion Pieces	UNDG	2017
UNDAF Companion Guidance	UNDG	2017
Programming Principles UNDAF Companion Guidance	UNDG	2017
Report on UNDS QCPR	UNDG	2017
Theory of Change UNDAF Companion Pieces	UNDG	2017
UN Vision 2030 UNDAF Companion Pieces	UNDG	2017
WFP General		
General Rules and Financial Regulations	WFP	2017
Telephone Directory September 2017	WFP	2017
WFP Annual Report 2016 (CD)	WFP	2017
WFP Global Presence	WFP	2017
Audit		
Brief of Internal Audit of IRM Scoping Note	WFP	2017
Internal Audit Report of Management Performance Indicators and Supporting Information Systems	WFP	2017
Gender		
Gender Action Plan 2015-2020	WFP	2017
Gender Marker Guidance 2014	WFP	2017
Gender Toolkit	WFP	2017
Gender Digest 8	WFP	2017
Gender Implementation Strategy (RBB example)	WFP	2016
UN SWAP Guidance Note	UN SWAP	
Update on Gender Policy EBA 2017	WFP	2017
WFP Gender Policy 2015	WFP	2014
WFP Gender Transformation Programme Office Guide	WFP	2017
HR		
WFP People Strategy Introduction	WFP	2016
WFP People Strategy Presentation	WFP	2014
WFP People Strategy Update	WFP	2016
WFP People Strategy Briefing Pack	WFP	2014

Annex 7: Members of the Internal Reference Group (IRG) (members to be identified following further consultation with WFP management)

Office of the Deputy Executive Director
Human Resources (HRM)
Integrated Road Map (IRM)
Gender Office (GEN)
Regional Bureau Bangkok (RBB)
Regional Bureau Cairo (RBC)
Regional Bureau Dakar (RBD)
Regional Bureau Johannesburg (RBJ)
Regional Bureau Nairobi (RBN)
Regional Bureau Panama (RBP)
Operations Services
Policy & Programme (OSZ)
Emergency Preparedness and Support Response (OSE)
Nutrition Division (OSN)
Partnership, Governance and Advocacy
Government Partnership Division (PGG)
Resource Management
Budget and Programming (RMB)
Performance Management and Monitoring (RMP)

Annex 8: Members of the External Advisory Group (EAG) (tentative list pending consultation with potential members)

Organization
ALNAP
FAO
OCHA
UN DOCO
UNDP
Plus Academia/NGO

Acronyms

CRF	Corporate Results Framework
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
DAO	Delivery as One
DOCO	Development Operations Coordination Office
EQAS	Evaluation Quality Assurance System
EAG	External Advisory Group
FFR	Financial Framework Review
ICSP	Interim Country Strategic Plan
IRG	Internal Reference Group
IRM	Integrated Road Map
LEO	Limited Emergency Operations.
NZHSR	National Zero-Hunger Strategic Review
OEV	Office of Evaluation
OIGA	Office of Internal Audit of the Inspector General and Oversight Office
OSZ	Policy and Programme Division
RMB	Budget and Programming Division
RMP	Performance Management and Monitoring Division
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
WFP	World Food Programme