

SAVING  
LIVES

CHANGING  
LIVES



# Annual Evaluation Report

2017



# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part 1: Evaluation – What is it for? WFP evaluations for evidence-based decision-making</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 WFP centralized evaluations	8
1.2 WFP decentralized evaluations	21
<b>Part 2: Evaluation – How well is WFP's evaluation function performing?</b>	<b>25</b>
2.1 Major developments in evaluation	26
2.2 Performance of the evaluation function	29
2.3 Use of evaluation	36
2.4 Strengthening evaluation partnerships and joint evaluations	38
2.5 Strengthening national evaluation capacity	39
2.6 Resources for evaluation	40
<b>Part 3: Evaluation – How is it evolving at WFP?</b>	<b>45</b>
3.1 Overview	46
3.2 Priorities for the decentralized evaluation function	47
3.3 Priorities for the centralized evaluation function	48
3.4 Medium-term outlook	49
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>51</b>
Annex I. KPI Dashboard	52
Annex II. Overview of WFP policies current in 2017 and evaluation coverage	54
<b>Endnotes</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Photographs</b>	<b>59</b>

# Tables

Table 1: Centralized evaluations completed or ongoing in 2017	9
Table 2: Ongoing and new centralized evaluations in 2018	10
Table 3: Profile of completed country portfolio evaluations, 2016-2017	14
Table 4: Minimum evaluation coverage norms	29

# Figures

Figure 1: Country portfolio evaluation coverage, 2016–2017	13
Figure 2: Major emergency responses, 2011–2017	16
Figure 3: Impact evaluation coverage, 2011–2017	17
Figure 4: Operation evaluation coverage, 2016–2017	19
Figure 5: Projected number of decentralized evaluations and new starts, 2016–2018	21
Figure 6: Implementation status of decentralized evaluations, 2016–2018	22
Figure 7: Distribution of decentralized evaluations, 2016–2018	23
Figure 8: Decentralized evaluation distribution by programmatic area: 2016–2018	23
Figure 9: Overview of Contingency Evaluation Fund allocations by region, 2017	27
Figure 10: Percentage of active policies approved since 2011 evaluated/under evaluation	30
Figure 11: Percentage of WFP's 10 largest portfolios covered by a country portfolio evaluation within the previous five years	31
Figure 12: Country portfolio evaluation coverage, 2013–2017	31
Figure 13: Percentage of WFP's portfolios (excluding the 10 largest) covered by country portfolio evaluations in the previous 10 years	32
Figure 14: Evaluation of corporate emergency responses coverage, 2013–2016	33
Figure 15: Percentage of active corporate emergency responses ongoing in the previous three years that have been evaluated	33
Figure 16: Percentage of country programmes that ended in 2017 that had a final evaluation in 2016 or 2017	34
Figure 17: Percentage of country offices that have completed at least one decentralized evaluation in 2016 or 2017	34
Figure 18: Post-hoc quality assessment of evaluation reports completed, 2016–2017	35
Figure 19: Percentage of strategic programme review documents commented on by OEV	36
Figure 20: Implementation status of actions within management responses due for implementation	37
Figure 21: Number of joint and Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations in which WFP participated in 2016 and 2017	38
Figure 22: Participation of WFP in regional and national evaluation conferences	39
Figure 23: Expenditure on evaluation as a percentage of WFP total contribution income	40
Figure 24: OEV expenditure by Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) outcome, 2017	41
Figure 25: Implementation of the 2017 OEV work plan (planned versus actual)	43



# Introduction

This is the second annual evaluation report produced under WFP's Evaluation Policy (2016–2021).<sup>1</sup>

**Part 1** explains the purpose of evaluation and how it is evolving in line with WFP's strategic direction and trends in its operating environment. It gives an overview of centralized and decentralized evaluations completed, conducted and planned in the period 2016–2018 and highlights the various types of evaluation evidence available to support the organization's strategic priorities.


**Part 2** examines the performance of WFP evaluation. It reports major developments in the function and assesses the six Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) established to measure progress against the outcomes listed in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021). It also looks at human and financial resources for evaluation.

**Part 3** looks ahead, presenting the outlook for the evaluation function and highlighting areas for attention in the coming years.

The Executive Board should note one thing that this report does not do. Unlike previous annual evaluation reports it does not provide a synthesis of centralized evaluations completed in the preceding year. That is because from 2018 the Office of Evaluation (OEV) plans to present a variety of synthesis reports on specific topics.

**Andrea Cook**  
Director of Evaluation



A group of children, including a young girl in a purple shirt and a boy in a blue and white striped shirt, are looking down at something on the ground. The background is blurred, showing other children and a wooden structure.

**Part 1:**  
**Evaluation – What is it for?**  
WFP evaluations for evidence-based  
decision-making



Part 1 looks at how the WFP evaluation function is evolving in line with WFP's strategic direction and trends in its operating environment.

It provides an overview of centralized (see 1.1) and decentralized (see 1.2) evaluations completed, conducted and planned in the period 2016–2018 and highlights the various types of evaluation evidence available to support the strategic priorities of WFP.

## 1.1 WFP centralized evaluations

WFP adheres to the United Nations definition of evaluation: evaluation serves the dual purpose of accountability and learning; these two objectives reinforce each other.

The programme of centralized evaluations is conducted by OEV. It is designed to be as relevant as possible to WFP's dynamic programming. All centralized evaluations and management responses are presented to the Executive Board.<sup>2</sup>

Decisions regarding what, when and how to evaluate take into account strategic relevance, demand, timeliness for decision making, risks, knowledge gaps, feasibility and evaluability, proportionality and complexity. Care is taken to ensure complementarity and avoid duplication between centralized and decentralized evaluations.

To support the phased introduction of the coverage norms set out in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), evaluation planning and resourcing are embedded in the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021),<sup>3</sup> WFP's Policy on Country Strategic Plans<sup>4</sup> (CSPs), its Financial Framework<sup>5</sup> and its Corporate Results Framework (2017–2021).<sup>6</sup>

### OVERVIEW OF CENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS, 2017–2018

Between 22 and 24 centralized evaluations were planned to be under way in 2017. However, OEV decided to increase evaluation coverage and made adjustments to the schedule and topics selected for policy and strategic evaluations in order to strengthen the evidence base and thus support the implementation of the Integrated Road Map (IRM). In the end, 29 evaluations were completed or ongoing in 2017 (table 1). Critical Corporate Initiative funding was used to increase the coverage of country portfolio evaluations and to commission a series of regional evaluation syntheses to inform the preparation of new CSPs.

Following consultation with the Executive Board and management, there will be 15 ongoing and new evaluations in 2018 (table 2), plus a new series of impact evaluations. The subject of the syntheses will be confirmed mid-2018.

**Table 1: Centralized evaluations completed or ongoing in 2017**

TYPE	TITLE	EXECUTIVE BOARD SESSION
POLICY	Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017)	2017 annual session
	Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts (2012-2017)	2018 annual session
	Humanitarian Protection (2012-2017)	2018 annual session
STRATEGIC	CSP Pilots (2014-2018)	2018 second session
	Support for Enhanced Resilience (2014-2017)	2019 first session
COUNTRY PORTFOLIO	South Sudan (2011-2015)	2017 second session
	Cambodia (2011-2017)	2018 first session
	Cameroon (2012-mid-2017)	2018 first session
	Central African Republic (2012-mid-2017)	2018 annual session
	Mali (2013-2017)	2018 second session
	Somalia (2012-2017)	2018 second session
CORPORATE EMERGENCY RESPONSE	WFP's Regional Response to the Syrian Crisis (2015-2017)	2018 second session
IMPACT	An Impact Evaluation of WFP Malnutrition Interventions in Niger (2014-2016) Targeting Moderate Acute Malnutrition in Humanitarian Situations in Chad (2016-2016) The Impact of Humanitarian Aid on Food Insecure Populations During Conflict in Mali <sup>7</sup> (2012-2017) WFP's Moderate Acute Malnutrition Treatment and Prevention Programmes in Kassala Sudan (2016-2016)	
	Synthesis report on four evaluations of the impact of WFP programmes on nutrition in humanitarian contexts in the Sahel <sup>8</sup>	2018 first session
OPERATIONS <sup>9</sup>	Cuba country programme 200703 (2015-2017) Djibouti protracted relief and recovery operation 00824 (2015-2017) Madagascar protracted relief and recovery operation 200735 (2015-2017) Rwanda country programme 200539 (2013-2016) Sudan protracted relief and recovery operation 200808 (2015-2017)	
	Annual synthesis report on operation evaluations Regional synthesis reports on operation evaluations: Regional Bureau Bangkok Regional Bureau Cairo Regional Bureau Dakar Regional Bureau Johannesburg Regional Bureau Nairobi Regional Bureau Panama	2017 second session
2016 ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT		2017 annual session

Source: OEV database

**Table 2: Ongoing and new centralized evaluations in 2018**

Type	Ongoing	New
<b>POLICY</b>	Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Context (2012-2017)	Safety Nets Update (2012-2017) People Strategy
<b>STRATEGIC</b>	CSP Pilots (2014-2018) Support for Enhanced Resilience (2014-2017)	WFP's Capacity to Respond to Emergencies
<b>COUNTRY PORTFOLIO</b>	Central African Republic (2012-mid-2017) Mali (2013-2017) Somalia (2013-2017)	Ethiopia Madagascar
<b>CORPORATE EMERGENCY RESPONSE</b>	WFP's Regional Response to the Syrian Crisis (2015-2017)	Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Northern Nigeria Response
<b>IMPACT</b>		New series
<b>SYNTHESES</b>		Country portfolio evaluations in conflict-affected contexts in the Sahel (tbc)

Source: OEV database



## POLICY EVALUATIONS

Policy evaluations examine particular WFP policies and the systems, guidance and activities in place to implement them. They seek to generate insights and evidence to help policymakers improve future policies and assist programme staff in policy implementation. Policy evaluations address three questions:

- ▶ How good is a given policy?
- ▶ What were the results of the policy?
- ▶ What factors affected the implementation and results of the policy?

In June 2017, OEV presented a policy evaluation of the WFP corporate partnership strategy<sup>10</sup> to the Executive Board. Together with a 2016 evaluation of the policy on capacity development as updated in 2009,<sup>11</sup> it provides important evidence to inform the implementation of WFP Strategic Goal 2: Partner to support implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (SDG 17).

The corporate partnership strategy evaluation assessed the quality of the strategy, its initial results and the factors influencing observed results from 2014 to 2017. Because the strategy was still in the early stages of implementation, the evaluation not only assessed the changes that could be directly attributed to implementation but also explored how far WFP's partnering behaviour was aligned with or progressing towards the partnership vision and results outlined in the strategy and how WFP partnership practices were affected by internal and external factors. The evaluation made six recommendations; four were agreed and two were partially agreed by WFP management.

In 2018, OEV will present two policy evaluations to the Executive Board, the first on WFP's 2004 policy on humanitarian principles<sup>12</sup> and 2006 policy on humanitarian access<sup>13</sup> and the second on WFP's 2012 policy on humanitarian protection.<sup>14</sup> The findings and conclusions from both evaluations will inform the implementation of the aspects of all WFP cross-cutting policies, as well as the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021). This is particularly important in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development<sup>15</sup> and the need for WFP to deliver a principled response to humanitarian crises, especially in conflict settings, where there are often major access and protection challenges that require a clear, principled approach (e.g. the **Syrian Arab Republic, South Sudan, northern Nigeria and Yemen**).

In 2018, OEV will commence two new policy evaluations, which will be presented to the Executive Board in 2019. The first will be an evaluation of the updated safety nets policy<sup>16</sup> approved by the Executive Board in 2012 following a 2011 strategic evaluation of WFP's role in social protection and safety nets.<sup>17</sup> The evaluation findings and recommendations will inform the implementation of WFP Strategic Goal 1: Support countries to achieve zero hunger (SDG 2) and provide evidence to inform the possible revision of related policies. The second will be an evaluation of WFP's "People Strategy"<sup>18</sup> approved by the Executive Board in 2014. This evaluation will assess a key element of the Fit For Purpose initiative focused on reinforcing, building, retaining and recruiting WFP's workforce and creating a more people-centred organization that develops the capabilities of its employees. The evaluation findings and recommendations will inform current and future human resource operations and strategies.

## STRATEGIC EVALUATIONS

Strategic evaluations are forward-looking and assess strategic, systemic or emerging corporate issues, programmes and initiatives with global or regional coverage that are selected for their relevance to WFP's strategic direction.

Following a three-year gap, OEV resumed strategic evaluations in 2017, commissioning two on topics central to the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021). The first is an evaluation of pilot CSPs implemented since the beginning of 2016. The evaluation findings and recommendations will inform the strategic direction, planning and implementation of future CSPs. The exercise will generate early learning related to the IRM and is complementary to internal audits. It will be presented to the Executive Board in 2018. The second is of WFP's support for enhanced resilience. WFP has made clear commitments to enhancing the resilience of individuals and communities in the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021) and there is also considerable interest in resilience-related indicators and programming in the international community. OEV

has decided to conduct a formative assessment of the extent to which WFP is fit for the purpose to deliver on its resilience-related commitments. This evaluation will inform the implementation of WFP Strategic Goal 1: Support countries to achieve zero hunger (SDG 2) and Strategic Goal 2: Partner to support implementation of the SDGs (SDG 17).<sup>19</sup> The evaluation will be presented to the Executive Board in 2019.

In the latter half of 2018 OEV conducted a review of strategic evaluation priorities to inform planning up to 2021. In line with the outcome of this review, in 2018 OEV will commission one strategic evaluation. An evaluation of WFP's capacity to respond to emergencies will explore the effectiveness of WFP systems and procedures, specifically the scale, coverage, speed and quality of WFP emergency response in the light of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021) and considering that emergency response is the biggest part of WFP's portfolio. The evaluation will assess WFP's ability to respond to the growing demand for emergency response; to shift into and out of emergency response mode; and to engage in humanitarian coordination and take a lead role in clusters.



## COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATIONS

WFP's Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) and CSP policy entail an evolution in the types of evaluation carried out at the country level. From 2019, country portfolio evaluations will become the primary accountability instruments and learning tools for all CSPs, assessing strategic positioning, decision-making, performance and results. They will complement decentralized evaluations, which assess individual operations and activities.


Since 2016, OEV has completed seven country portfolio evaluations (figure 1), examining operations with a combined planned value of USD 6.7 billion and funding of USD 4.4 billion in contributions received, reaching 36 million beneficiaries (table 3).

When selecting country portfolio evaluations, OEV prioritized countries where the evaluation findings could be used in the design of CSPs.

Three country portfolio evaluations were completed in 2017, for **Cambodia** (2011–2017), **Cameroon** (2012–mid-2017) and **South Sudan** (2011–2016).

Although **Cambodia** has been a lower middle-income country since 2016, it is highly vulnerable to natural shocks, and unemployment, migration and chronic malnutrition rates are high. WFP's portfolio was found to have adapted to the evolution of the country and a challenging political and funding environment. The evaluation made six recommendations – all were agreed by WFP management.

**Figure 1: Country portfolio evaluation coverage, 2016–2017**




Source: OEV

**Cameroon** is a lower middle-income country that has seen instability in recent years due to the regional crisis. Poverty and chronic malnutrition rates remain high. Over the reporting period, WFP's portfolio shifted from development to humanitarian assistance, responding to emergencies in the northern and eastern regions of the country, and gradually moving to more recovery-oriented activities. The evaluation made seven recommendations – all were agreed by WFP management.

Since the outbreak of conflict in 2013, **South Sudan** been in acute crisis. This is one of WFP's largest portfolios, characterized by an extremely challenging environment at the heart of the humanitarian-development nexus. The evaluation made five recommendations – all were agreed by WFP management.


Three country portfolio evaluations were commissioned to be completed in 2018, for the **Central African Republic, Mali** and **Somalia**. In 2018, OEV will commence evaluations in **Ethiopia** and **Madagascar**.

**Table 3: Profile of completed country portfolio evaluations, 2016-2017**

	BURUNDI	CAMBODIA	CAMEROON	IRAQ	MAURITANIA	SOUTH SUDAN	SRI LANKA	TOTAL
REFERENCE PERIOD	2011-2015	2011-2017	2012-mid-2017	2010-2015	2011-2015	2011-2016	2011-2015	
EXECUTIVE BOARD SESSION	EB.2/2016	EB.1/2018	EB.1/2018	EB.2/2016	EB.A/2016	EB.2/2017	EB.2/2017	
PLANNED BENEFICIARIES	4,266,423	5,325,195	4,511,591	7,020,874	2,676,591	16,453,373	3,703,059	43,957,106
ACTUAL BENEFICIARIES	3,634,772	3,580,736	3,641,196	6,141,020	2,134,749	13,853,850	3,202,313	36,188,636
BENEFICIARIES (ACTUAL NUMBER AS A PERCENTAGE OF PLANNED NUMBER)	 85%	 67%	 81%	 87%	 80%	 84%	 86%	 82%
REQUIREMENTS (APPROVED BUDGET) USD	287,012,810	204,159,843	402,839,505	1,204,181,672	553,202,876	3,848,422,131	187,126,355	6,686,945,192
CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED USD	175,396,245	120,328,412	230,637,391	845,773,970	294,575,796	2,642,072,566	97,549,840	4,406,334,220
FUNDING LEVEL (CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED AS A PERCENTAGE OF REQUIREMENTS)	 61%	 59%	 57%	 70%	 53%	 69%	 52%	 66%

Source: OEV country portfolio evaluation reports

# Conducting a Country Portfolio Evaluation



## EVALUATIONS OF CORPORATE EMERGENCY RESPONSES


Evaluations of corporate emergency responses examine humanitarian context and principles, assessing the coverage, coherence and connectedness of the responses.

In 2017, 68 percent of operational requirements were allocated to Strategic Objective 1: End hunger by protecting access to food. This largely reflects

increased requirements for Level 3 emergencies, which account for 87 percent of the total Strategic Objective 1.<sup>20</sup> Figure 2 sets out the main emergency responses since 2011, highlighting the complex and protracted nature of many of these crises.

Since 2016, two of the active corporate emergency responses were evaluated by OEV: the **Iraq** response, which was covered by a country portfolio evaluation, and the response to the 2014–2015 Ebola L3 crisis in West Africa. An Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) was completed for the **Central African Republic** in 2016.

Figure 2: Major emergency responses, 2011–2017



Source: WFP Emergency Preparedness and Support Response Division (OSE)


In 2017, resources for evaluating corporate emergency responses were directed to completing country portfolio evaluations in **South Sudan** and **Cameroon**. In view of the scale and protracted nature of the Syrian crisis, OEV started a new evaluation of WFP's regional response, which will cover all of WFP's emergency work in the **Syrian Arab Republic, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon** and **Turkey** (2015–2017). The evaluation offers an opportunity for learning from organizational adaptations and innovations that may be relevant for future regional emergency responses of comparable scale, complexity and duration. The evaluation will be presented to the Executive Board in 2018.

In 2018, an evaluation of the WFP Level 3 emergency response in north-eastern **Nigeria** will be conducted for accountability and learning purposes, to inform decision-making in complex emergencies.

An Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation of is scheduled for 2018 – the country is to be confirmed.

The L3 response to the El Niño-induced drought in southern Africa that lasted from June 2016 to March 2017 has not been subject to a corporate emergency response evaluation. However, the response is being evaluated partially through the ongoing strategic evaluation of WFP's support for enhanced resilience and a country portfolio evaluation for **Madagascar**, one of the countries affected by the crisis.

**Figure 3: Impact evaluation coverage, 2011-2017**



Source: OEV

## IMPACT EVALUATIONS

OEV has completed four series of centralized impact evaluations since 2011 to contribute to organizational learning and accountability (figure 3). These evaluations help WFP understand if and how a programme has achieved its intended impact; they are also used to test the effectiveness of programme mechanisms.

In 2017, OEV completed a series of four impact evaluations in **Chad, Mali, the Niger** and the **Sudan** to examine the impact of WFP programmes on nutrition in humanitarian contexts in the Sahel. The evaluations identified lessons for improving

programme effectiveness to achieve WFP objectives on food security and malnutrition. A synthesis report made six recommendations – all were agreed by WFP management.

The series forms part of the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation's Humanitarian Assistance Thematic Window, which was launched in 2014 with the aim of generating high-quality policy relevant evidence to improve the quality of life of those in humanitarian crises.

In 2018, OEV will embark on a new series of impact evaluations in consultation with WFP management. A new WFP impact evaluation strategy is currently being developed to set out priorities for centralized and decentralized impact evaluation.




## OPERATION EVALUATIONS

In 2013, in line with WFP’s corporate emphasis on evidence and accountability for results, OEV launched a temporary series of operation evaluations, intended to complement OEV evaluations of policies, strategies, and country portfolios. The series was designed to deliver independent, credible and useful evaluations of WFP’s operations efficiently to provide an acceptable level of coverage.

In 2017, the last of the 15 operation evaluations conducted between July 2016 and June 2017 was completed and the series came to a close. A variety of operations were evaluated, with a total combined planned value of USD 2.3 billion and funding of USD 1.35 billion, targeting 19.7 million beneficiaries. OEV presented the fourth and final synthesis report on operations evaluations to the Executive Board, which included six lessons for consideration by WFP management. In the future, operation evaluations will take the form of decentralized evaluations, until all country offices have completed the transition to CSPs and interim CSPs.

**Figure 4: Operation evaluation coverage, 2016-2017**



Source: OEV

## EVALUATION SYNTHESIS REPORTS

OEV completed nine synthesis reports in 2017, including the report on the impact of four WFP programmes on nutrition in humanitarian contexts in the Sahel and the report on operation evaluations. The other reports included six regional synthesis reports on operation evaluations conducted since 2013, which were designed to make this evidence base more accessible to country offices developing CSPs and ICSPs.<sup>21</sup>

As the coverage of country portfolio evaluations increases, so does the opportunity to synthesize the evidence they collect. In 2018, OEV will commission a synthesis report to learn from recent country portfolio evaluations, focusing on conflict-affected countries in the Sahel.

Looking ahead, OEV is exploring potential new types of synthesis products to promote the use of evaluation evidence by WFP management and partners. In 2017, OEV started to develop and test tools for generating various types of synthesis reports from centralized evaluations. It will also be possible to use these tools to synthesize the lessons from decentralized evaluations once an acceptable quality threshold is reached.



## 1.2 WFP decentralized evaluations

According to the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), decentralized evaluations are “demand-led”: commissioning units (predominantly country offices) select a topic or intervention to be evaluated and time the evaluation so that the results can be fed into programme decision-making. Decentralized evaluation planning is based on learning needs and the desire to generate evidence and demonstrate results, with requests from donors and partners also taken into account.

The implementation of the CSP policy was an opportunity for country offices to develop long-term evaluation plans seeking to generate timely evidence to fill knowledge gaps and improve performance while following the minimum coverage norms set out in the policy.


Seventeen decentralized evaluations were completed between 2016 and 2017. Fifteen were commissioned by country offices, and the remaining two were for headquarters divisions: the UN Network for Scale Up Nutrition (SUN)/Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger and undernutrition (REACH) Secretariat and the Purchase from Africans for Africa Coordination Unit in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

As of early 2018, the majority of decentralized evaluations has been commissioned by country offices. A recent survey of country offices and regional bureaux found that most of these evaluations were commissioned to support country office decision-making and learning.

### OVERVIEW OF DECENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS, 2016–2018


Figure 5 shows that the number of decentralized evaluations scheduled to take place between 2016 and 2018 is substantially higher than the original projections made in early 2016. The schedule of decentralized evaluations is likely to change, for reasons such as adjustments in the CSP roll-out timeline, bringing forward or postponing some evaluations so that results can feed into CSP design; delays in completing evaluations because of various pressures on country offices; and the identification of other accountability and learning exercises. Figure 6 gives an overview of the status of all decentralized evaluations for the period 2016–2018.

**Figure 5: Projected number of decentralized evaluations and new starts, 2016–2018**



Source: OEV

Figure 6: Implementation status of decentralized evaluations, 2016–2018



Source: OEV

In addition, several headquarters divisions or units are planning or working on decentralized evaluations; some cover multiple countries, such as the evaluation of school meals programmes in emergency contexts, which covers the **Democratic Republic of Congo, Lebanon, the Niger** and the **Syrian Arab Republic**.

Figure 7 shows the distribution of decentralized evaluations for the period 2016–2018.


Figure 8 shows that over a third of decentralized evaluations for the period 2016–2018 focus on school meals programmes. This is because school meals constitute WFP’s second largest programme in terms of number of beneficiaries; donors also have specific evaluation requirements for school meals. The second largest set of decentralized evaluations looks at nutrition programmes. As the

regional bureaux are setting priorities for decentralized evaluations through their regional evaluation strategies, the range of themes covered by these strategies is likely to broaden, with an increased focus on smallholder agriculture market support, emergency preparedness, climate adaptation, and asset creation and livelihood support.

With OEV support, the regional evaluation committees and the Evaluation Function Steering Group (EFSG) will monitor geographic and programmatic coverage and identify opportunities for multi-country thematic evaluations or syntheses in order to enhance strategic thematic evidence and learning.




**Figure 7: Distribution of decentralized evaluations, 2016-2018**



Source: OEV

**Figure 8: Decentralized evaluation distribution by programmatic area: 2016-2018**





Source: OEV





## **Part 2: Evaluation – How well is WFP's evaluation function performing?**





Part 2 explores how well WFP is evaluating its performance. It gives an overview of recent major developments, followed by an assessment of each of the six Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) established to measure progress towards the outcomes set out in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021).

## 2.1 Major developments in evaluation

This section reports on major developments in 2017 in the evolution of WFP's integrated model of centralized evaluation and demand-led decentralized evaluation. These changes concern the organizational systems, structures and practices that enable WFP to fulfil the vision – set out in the evaluation policy – of creating a culture of evaluative thinking and behaviour that enables WFP to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

### REGIONAL EVALUATION OFFICERS

In the first half of 2017, regional evaluation officers took up post in every regional bureau, following a one-week induction. The officers have already enabled major steps forward in the development of WFP's evaluation function. They have all sought to raise awareness among WFP staff of their roles in operationalizing the evaluation policy. Their achievements at the regional bureaux and supporting country offices in evaluation planning and conduct and the use of evidence is summarized below. They also participated in WFP's "Evaluation Week" and are members of various working groups on WFP's evaluation function.

### REGIONAL EVALUATION STRATEGIES

In 2017, all regional bureaux started developing regional evaluation strategies, setting out how country offices should operationalize the policy in line with regional programme and monitoring strategies. By the end of 2017, the Regional Evaluation Strategy of the regional bureau for East & Central Africa had been approved by the regional evaluation committee; the remaining five regional strategies were in draft form and are expected to be completed by mid-2018. The strategies are based on thorough consultative processes and reviews of current evaluation capacities at the regional and country levels. They set out priority actions for the next four years.

### REGIONAL EVALUATION PLANS

Guidance on evaluation planning and budgeting developed in late 2016 was updated in mid-2017 to ensure optimum alignment with IRM guidance and the practices that are evolving as WFP moves to the IRM framework.

The regional evaluation officers have led the development of regional evaluation plans, which combine centralized and decentralized evaluations for optimum complementarity and balanced coverage. These plans will be endorsed by the regional evaluation committees in the first quarter of 2018 and will be updated regularly.

## CONTINGENCY EVALUATION FUND

Launched in January 2017 under the management of the EFSG, the Contingency Evaluation Fund (CEF) has provided USD 1.42 million to fund 16 commissioned decentralized evaluations conducted by country offices facing funding shortfalls and thus severely constrained in their ability to conduct already planned decentralized evaluations.<sup>22</sup> The fund provided essential funding for 62 percent of all decentralized evaluations planned to start in 2017, providing between 30 and 70 percent of the budgets for those evaluations, or an average of 61 percent. Ninety-five percent of the USD 1.5 million renewable fund was allocated in 2017.


In its first year of operation, the CEF provided a stop-gap mechanism for country offices that have planned decentralized evaluations and face funding shortfalls despite having adequately budgeted for evaluation. The fund is incentive-based, supporting good evaluation planning practices while recognizing the uncertainty faced by many country offices. In 2018, procedures will be streamlined based on experience gathered to date.

## EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

A comprehensive evaluation learning programme called EvalPro, designed for specific internal audiences, was piloted in 2017 to strengthen the evaluation capacity of WFP staff. It uses a “learn as you go” approach and a mix of online and face-to-face sessions. By the end of 2017, decision makers and evaluation managers from 26 country offices and 2 headquarters divisions had enrolled. Following the pilot, a number of recommendations were made to improve the content and delivery of the programme and to increase engagement among decision makers.

Evaluation capacity and skills are critical factors influencing the effectiveness of decentralized evaluation. In 2018, OEV intends to develop a comprehensive capacity development and professionalization strategy, including elements of partnership with other United Nations agencies, which builds on the recommendations of the review of decentralized evaluation at WFP (see below).

**Figure 9: Overview of Contingency Evaluation Fund allocations by region, 2017**



Source: OEV.

Note: Headquarters includes an application prepared by the China country office

## REVIEW OF DECENTRALIZED EVALUATION AT WFP

OEV conducted a review to assess the progress made with regard to decentralized evaluation at WFP and to identify potential areas of improvement. The review was systematic but light, drawing on a range of evidence, including a self-assessment completed by evaluation staff in OEV and regional evaluation officers; and a validation workshop to pull together the analysis and develop recommendations.

The review concluded that the decentralized evaluation system was carefully designed within a robust policy framework for evaluation as a whole. There was a clear delineation of responsibilities and accountabilities regarding evaluation across the organization. Thanks to corporate investments, good progress had been made on implementing the decentralized evaluation system in 2016 and 2017, supported by wider processes such as the IRM.

The multifaceted support mechanisms for decentralized evaluation have been effective. These include quality assurance system guidance, a helpdesk, an outsourced quality support service, an evaluation learning programme (EvalPro) and the CEF, together with a stronger field presence since regional evaluation officers came into post. The guidance for Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance (DEQAS), issued in 2017, was found to be comprehensive and of high quality; a few areas of

improvement to increase accessibility and address gaps, notably on joint evaluations, were identified. The review concluded that the provisions in place to safeguard the impartiality of decentralized evaluations – the bedrock of their credibility – were implemented effectively in most instances.

The review noted the sharp rise in the number of decentralized evaluations being planned. Progress had been made in embedding evaluation costs in country portfolio budgets, notably with the establishment of a dedicated budget line for evaluation.

The review also acknowledged that the implementation of such an ambitious system requires significant resources and that many country offices face personnel constraints because of the many competing demands on their staff.

Other areas requiring attention were highlighted, notably some rebalancing between a top-down and bottom-up approach to planning decentralized evaluations is required to meet accountability and learning needs coherently across the organization and continued effort is needed to build a strong evaluation culture and increase understanding of the benefits of decentralized evaluations so that WFP management takes full ownership of them.

The review made a number of strategic and operational recommendations (presented in part 3). These were discussed with the EFSG and will be reflected in a joint action plan for OEV and the regional bureaux.



## 2.2 Performance of the evaluation function

This section reports on the six KPIs used to measure progress towards the outcomes set out in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021). Each KPI provides quantitative data related to four questions:

- ▶ What are we evaluating?
- ▶ To what extent does it meet quality standards for evaluations?

- ▶ To what end: how are evaluations used?
- ▶ At what cost?

For each KPI, the report gives the result for 2017 and the trend since 2016, together with an explanation of the progress made.<sup>23</sup>

**Table 4: Minimum evaluation coverage norms**

CENTRALIZED EVALUATION	DECENTRALIZED EVALUATION
<p>Strategic evaluations providing balanced coverage of WFP's core planning instruments, including WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021) elements and related strategies</p> <p>Evaluation of policies 4–6 years after the start of implementation<sup>26</sup></p> <p>Country portfolio evaluations:<sup>28</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ every 5 years for the 10 largest country offices;<sup>29</sup></li> <li>▶ every 10–12 years for all other country offices.</li> </ul> <p><b>For every CSP:</b><sup>30</sup> a country portfolio evaluation is required in the penultimate year of the CSP</p> <p><b>For interim CSPs:</b> the original Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) coverage norm for country portfolio evaluations applies (above)</p> <p>Evaluation of all corporate emergency responses, sometimes jointly with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)</p> <p>Centrally managed operation evaluations providing balanced coverage</p>	<p>Evaluation of at least 50 percent of each country office portfolio of activities<sup>24</sup> within a 3-year period<sup>25</sup></p> <p>Interim: As part of the phased implementation of the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), a minimum coverage norm for decentralized evaluation was to be phased in from 2016 to 2018, requiring all country offices to have completed decentralized evaluations by the end of 2018</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ before the scale-up of pilots, innovations, and prototypes;</li> <li>▶ for high-risk<sup>27</sup> interventions; and</li> <li>▶ before the third application of an intervention of similar type and scope</li> </ul>
<b>ALL COUNTRY PROGRAMMES (BEING PHASED OUT UNDER THE IRM)</b>	

## EVALUATION COVERAGE

Part 1 of this annual evaluation report explained the “what”, “when” and “how” behind the selection of topics and countries for evaluation. Table 4 shows the development of the coverage norms set out in the policy. This section reports on WFP’s progress towards these norms: together, they constitute one multi-component KPI.

### Policy evaluations


The norm for minimum evaluation coverage of WFP policies was approved by the Executive Board in 2011.<sup>31</sup> All policies approved since 2011 are to be evaluated 4–6 years after the start of implementation. Older policies are evaluated subject to their relevance and OEV capacity.

Following a strict interpretation of the coverage norm, the achievement rate for 2017 is 20 percent: of the five policies due for evaluation,<sup>32</sup> only the humanitarian protection policy was evaluated.

However, as in 2016, the picture is much more positive when the spirit, rather than the letter, of the norm is considered. A second policy evaluation was completed in 2017, – of the corporate partnerships strategy. Approved in 2014, the strategy lasted just three years. Because of the importance of the topic to the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda, the evaluation was timed to inform WFP’s new approach to partnerships under the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021)<sup>33</sup> and CSPs. If this evaluation is included, the coverage rate rises to 33 percent (figure 10).<sup>34</sup>

There are also 14 older – but still active – policies listed in the compendium of policies relating to the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021).<sup>35</sup> They predate the coverage norm, and eight are eligible for evaluation subject to continued relevance and OEV capacity. One policy was evaluated before 2011,<sup>36</sup> two have been evaluated more recently<sup>37</sup> and three are covered by ongoing or planned evaluations.<sup>38</sup> Details can be found in annex II.

**Figure 10: Percentage of active policies approved since 2011 evaluated/under evaluation**



Source: OEV

## Country portfolio evaluations

As explained in part 1, in 2017 OEV increased the number of country portfolio evaluations to augment the evidence base available to countries formulating CSPs. Three such evaluations were completed in 2017<sup>39</sup> instead of the planned one, and five were started.<sup>40</sup>

By the end of 2017, 30 percent of the 10 largest country portfolios of 2013–2017 had been evaluated within the previous five years (**Sudan**, **Iraq** and **South Sudan**)<sup>41</sup> (figure 11). This is the same rate as in 2016.<sup>42</sup> One new country portfolio evaluation of a top 10 country portfolio was completed in 2017 (**South Sudan**); between 2016 and 2017 the composition of the 10 largest portfolios changed, with **Malawi** replacing the **Niger**.

If ongoing country portfolio evaluations are included (**Ethiopia** and **Somalia**, due to be completed in 2018), the coverage rate rises to 50 percent.


Of the five remaining countries, the **Syrian Arab Republic** was covered by an OEV-managed evaluation of the corporate emergency response in 2015;<sup>43</sup> the main operation in the portfolio in **Pakistan**<sup>44</sup> and **Malawi**<sup>45</sup> was evaluated within the last five years (both in 2014); **Kenya**<sup>46</sup> had a country portfolio evaluation just outside the five-year cut-off; and an evaluation of the corporate emergency response in **Yemen** will be conducted in 2019 (figure 12).

**Figure 11: Percentage of WFP’s 10 largest portfolios covered by a country portfolio evaluation within the previous five years**



Source: OEV

**Figure 12: Country portfolio evaluation coverage, 2013-2017**



Source: OEV

Of all other WFP portfolios (excluding the largest 10), 31 percent were covered by country portfolio evaluations in the previous 10 years – up from 28 percent in 2016 (figure 13).<sup>42</sup>

**Figure 13: Percentage of WFP’s portfolios (excluding the 10 largest) covered by country portfolio evaluations in the previous 10 years**



Source: OEV



## Evaluation of corporate emergency responses

The norm is that all corporate emergency responses must be evaluated every three years through either an Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation of the collective response or an OEV-managed evaluation of the response alone.<sup>47</sup>

For an OEV-managed evaluation of a response within one country, in any given two-year period, OEV conducts either a country portfolio evaluation or an evaluation of the response. The choice is determined by the extent to which there are other activities besides the corporate emergency response to justify the broader scope of a country portfolio evaluation.


In the three-year period 2014–2016, there were 10 active corporate emergency responses, 70 percent of which have been evaluated. This compares to the 75 percent coverage of eight active corporate emergency responses in the period 2013–2015 (figure 15).<sup>48</sup>

**Figure 15: Percentage of active corporate emergency responses ongoing in the previous three years that have been evaluated**



Source: OEV

**Figure 14: Evaluation of corporate emergency responses coverage, 2013-2016**



Source: OEV

## Country programmes


The Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) requires that all country programmes ending in 2017 be evaluated through a centralized or a decentralized evaluation in 2016 or 2017. Figure 16 shows that 26 percent of the 19 qualifying country programmes had been evaluated by the end of 2017. A further three evaluations (all decentralized) were ongoing, to be completed in 2018, which will bring the coverage to 42 percent.

Once the transition to the IRM is complete in 2019, country programmes will no longer exist and this coverage norm will lapse.

## Operation evaluations


As noted in part 1, the series of centrally managed operation evaluations has been discontinued.

**Figure 16: Percentage of country programmes that ended in 2017 that had a final evaluation in 2016 or 2017**



Source: OEV

**Figure 17: Percentage of country offices that have completed at least one decentralized evaluation in 2016 or 2017**



Source: OEV

## Decentralized evaluations

As part of the phased implementation of the evaluation policy, a minimum coverage norm was introduced for 2016–2018, requiring all country offices to have completed at least one decentralized evaluation by the end of 2018. By the end of 2017, the coverage rate was 19 percent, slightly lower than in 2016, even though the number of completed decentralized evaluations rose from six to ten (figure 17).<sup>49</sup>

The transition to the IRM by 2019 is a corporate priority, so this coverage norm is currently under review to ensure that decentralized evaluations are planned based on existing evidence, in complementarity with other evaluation types and with a clear purpose.

## EVALUATION QUALITY


Since 2016, OEV has used an outsourced post-hoc quality assessment mechanism, through which independent assessors rate the quality of all completed WFP evaluations (centralized and decentralized) against WFP’s own evaluation quality standards, which are based on international professional evaluation standards and include the requirements for evaluation set by the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP). This mechanism also indicates whether WFP’s evaluation quality assurance and support mechanisms are delivering the intended results.

As figure 18 shows, two centralized evaluations and 10 decentralized evaluations were assessed. Of these, 100 percent of centralized evaluations (as in 2016) and 70 percent of the decentralized evaluations were assessed as meeting or exceeding requirements (see figure 18). The latter is a major improvement over the 33 percent rate for decentralized evaluations in the baseline year of the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021).

The UN-SWAP-evaluation performance indicator for WFP evaluations completed in 2017 was rated as part of the integrated post-hoc quality assessment, but reported separately to UN WOMEN. As in 2016, for this indicator WFP's 2017 evaluation reports (both centralized and decentralized) were given an overall rating of “approaching requirements”.

The findings and recommendations from the annual summary report on the 2016 post hoc quality assessment prompted OEV to strengthen guidance and practice in areas identified for improvement, especially gender and equity, ethical safeguards and transparency with regard to evidence bases. In addition, decentralized evaluations need to be more systematic in tracing cause and effect.

**Figure 18: Post-hoc quality assessment of evaluation reports completed, 2016–2017**



Source: OEV

## 2.3 Use of evaluation

In 2017, OEV invested in evaluation knowledge, learning and communications with the aim of engaging various audiences with the right information in the right way at the right time in order to increase the use of WFP evaluative insights and broaden WFP’s culture of accountability and learning.

Use of evaluation evidence was the theme of a WFP Global Evaluation Meeting held in November 2017. Under the title “Evaluation – What’s the Use?”, participants explored how the evaluation function serves WFP as an organization; the value and potential uses of evaluation evidence; gaps in knowledge that WFP evaluations should explore in the future; and how evaluation evidence could be better packaged and communicated for greater use to meet the demands of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The meeting was an opportunity for senior country-based colleagues to share insights into how they are using evaluative evidence to support programme decision-making with WFP evaluation staff and United Nations, international NGOs and other partners.


The CSP/interim CSP formulation process has provided an unprecedented opportunity to use evaluation evidence in programme design and

long-term adjustments. Regional evaluation officers and OEV helped to map evidence from recent global and country-level evaluations and identify ways to strengthen the evidence base to inform future programme design and implementation decisions.

From 2018, OEV will introduce a KPI for gauging whether the use of evidence in a CSP or interim CSP meets or exceeds requirements. In 2016 and 2017, an interim output indicator was used to measure the percentage of strategic programme review documents reviewed by OEV staff and regional evaluation officers. The indicator aimed to promote the use of existing evaluation evidence and to facilitate planning for future evaluations.

For 2017, this KPI was 100 percent of 77 documents,<sup>50</sup> an improvement on 79 percent (of 28 documents) in 2016 (figure 19). The indicator has contributed to an increased use of evaluative evidence and to deeper analysis. OEV expanded its involvement in the programme review process, providing comments on the more detailed documents used in the electronic programme review process (including detailed country portfolio budgets), transitional and interim CSP documents and the strategic programme review documents.

**Figure 19: Percentage of strategic programme review documents commented on by OEV**




Source: OEV

Figure 20 gives an overview of the implementation status of management’s response to discrete actions within evaluation recommendations due to be implemented by the end of 2017 or earlier. The evaluations range from policy to county portfolio and operation evaluations. Overall, 80 percent of actions were implemented. This is a major improvement over 2016, when only 66 percent of

such actions were implemented. OEV is working with the Resource Management Department in adjusting the corporate management response system to cover decentralized evaluations as well. In the future, OEV expects to be able to report on this KPI for all types of evaluation.

**Figure 20: Implementation status of actions within management responses due for implementation**



Source: Performance Management and Monitoring Division (RMP) and OEV



## 2.4 Strengthening evaluation partnerships and joint evaluations

WFP continued to coordinate closely with other United Nations agencies in 2017, participating in and leading in the United Nations Evaluation Group, including as Vice-Chair of the Executive Group. OEV staff and regional evaluation officers were conveners and participants in a range of working groups on themes such as decentralized evaluation, professionalization, ethics, human rights and gender equality, partnership, knowledge management and the use of evaluation, and humanitarian evaluation. OEV staff also played an active role in the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group, leading work to revise evaluation guidelines. The new Director of Evaluation continued WFP's participation in the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) Steering Committee.

In line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and ongoing United Nations reform, partnerships are increasingly important for WFP.<sup>51</sup> This includes participating in evaluations jointly commissioned with other United Nations agencies and cooperating partners. In 2017, a joint evaluative exercise was conducted by the Rome-based agencies, drawing on their respective country programme evaluations in **Cameroon**. A high-level

workshop in early 2018 was held with government and other partners to explore the potential for enhanced collaboration.

In 2017, joint decentralized evaluations started to take shape. Two joint evaluations were completed in 2017 and a further three were under way.<sup>52</sup> In 2018, this set of joint evaluations will be analysed with participating agencies to extract lessons to feed into guidance (figure 21).

The joint decentralized evaluation of the Committee on World Food Security was completed in 2017 and follow-up actions were discussed in depth at the committee's forty-fourth session. Although the evaluation began before WFP's normative framework for decentralized evaluation had been developed, OEV (along with the evaluation offices of FAO and IFAD) gave advice and support in the planning and inception stages and the evaluation report benefitted from review by WFP's quality support service for decentralized evaluations.

The multi-year strategic collaboration with the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation continued as part of inter-agency learning within the Humanitarian Action Thematic Window.

**Figure 21: Number of joint and Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations in which WFP participated in 2016 and 2017**



Source: OEV

## 2.5 Strengthening national evaluation capacity

United Nations General Assembly resolution 69/237 of 19 December 2014 committed all United Nations agencies to supporting country-level capacity building for the evaluation of development activities. This commitment is reflected in WFP's Evaluation Policy (2016–2021).


In 2017, WFP began exploring how the organization could contribute to this joint commitment in the long term. Further work is planned in 2018.

The presence of regional evaluation officers, combined with increased evaluation capacities in some country offices, created opportunities to

cooperate more closely with United Nations colleagues and to take part in regional and national conferences and professional evaluation associations in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

National evaluators already have the chance to gain on-the-job experience thanks to their inclusion in WFP's evaluation teams. Cooperating partners are included in WFP's country-level governance mechanisms for decentralized evaluations, providing exposure to evaluation processes, technical guidance and quality assurance mechanisms.

**Figure 22: Participation of WFP in regional and national evaluation conferences**



Source: OEV

## 2.6 Resources for evaluation


### FINANCIAL RESOURCES

WFP has committed to assigning 0.8 percent of its total contribution income to funding the evaluation function by 2021. This funding covers centralized and decentralized evaluation.

For 2017, expenditure on evaluation as a percentage of WFP’s total contribution income was 0.18 percent, up from 0.15 percent in 2016. However, this change should be seen in the light of three factors. First, evaluation expenditure figures for decentralized evaluations were not available in 2016 and were only partially available in 2017.

Second, WFP’s total contribution income rose from USD 5.9 billion in 2016 to USD 6 billion in 2017. Evaluation expenditure should rise proportionally, although not until evaluations become due. Third, in absolute terms, OEV’s expenditure fell slightly, while expenditure on evaluation by other units rose. This shift was largely due to the phase-out of operation evaluations; the establishment of regional evaluation officers in the regional bureaux; and the revision of priority country portfolio evaluations by OEV in support of CSP implementation.

Figure 23: Expenditure on evaluation as a percentage of WFP total contribution income<sup>53</sup>



Source: OEV; Audited Annual Accounts; estimates from General Accounts Branch (2017)


OEV expenditure amounted to 0.14 percent of total contribution income in 2017. The remaining 0.04 percent was expenditure on decentralized evaluations by units outside OEV, predominantly regional bureaux and country offices but also other headquarters divisions. For 2017, WFP has been able to produce an indication of expenditure on decentralized evaluations for the first time, although the figures must be treated as merely indicative.<sup>54</sup> Decentralized evaluation expenditure figures do not yet include evaluation management costs, which are usually absorbed by the country offices. Moreover, the figures only reflect the 10 decentralized evaluations completed in 2017; costs related to the 26 ongoing evaluations are not included. In the future, decentralized evaluation management costs will be reported in line with the approach taken by other United Nations agencies to facilitate benchmarking.

Once again, OEV's expenditure rate was 100 percent of resources allocated for the year. Figure 24 shows that the centralized evaluations conducted under outcome 2 of the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) (appropriate evaluation

coverage) accounted for 72 percent of OEV's non-staff expenditure. A further 22 percent of non-staff expenditure was allocated to outcomes related to evaluation quality and use, evaluation management capacity and partnerships. More resources will be needed for regional bureaux to contribute adequately to the delivery of these outcomes.

A fundamental tenet of WFP's Corporate Evaluation Strategy (2016–2021) is that centralized evaluations (excluding country portfolio evaluations) will be funded from the programme support and administrative budget and that decentralized evaluations and country portfolio evaluations will be funded from programme funds (budgeted for in country portfolio budgets). WFP's CSP policy encourages this, but the speed of evaluation scale-up needs to be augmented. Recognizing that more focused actions will be needed to fund the evaluation function, in particular at the country office level, in early 2018 the EFSG established a cross-divisional task force to review and develop sustainable financing mechanisms for evaluation to enable WFP to fulfil its policy commitments over time.

**Figure 24: OEV expenditure by Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) outcome, 2017**



Source: OEV

## HUMAN RESOURCES

As stated in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), an “effective evaluation function requires secure, predictable and adequate financial and human resources to attain and sustain balanced and sufficient evaluation coverage for accountability requirements and learning needs.” Because of the gap between WFP evaluation capacities when the policy came into force and those required to achieve the vision of the policy, “adequate evaluation management capacity across WFP” was made an explicit policy outcome (outcome 3) of WFP’s Corporate Evaluation Strategy (2016–2021). This has been translated into four workstreams in the Corporate Evaluation Strategy (2016–2021): WFP evaluation capacity development; institutional arrangements; evaluation expertise; and augmentation of evaluation staffing.

The single most significant development in this area in 2017 was the arrival of six regional evaluation officers based in the regional bureaux. This increased the cadre of dedicated evaluation staff by 50 percent and significantly advanced efforts to embed the evaluation function in the regional bureaux and country offices. Three additional staff positions were created in OEV for corporate emergency evaluations and impact evaluations and to support the decentralized evaluation function.

As WFP continues to phase in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021), a significant increase in evaluation staffing in OEV and at the regional and country levels will be required. With this in mind, the Director of Evaluation has started to put in place a new structure and staffing plan for OEV.


It is not easy to secure access to independent evaluators with the right technical and geographical knowledge in a world where demand is outstripping supply. To keep abreast in the medium term, OEV expanded the number of long-term agreements with evaluation service providers around the world from 15 to 24 and ran induction sessions on WFP. A roster of individual consultant evaluators gives WFP more options for hiring evaluation expertise depending on needs. In the long term, investments to improve national evaluation capacity and promote joint evaluations (described in 2.4 and 2.5 above) will be important in meeting demand.

## OEV PERFORMANCE TO PLAN

As described in part 1, considerable changes were made to the OEV centralized evaluation work plan in 2017 to focus more on generating the evidence base to support IRM implementation. There were significant increases in the production of syntheses of lessons from existing evaluations, and planned country portfolio evaluations were delivered more quickly to feed evidence into CSP and interim CSP preparation. As a result, the start of one strategic evaluation was postponed to 2018. One Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation was planned but not commissioned because of the revision of the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation guidance. Figure 25 shows how the actual numbers of completed centralized evaluations and new starts compare with planning for 2017.



Figure 25: Implementation of the 2017 OEV work plan (planned versus actual)




Source: OEV





**Part 3:  
Evaluation – How is it evolving  
at WFP?**





Part 3 highlights the next steps for the evaluation function in WFP, both at centralized and decentralized levels.

## 3.1 Overview

WFP has now completed the first two years of implementation of the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021). The year 2017 was a pivotal one for the evaluation function, as it was also the first year of implementation of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021).

WFP began implementing the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021) within the framework of the IRM, setting out a broad reform agenda for WFP in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and harmonized with the United Nations quadrennial comprehensive policy review.<sup>55</sup>

The evaluation policy was developed in alignment with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards.<sup>56</sup> Together with the Corporate Evaluation Strategy (2016–2021) and the WFP Evaluation Charter, the evaluation policy sets out a new vision, strategic direction and normative and accountability framework, institutional arrangements and an implementation plan for embedding evaluation throughout WFP in a phased approach.

As the series of operation evaluations has come to an end, the commitment to decentralized evaluation has become increasingly visible across WFP, showing what it will take for WFP to establish and sustain this function. At the same time, OEV has focused on re-establishing coverage for centralized evaluation as set out in the Evaluation

Policy (2016–2021) and in response to the requirements of the CSP policy.

With the founding of the EFSG, senior management worked to ensure appropriate and balanced coverage of centralized and decentralized evaluations to meet global expectations for independent evaluation that supports accountability results, organizational learning and evidence-based decision making throughout the organization.

Following discussion at the 2017 Annual Consultation on Evaluation, OEV carried out the following analytical work in 2017 to inform future priorities for WFP evaluation:

- ▶ Review of the decentralized evaluation function;
- ▶ Review of the coverage and alignment of priorities for strategic evaluations;
- ▶ Assessment of country portfolio evaluation planning and coverage in line with CSP policy;
- ▶ Assessment of evaluation coverage of complex L3 and L2 emergencies;
- ▶ Preparatory work for the development of a strategy to guide centralized and decentralized impact evaluations; and
- ▶ Testing of approaches to synthesizing evaluative evidence.

## 3.2 Priorities for the decentralized evaluation function

Building on the positive start to establishing a decentralized evaluation function, WFP will need to ensure that the priority actions identified by the review of the function are taken forward. These include the following:

- ▶ Continued advocacy efforts to help build and reinforce an evaluation culture across the organization.
- ▶ Fine tuning of the evaluation coverage norms for decentralized evaluations to reflect the demand-led model adopted by WFP; promoting utility-focused evaluation planning and balancing the bottom-up approach to decentralized evaluation planning taken in the context of CSPs with a strategic/cluster/thematic approach to ensure that decentralized evaluations are strongly linked with corporate strategic priorities. The revised Evaluation Policy and Corporate Evaluation Strategy coverage norms will require that at least one decentralized evaluation is planned within each Country Strategic Plan and Interim Country Strategic Plan's cycle.
- ▶ Re-examination of the human resource implications of the decentralized evaluation function in country offices and regional bureaux and exploration of options for addressing the growing pressures on country offices.
- ▶ Continuing efforts to embed evaluation costs within CSPs and engage with donors to ensure that financial resources are in place to deliver independent, credible and useful decentralized evaluations.
- ▶ Continuing to expand evaluation capacity and enhance professionalism by building on the success of WFP's evaluation learning programme (EvalPro), including through leadership in country offices and by sharing expertise with other United Nations agencies that work on evaluation.
- ▶ Putting in place measures to ensure that WFP staff who commission evaluations understand impartiality and are able to protect it.
- ▶ Establishing an enhanced corporate evaluation management response system that includes decentralized evaluations and creates synergies with other oversight functions.



## 3.3 Priorities for the centralized evaluation function

### STRATEGIC EVALUATIONS

A programme of strategic evaluations for 2018–2021 was drawn up following the review of strategic evaluation priorities. The review focused on how to enhance evaluation coverage to meet accountability and learning needs in the light of the challenges and opportunities arising from IRM implementation, WFP’s sustained emergency response in the face of continued large-scale complex and protracted crises and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) envisages that from 2019 OEV will move to full coverage for policy evaluation, conducting up to four policy evaluations per year. However, it will be important to strike the right balance between policy and strategic evaluation coverage to best respond to WFP’s needs.

### COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATIONS

From 2019, the evaluation coverage norm as defined by the 2016 CSP policy will come into force. This means that all CSPs will undergo a country portfolio evaluation in their penultimate year of implementation so that evidence can be gathered to inform the next CSP cycle. This is a positive development that will significantly increase evaluation coverage to improve learning and accountability to the Executive Board and to national partners in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the quadrennial comprehensive policy review<sup>57</sup> and the Secretary-General’s proposals for United Nations reform.<sup>58</sup>

This change will mean a significant increase in the number of country portfolio evaluations conducted from 2020. It will require OEV to develop and test systems in 2018 and scale up staffing in 2019 in preparation for the increased workload.

### EVALUATION OF COMPLEX EMERGENCY RESPONSE

The Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) states that all corporate emergency responses should be evaluated. To date, OEV has paid considerable attention to ensuring complementarity and efficiency in the coverage and conduct of centralized evaluations. Progress has been made in the evaluation coverage of corporate emergency responses since the introduction of the coverage norm in 2016, but there is room for improvement. The policy does not set a coverage norm for L2 crises. However, in view of the number of protracted and multi-country crises, OEV believes the current level of coverage to be sub-optimal, considering the levels of funding involved and beneficiary need over time.

Looking ahead, in response to a request from the Executive Board, OEV aims to increase coverage with a view to meeting the specific accountability requirements of protracted L3 and L2 crises, including multi-country crises. This will be achieved through evaluations of corporate emergency responses, either conducted by WFP or Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations (in accordance with revised guidelines), or country portfolio evaluations<sup>59</sup> together with decentralized evaluations of certain aspects as appropriate.

## IMPACT EVALUATIONS

The new impact evaluation strategy will be finalized in 2018, covering centralized and decentralized evaluations. The strategy will build on experience with the strategic partnership between WFP and the Humanitarian Action Thematic Window. Partnering is especially important, enabling increased coverage by working with highly specialized experts to conduct credible, high-quality impact evaluations that meet the methodological challenges of humanitarian contexts, increase the capacity available to WFP and provide learning opportunities.

## EVALUATION SYNTHESSES

Looking ahead, OEV is exploring potential new types of synthesis products to promote the use of evaluation evidence to WFP management and partners. The increasing coverage of country portfolio evaluations from 2019 will provide a significant opportunity to synthesize evidence to promote cross-regional learning by identifying programmatic and thematic lessons across WFP's diverse operating environments. The volume of decentralized evaluations will also increase; once OEV is satisfied with the quality of the evidence generated, it should be possible to produce synthesized evidence by region and/or theme.

### 3.4 Medium-term outlook

The CSP and interim CSP formulation process has provided an unprecedented opportunity to use evaluation evidence in programme design and evaluation planning and budgeting. This demonstrates real progress in embedding the evaluation culture into decision-making and practice across WFP, as envisaged in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021).

To a certain extent, the 2018–2020 OEV work plan, approved by the Executive Board in November, already reflects the need to respond to the opportunities and challenges of decentralized evaluations and to align elements of centralized evaluations to evolving needs. The next step is to deepen and broaden this work in consultation with WFP management and the Executive Board. This will be reflected in the 2019–2021 OEV work plan.

As in previous years, close attention must be paid to ensure consistent progress towards evaluation coverage norms and resource requirements.

As the IRM takes shape, the means to ensure the sustainable financing of evaluations to meet the policy target are becoming clearer and new opportunities are unfolding. With guidance from the EFSG, the mechanisms for delivering more resources at all levels will be codified, and it is expected that the bulk of new financing will come from programme resources for evaluation at the country office level.

Regarding human resources, the first phase in scaling up WFP's evaluation function has been largely achieved by hiring staff on short-term arrangements. As the development of the evaluation function evolves into the roll-out and embedding of evaluation in the programme cycle, staffing plans are being drawn up to ensure more long-term and secure access to adequate skilled human resources. The plans will need to build on the "Build, Borrow/Rent, Buy" model and identify appropriate career pathways within WFP's corporate "People Strategy",<sup>60</sup> harnessing synergies with monitoring functions.





## Annexes



# Annex I. KPI Dashboard


1

## Evaluation coverage KPIs

**active policies** evaluated within 4 to 6 years




**WFP ten largest portfolios,** covered by a CPE in the previous 5 years



**active corporate emergency responses** ongoing in the previous 3 years evaluated




**WFP portfolios** (excluded 10 largest), covered by a CPE in the previous 10 years



**country programmes** that ended in 2017 had an evaluation that year or the previous one



**country offices** have completed at least one decentralized evaluation within a 3 year period



2

### Evaluation quality KPI

evaluation reports received a rating in PHQA of 'meeting requirements' or higher





3

### Evaluation use KPIs

strategic programme review documents commented on by OEV

Implementation of actions within management responses



5

### Evaluation funding KPI

0.18% is the expenditure on evaluation as a percentage of WFP total contribution income



0.15% in 2016

6

### Evaluation partnerships KPI

3 completed joint and inter-agency humanitarian evaluations in which WFP participated



1 in 2016

# Annex II. Overview of WFP policies current in 2017 and evaluation coverage

APPROVAL DATE	POLICY AREA AND TITLES OF DOCUMENTS IN WHICH POLICIES ARE SET OUT	YEAR OF EVALUATION START/ PRESENTATION TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD
2000	Participatory approaches <i>Participatory Approaches (WFP/EB.3/2000/3-D)</i>	
2002	Urban food insecurity <i>Urban Food Insecurity: Strategies for WFP (WFP/EB.A/2002/5-B)</i>	
2003	Food aid and livelihoods in emergencies <i>Food Aid and Livelihoods in Emergencies: Strategies for WFP (WFP/EB.A/2003/5-A)</i>	
2004	Emergency needs assessment <i>Emergency Needs Assessments (WFP/EB.1/2004/4-A)</i>	2007 second regular session <sup>61</sup>
2004	Humanitarian principles <i>Humanitarian Principles (WFP/EB.A/2004/5-C)</i>	2018 annual session
2005	Definition of emergencies <i>Definition of Emergencies (WFP/EB.1/2005/4-A/Rev.1)</i>	
2005	Exiting emergencies <i>Exiting Emergencies (WFP/EB.1/2005/4-B)</i>	
2006	Targeting in emergencies <i>Targeting in Emergencies (WFP/EB.1/2006/5-A)</i>	
2006	Humanitarian access <i>Note on Humanitarian Access and its Implications for WFP (WFP/EB.1/2006/5-B/Rev.1)</i>	2018 annual session
2006	Food procurement in developing countries <i>Food Procurement in Developing Countries (WFP/EB.1/2006/5-C)</i>	
2006	Economic analysis <i>The Role and Application of Economic Analysis in WFP (WFP/EB.A/2006/5-C)</i>	
2008	Vouchers and cash transfers <i>Vouchers and Cash Transfers as Food Assistance Instruments: Opportunities and Challenges (WFP/EB.2/2008/4-B)</i>	2015 first regular session <sup>62</sup>
2009	Capacity development <i>WFP Policy on Capacity Development (WFP/EB.2/2009/4-B)</i>	2017 first regular session <sup>63</sup>
2010	HIV and AIDS <sup>64</sup> <i>WFP HIV and AIDS Policy (WFP/EB.2/2010/4-A)</i>	Planned to start in 2019
2011	Disaster risk reduction and management <i>WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (WFP/EB.2/2011/4-A)</i>	

Subject to ongoing and planned strategic evaluations

New policy planned to be presented to the Executive Board in 2018

Not evaluated

Evaluated

Evaluation ongoing

Evaluation planned

APPROVAL DATE	POLICY AREA AND TITLES OF DOCUMENTS IN WHICH POLICIES ARE SET OUT	YEAR OF EVALUATION START/ PRESENTATION TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD
2012	Humanitarian protection <i>WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (WFP/EB.1/2012/5-B/Rev.1)</i>	2018 annual session
2012	Social protection and safety nets <i>Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy (WFP/EB.A/2012/5-A)</i>	Planned to start in 2018
2013	Peacebuilding in transition settings <i>WFP's Role in Peacebuilding in Transition Settings (WFP/EB.2/2013/4-A/Rev.1)</i>	Planned to start in 2019
2013	School feeding <sup>65</sup> <i>Revised School Feeding Policy (WFP/EB.2/2013/4-C)</i>	
2014	Corporate partnership <sup>66</sup> <i>WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017) (WFP/EB.A/2014/5-B)</i>	2017 annual session
2014	Workforce management <i>WFP People Strategy: A People Management Framework for Achieving WFP's Strategic Plan (2014–2017) (WFP/EB.2/2014/4-B)</i>	Planned to start in 2018
2015	Gender <sup>67</sup> <i>Gender Policy (2015–2020) (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-A)</i>	Planned to start in 2019
2015	Enterprise risk management <i>Enterprise Risk Management Policy (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-B)</i> <i>Directive on the Corporate Risk Management Register (RM2012/004)</i> <i>Risk Appetite Statement (WFP/EB.1/2016/4-C)</i>	
2015	Building resilience for food security and nutrition <i>Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C)</i>	
2015	South–South and triangular cooperation <i>South–South and Triangular Cooperation Policy (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-D)</i>	
2015	Fraud and corruption <i>Anti-Fraud and Anti-Corruption Policy (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-E/1)</i>	
2015	Evaluation <sup>68</sup> <i>Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) (WFP/EB.2/2015/4-A/Rev.1)</i>	
2016	CSPs <i>Policy on CSPs (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-C/1/Rev.1)</i>	
2017	Environment <i>Environmental Policy (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-B/Rev.1)</i>	
2017	Climate change <i>Climate Change Policy (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-A/Rev.1)</i>	
2017	Nutrition <sup>69</sup> <i>Nutrition Policy (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-C)</i>	
2017	Emergency preparedness <i>Emergency preparedness policy - Strengthening WFP emergency preparedness for effective response (WFP/EB.2/2017/4-B/Rev.1)</i>	

Source: OEV database; Compendium of policies relating to the Strategic Plan (WFP/EB.1/2018/4).

# Endnotes

- 1 WFP/EB.2/2015/4-A/Rev.1.
- 2 In the past, OEV did not present single operation evaluations to the Executive Board, but instead an annual synthesis of operation evaluations. The final annual synthesis report for that series of evaluations was presented to the Executive Board in 2017. From 2018 OEV will no longer undertake operation evaluations.
- 3 WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1/Rev.2.
- 4 WFP/EB.2/2016/4-C/1/Rev.1.
- 5 WFP/EB.2/2015/5-C/1.
- 6 WFP/EB.2/2016/4-B/1/Rev.1.
- 7 The Mali impact evaluation includes a qualitative analysis of conflict-afflicted populations to identify patterns of conflict exposure. This analysis will be concluded in 2018.
- 8 Each constituent evaluation comprises a summary evaluation report (SER) and a full evaluation report; the synthesis is based on the main findings and lessons from four WFP-funded evaluations of the impact of nutrition and food security interventions in Chad, Mali, the Niger and the Sudan.
- 9 For operation evaluations, the reference period refers to the scope of the evaluation.
- 10 "WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017)" (WFP/EB.A/2014/5-B).
- 11 "WFP Policy on Capacity Development" (WFP/EB.2/2009/4-B).
- 12 "Humanitarian Principles" (WFP/EB.A/2004/5-C).
- 13 "Note on Humanitarian Access and its Implications for WFP" (WFP/EB.1/2006/5-B/Rev.1).
- 14 "WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy" (WFP/EB.1/2012/5-B/Rev.1).
- 15 General Assembly resolution 70/1 of 25 September 2015.
- 16 "Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy" (WFP/EB.A/2012/5-A).
- 17 Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets (WFP/EB.A/2011/7-B).
- 18 WFP People Strategy. A People Management Framework for Achieving WFP's Strategic Plan (2014-2017) (WFP/EB.2/2014/4-B).
- 19 Although the Strategic Plan 2017–2021 does not have a strategic objective related to resilience, it is one of the focus areas around which national strategic outcomes are framed. Resilience is included in the Corporate Results Framework (2017–2021) under Strategic Objective 3 (Achieve food security) and Strategic Result 4 (Food systems are sustainable).
- 20 "WFP Management Plan (2017–2019)" (WFP/EB.2/2016/5-A/1/Rev.2).
- 21 Some country offices have developed CSPs and, others, ICSPs.
- 22 Fund allocations were made to the following country offices: Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Timor-Leste, Guinée, Congo, Algeria, Pakistan, Ecuador, Lesotho, Sierra Leone, the Gambia, China, Ethiopia, Armenia, Senegal and Zambia.
- 23 During 2017, the calculation methodologies for some KPIs were refined and clarified. In these cases, the results for 2016 are shown, recalculated using the revised methodology.
- 24 In terms of value in USD of resourced requirements and implemented through operations or trust funds.
- 25 In countries with only one development project or country programme, evaluations can be every five years.
- 26 "WFP Policy Formulation" (WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B).
- 27 "Enterprise Risk Management Policy" (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-B).
- 28 As specified in the WFP Evaluation Policy (2016-2021).
- 29 To ensure the greatest possible accuracy in the evaluation coverage of WFP's interventions, country offices are categorized according to the USD size of the WFP portfolio of activities per country as recorded in the programme of work.
- 30 This norm was increased by the WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-C/1/Rev.1).
- 31 The Board approved the norm as described in the document "WFP Policy Formulation" (WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B).
- 32 i.e., policies that were adopted between 2011 and 2013.
- 33 WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1/Rev.2.
- 34 Of 6 policies.
- 35 "Compendium of policies relating to the Strategic Plan" (WFP/EB.1/2018/4).
- 36 Emergency needs assessment (evaluated in 2007).
- 37 The policy on capacity development was evaluated in 2016 and the policy on vouchers and cash transfers was evaluated in 2014.
- 38 An evaluation of WFP's policy on HIV and AIDS is planned for 2019, an evaluation of the policy on humanitarian principles and humanitarian access (both covered by a single evaluation of principled access in humanitarian contexts) is under way, and the results are expected to be presented to the Board in June 2018.
- 39 Republic of South Sudan, Cambodia and Cameroon.
- 40 Cambodia, Cameroon, Mali, Central African Republic and Somalia.
- 41 Sudan: country portfolio evaluation (2010–2012); Iraq: country portfolio evaluation (2010–2015); South Sudan: country portfolio evaluation (2011–2015)

- 42 The methodology for calculating this KPI was adjusted in 2017. The figures above show the results for 2016 and 2017 using the same new methodology for both years.
- 43 OEV has commissioned a follow-up evaluation of the corporate emergency response to the Syrian crisis, which will be completed in 2018.
- 44 Pakistan operation evaluation of protracted relief and recovery operation 200250.
- 45 Malawi is also included as a case study in the ongoing strategic evaluation of resilience, reporting in 2018.
- 46 The Kenya country office is currently conducting a number of decentralized evaluations.
- 47 In 2017, the norm was refined for reliable measurability compared to the simple statement in the Evaluation Policy (2016–2021) that “all corporate emergency responses” would be evaluated. This refinement leads to a result of 75 percent for 2016 (shown in fig.13), compared to the 33 percent stated in the 2016 annual evaluation report.
- 48 The 2017 list of countries is as follows: South Sudan (country portfolio evaluation), Yemen, Syrian Arab Republic (corporate emergency response evaluation), Iraq (country portfolio evaluation), Nigeria, southern Africa, Central African Republic (IAHE), Philippines (IAHE) and Cameroon (country portfolio evaluation), plus Ebola (corporate emergency response evaluation). The 2016 list of countries is as follows: South Sudan (IAHE), Yemen, Syrian Arab Republic (corporate emergency response evaluation), Iraq (country portfolio evaluation), Central African Republic (IAHE), Philippines (IAHE) and Cameroon (country portfolio evaluation), plus Ebola (corporate emergency response evaluation).
- 49 This is explained as follows: three country offices completed more than one decentralized evaluation; two decentralized evaluations commissioned by headquarters divisions are not included, even though they covered six countries; and the total number of country offices increased in 2017.
- 50 Including 23 CSPs, 7 interim CSPs and 47 transitional interim CSPs.
- 51 “WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021)” (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1/Rev.2).
- 52 The decentralized evaluations completed in 2017 were the end-of-term evaluation of REACH in Burkina Faso, Haiti, Mali, Myanmar and Senegal for 2014–2017 and the evaluation of the Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA Africa) programme in Senegal’s Kédougou region.
- 53 The reported value for 2016 in the 2016 annual evaluation report was 0.18 percent. This was based on projections of WFP contributions (USD 4.9 billion) for that year in the Management Plan (2017–2019), presented at the 2017 second regular session of the Board (WFP/EB.2/2017/5-A/1/Rev.1), pending release of the audited annual accounts for 2016. In those audited annual accounts, published in June 2017 (WFP/EB.A/2017/6-A/1), WFP contributions were adjusted to USD 5.9 billion, while evaluation expenditure for 2016 remained unchanged. Consequently, the percentage dropped to 0.15 percent.
- 54 Source: evaluation function records. OEV is aware of some interpretation errors at the country level in the assignment of costs to the new line in country portfolio budgets dedicated to evaluation, as well as issues arising in the transition to the new budgeting system for WFP. Expenditure records for decentralized evaluations do not include evaluation management costs or any costs related to evaluations not yet completed.
- 55 GA Resolution, A/RES/71/243.
- 56 United Nations Evaluation Group. 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- 57 General Assembly resolution 71/243.
- 58 General Assembly resolution 72/684.
- 59 Of the 11 L2 crises ongoing in 2014–2016, five have been covered by country portfolio evaluations (ongoing or completed). Country portfolio evaluations of Somalia and Ethiopia will shed some light on the Horn of Africa crisis.
- 60 “WFP People Strategy: A People Management Framework for Achieving WFP’s Strategic Plan (2014–2017)” (WFP/EB.2/2014/4-B).
- 61 Evaluation of WFP’s Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessment Implementation Plan (WFP/EB.2/2007/6-A).
- 62 Summary Evaluation Report (SER) on WFP’s Cash and Voucher Policy (2008–2014) (WFP/EB.1/2015/5-A).
- 63 SER of WFP Policy on Capacity Development (WFP/EB.1/2017/6-A/Rev.1).
- 64 A Thematic Evaluation of WFP’s HIV and AIDS Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa was presented at the second regular session in 2008 (WFP/EB.2/2008/6-A/Rev.1).
- 65 An evaluation of the WFP School Feeding Policy was presented at the first regular session in 2012 (WFP/EB.1/2012/6-D).
- 66 SER on the Corporate Partnership Strategy (WFP/EB.A/2017/7-B).
- 67 An evaluation of the WFP Gender Policy (2008–2013) was presented at the first regular session in 2014 (WFP/EB.1/2014/5-A).
- 68 A Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the World Food Programme was presented at the annual session in 2014 (WFP/EB.A/2014/7-D).
- 69 An evaluation of the Nutrition Policy (2012–2014) was presented at the second regular session in 2015 (WFP/EB.2/2015/6-A).

# Acronyms

<b>CEF</b>	Contingency Evaluation Fund
<b>CSP</b>	Country Strategic Plan
<b>EFSG</b>	Evaluation Function Steering Group
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
<b>IAHE</b>	Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation
<b>ICSP</b>	Interim Country Strategic Plan
<b>IRM</b>	Integrated Road Map
<b>KPI</b>	Key Performance Indicator
<b>OEV</b>	Office of Evaluation
<b>SDG</b>	Sustainable Development Goal
<b>UN-SWAP</b>	United Nations System-Wide Action Plan

# Photographs

Front page  
Blanket Supplementary Feeding  
Programme, **Bangladesh**.  
©2017, WFP/Saikat Mojumder



Pages 4-5  
Families in Bhashantek, **Bangladesh**.  
©2017, WFP/Wahid Adnan



Pages 6-7  
Lawrence Mborifué, a refugee from  
South Sudan in **Central African Republic**.  
©2017, WFP/Bruno Djoyo



Page 8  
Darfur, **Sudan**.  
©2005, WFP/Diego Fernandez Gabaldon



Page 10  
Food distribution, **Democratic  
Republic of the Congo**.  
©2017, WFP/Griff Tapper



Page 12  
School Feeding in **Haiti**.  
©2016, WFP/Alejandro Chicheri



Page 18  
Visit of Supply Chain Director Ms. Corinne  
Fleischer to **Somalia**.  
©2017, WFP/Karel Prinsloo



Page 20  
Food assistance for assets in Ndokayo,  
**Cameroon**.  
©2017, WFP/Simon Pierre Diouf



Page 22  
Page 42  
WFP school meals programme in **Sudan**.  
©2017, WFP/Ala Kheir



Page 24-25-26  
Myanmar conflict, **Bangladesh**.  
©2017, WFP/Saikat Mojumder



Page 28  
WFP Purchase for Progress Programme,  
**Uganda**.  
©2017, WFP/Waswa Moses



Page 32  
WFP Airdrops in Ganyiel, **South Sudan**.  
©2017, WFP/Sabine Starke



Page 37  
Les Cayes (Aux Cayes), **Haiti**.  
©2016, WFP/Alexis Masciarelli



Page 44-45-46  
School Meals in Muisne, **Ecuador**.  
©2017, WFP/Alejandra Leon



Page 47  
COMANYA Nyanza cooperative, **Rwanda**.  
©2017, WFP/Jonathan Eng



Page 64-65  
WFP reaches four besieged Syrian towns,  
**Syrian Arab Republic**.  
©2016, WFP/Hussam Al Saleh

**World Food Programme**

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70  
00148 Rome, Italy  
T +39 06 65131 [wfp.org](http://wfp.org)