



EVALUATION QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Office of Evaluation
Measuring Results, Sharing Lessons

TERMS OF REFERENCE

SYNTHESIS OF EVIDENCE AND LESSONS FROM WFP'S POLICY EVALUATIONS (2011 - 2019)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Background	2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Context	3
2. Purpose of the Synthesis	4
2.1 Rationale and Objectives.....	4
2.2 Stakeholders and Users	4
3. Synthesis questions, scope and proposed approach	5
3.1 Synthesis questions	5
3.2 Scope	5
3.3 Proposed approach and methodology	7
4. Organization of the Synthesis	9
4.1 Policy Synthesis Team, Roles and Responsibilities	9
4.2 Communication	9
4.3 Timeline	11
ANNEXES	13
Annex 1: WFP Internal Reference Group (IRG) composition.....	13
Annex 2: Suggested Reporting Format	14
Annex 3: E-library	14
Annex 4: Communication and learning plan	17

1. Background

1. The purpose of these terms of reference (TOR) is to guide the conduct of the proposed Synthesis of Evidence and Lessons from WFP's Policy Evaluations (2011 to 2019). There is a growing body of evidence generated through WFP policy evaluations on the conception, implementation, uptake, and results associated with WFP policies in different areas ranging from school feeding and safety nets, to gender and capacity development.
2. This synthesis aims to bring together findings from WFP policy evaluations conducted since 2011 to shed a light on learning and uptake from policy evaluations and generate further evidence on the programming in a range of policy areas, as well as on policy processes to inform current thinking on the policy cycle in WFP.

1.1 Introduction

3. At WFP, policy evaluations focus on specific policies and the systems, guidance, initiatives, and programmes that were established to implement them. Collectively, the evaluation questions aim to generate insights and evidence that will help policy makers to improve future policies and assist programme staff in policy implementation. Policy evaluations also seek to facilitate understanding by diverse stakeholders of the assumptions, expectations and objectives that the policy should meet. Consistently, they all ask high-level questions¹ around the quality of the policy, its results, and seek to explain why and how these results occurred.
4. The norm governing the evaluation of WFP's policies is set by the WFP Policy Formulation document approved by the Board in April 2011². It requires that policies approved after 2011 are evaluated between 4 to 6 years³ following the start of implementation to assess their effectiveness and feed into WFP's policy cycle.⁴
5. The prioritisation of policy evaluations⁵ is based on an analysis of WFP's Policy Compendium and information on future policy developments. Specifically, policy evaluations are a requirement prior to new policy development, and together with synthesis products they can be used as one of the sources for identifying policy gaps or highlighting the need to update existing policies.
6. Evaluation syntheses are an approach used to highlight issues that cut across different evaluations, and to address questions using an existing evidence base⁶. Syntheses bring together existing evaluation evidence and findings, assess them against a conceptual framework and develop an analysis to answer specific policy, programme, or system-related questions.⁷
7. This synthesis of evidence from policy evaluations has been initiated in response to a growing interest of WFP stakeholders to: **i)** enhance the knowledge base on WFP policy development and policy effectiveness; **ii)** identify recurrent findings useful to derive lessons across different policy areas; and **iii)** reflect on how effectively WFP has responded to and used

1 The high-level evaluation questions are: 1) What is the quality of the Policy? 2) What were the results of the Policy? 3) What were the factors that affected the implementation and results of the policy?

2 WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B

3 Ibid. para 14.

4. The Compendium of policies relating to the Strategic Plan is intended to guide the work of the Secretariat and the Board; it is updated annually to reflect any changes in the policies listed in it.

5 Policies approved before 2010 are progressively included in OEV's workplan based on assessment of their continued relevance to WFP's work or potential to contribute to new policy development

6 This also entails that evaluation syntheses generally do not include extensive field-based primary data collection activities.

7 Canadian Evaluation Society (2009), and US GAO (1992).

policy evaluations to improve results. This synthesis will be presented for consideration to the WFP Executive Board in June 2020.

1.2 Context

8. The broader context within WFP is characterised by growing demands for evidence generation and a commitment for more systematic use of evidence to inform strategic directions, policies and programmes. The Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CSP) for example includes a provision for mandatory evaluations, thereby embedding evaluative planning, budgeting and thinking into the country-level programming framework.⁸ Moreover, OEV has reviewed each CSP-related Concept Note to ensure a strong use of evaluative evidence and emphasised the need to plan and budget for the mandatory CSP evaluations and at least one decentralized evaluation during each CSP cycle. Regional Evaluation Officers are also increasingly supporting the use of evidence by Country Offices (COs) by preparing summaries of evaluative evidence to contribute to CSP planning processes.

9. The value of evaluative evidence for learning and accountability was also recognised in latest Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) that highlighted how “[o]ne of WFP’s strengths is its ability to rely on a strong evaluation system; and while there are still some gaps in the system, a culture of using evaluation evidence in planning and programming is emerging.”⁹

10. Most recently, at the 2019 Global Evaluation Meeting, the Office of Evaluation (OEV) brought together colleagues from different parts of WFP to discuss the generation and use of evidence generated not only through evaluations, but also through other functions in WFP such as monitoring, operational research as well as through other oversight functions. The discussion underscored not only the need for strengthened knowledge management systems to support evidence use and uptake, but also that more can be done to synthesise evidence and lessons from the existing (and growing) body of evaluations systematically carried out in WFP.¹⁰

11. Evaluation synthesis are one of the products issued by the OEV to respond to such growing interest in and demand for succinct and actionable analysis drawing from completed evaluations.

12. Until 2016, the annual evaluation report included a high-level synthesis of finding and lessons emerging from the evaluations conducted within the previous year¹¹. OEV also carried out an annual synthesis of Operations Evaluations from 2014 to 2017 and prepared syntheses of other series, such as the Impact Evaluation series on moderate-acute malnutrition.¹²

13. In 2017, OEV changed its approach to be more responsive to specific demands for synthesis products. The first exercise was the Synthesis of WFP’s Country Portfolio Evaluations in the Sahel and Horn of Africa from 2016 to 2018, which was presented to the Executive Board for consideration in June 2019.¹³

⁸ For example, it is worth noting the commitment reflected in the WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans to evaluate all CSPs to generate evidence on results and lessons to inform subsequent country-level support. See WFP/EB.2/2016/4-C/1/Rev.1, para 94.

⁹ MOPAN 2017-2018 Organisational Performance brief, page 4.

¹⁰ See for example the 2017 Annual Evaluation Report.

¹¹ See for example WFP Annual Evaluation Report 2015, pp.8-11.

¹² WFP/EB.1/2018/5-C/Add.1

¹³ The synthesis was presented to the Executive Board in June 2019. WFP/EB.A/2019/7-C Synthesis of WFP’s country portfolio evaluations in Africa (2016-2018).

14. The present synthesis aims to expand the learning from Policy Evaluations¹⁴ further and strengthen OEV's efforts to provide synthesis products of interest to different target audiences within WFP, including Executive Board Members.

15. Considering the growing body of evidence generated through different types of evaluations in WFP, a greater investment by OEV to commission synthesis products can also be seen as an effort to create greater efficiencies within the evaluation function. This can be done through **i)** further analysing and interrogating existing evaluative evidence without extensive plans for field-based data collection activities; **ii)** developing and refining over time an approach and methodology to produce succinct and user-oriented analytical products that bring together findings and lessons from different evaluations; and, **iii)** maximising the learning from a broad sample of evaluative work by applying different analytical and thematic lenses.

2. Purpose of the Synthesis

2.1 Rationale and Objectives

16. This synthesis has been initiated in response to a perceived gap in policy learning and uptake in WFP, and a demand for succinct and actionable analysis that builds on existing evaluative evidence.

17. Balancing learning and accountability purposes, this synthesis aims to:

- Identify recurrent findings within and across different policy areas and highlight key themes of strategic relevance for WFP;
- Contribute new learning on policy formulation and uptake in WFP highlighting the factors that enable or hamper **(a)** the quality of policy-making; and **(b)** the chances of uptake and effective roll-out of new or updated policy directions by WFP Divisions, Bureaux and Offices;¹⁵
- Explore issues around learning and uptake from policy evaluations; and
- Serve an accountability purpose through exploring the extent of management response to recommendations from policy evaluations.

18. Four high-level questions relating to the objectives above, key scoping details and a proposed approach to the synthesis are outlined in section 3.

2.2 Stakeholders and Users

19. The synthesis will seek the views of, and be useful to, a range of WFP's internal and external stakeholders. The primary internal stakeholders and intended audience of the synthesis are the WFP policy-makers, WFP Senior Management, Regional Bureaux (RB) and Country Offices (COs) and the Executive Board members.

20. As secondary audience, the synthesis will be of interest to all United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) members part of the Evaluating Policy Support group¹⁶, as a platform for peer

14 In 2017, OEV engaged in a lessons learning exercise focusing on Policy Evaluations, and produced a guidance note on *Top 10 lessons for Policy Quality in WFP*, which has recently been updated to include evidence from policy evaluations until 2018. This Note is meant to provide WFP stakeholders with a set of practical tips on ensuring high-quality policy design, and to increase the likelihood of policy successful implementation. The note is available at: <https://www.wfp.org/publications/top-10-lessons-policy-quality-wfp>

15 This will also be done expanding and adding nuances to the analysis contained in the note on Top 10 Lessons for Policy Quality in WFP issued by OEV in 2018 and revised in 2019.

16 The group also includes the Evaluation Offices of the other Rome Based Agencies.

learning and exchange across the UNEG membership on methodologies and approaches to improve the quality and uptake of policy evaluations.

3. Synthesis questions, scope and proposed approach

3.1 Synthesis questions

21. This synthesis will try to answer four main questions listed below.
22. In the set of policy evaluations completed by WFP since the issuance of the Policy Formulation note in 2011:
 - a) What are common themes, systemic issues, and potential opportunities most recurrently highlighted within and across policy domains in WFP? Have these elements been reflected in the WFP Strategic Plans (SPs)¹⁷ and, if so, how and to what extent? What implications does this have for policy coherence in WFP, and the delivery of the current SP?
 - b) What elements appear to have enabled effective policy-making and policy implementation in order to contribute to achieve the expected results in the different policy areas?
 - c) What is the extent of implementation of the actions agreed in the final management response by the targeted responsible entities?
 - d) What is the evidence of WFP applying the learning generated through policy evaluations?
23. A number of sub-questions will be developed by the synthesis team, to be discussed, refined and agreed with OEV in the inception stage of the synthesis.

3.2 Scope

24. This synthesis will include all policy evaluations conducted by OEV between April 2011 when the WFP Note on Policy Formulation was issued, and August 2019 as listed below.

Table 1: Policy evaluations completed between 2011 and 2019

Evaluation report	Evaluation presented to the Board session	Related WFP policy issued in
WFP's School Feeding Policy	EB.1.2012	2009
Evaluation of WFP's 2009 Gender Policy. This Time Around?	EB.1.2014	2008
WFP's 2008 Cash and Voucher Policy	EB.1.2015	2008
Nutrition Policy	EB.2.2015	2012
WFP's Policy on Capacity Development (2009): An Update on Implementation	EB.1.2017	2009
Evaluation of the WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017) **	EB.A.2017	2014
WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy	EB.A.2018	2012
WFP Policies on Humanitarian Principles (2004) and Access in Humanitarian Contexts	EB.A.2018	2006
Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy: The Role of Food Assistance in Social Protection	EB.A.2019	2012

NOTES: (*) It is noteworthy to highlight some inconsistencies in the categorisation and use of terminology for WFP normative documents particularly in relation to the use of the terms 'strategy' and 'policies'. On this point see also the WFP OEV note on Top 10 Lessons for Policy Quality in WFP.

¹⁷ The synthesis can also look at other normative documents beyond the SP. Given the timeframe of the synthesis from 2011 to 2019, the following strategic plans should be looked at: WFP Strategic Plan 2008-2013; WFP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 ; WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021.

(**) Despite the label of 'strategy' this evaluation has been commissioned and managed as a Policy Evaluation (i.e. following all WFP EQAS provisions for policy evaluations) as this Strategy was included in the Policy Compendium.

25. The synthesis is also expected to explore how learning and uptake from policy evaluations has been translated in other strategic and normative work in the organisation.¹⁸ Hence the need to include in the desk review some of the main WFP strategies as they relate to the policies included in this synthesis.¹⁹

26. The synthesis is expected to draw from a broad and diverse body of information, evaluative evidence, primary and secondary data. Main secondary data sources include:

- the full set of policy documents that have been evaluated, coupled with any other type of normative work that specifically relate to the policies;
- the full spectrum of information related to the management response following the completion of a policy evaluation in WFP – including information on management responses and relevant excerpts from the ACE database²⁰;
- all the WFP strategic plans that span across the 2011-2019 period;
- Annual Performance Reports for the period under consideration;
- Relevant excerpts from the assessments in the Corporate Risk Register;
- Relevant excerpts from Audit recommendations in thematic areas similar to those included in the synthesis;
- all OEV Annual Evaluation Reports since 2011;
- Different synthesis reports issued by OEV²¹ – including background research done to inform that analysis.

27. Primary data gathered for the synthesis will mainly come from interviews with WFP stakeholders as outlined with more details in table 2 below.

28. The overall design of the synthesis is expected to be inductive in nature – without pre-empting specific programmatic areas or themes to be included in the synthesis. The synthesis team is also expected to work in an iterative manner with OEV by submitting a synthesis protocol and analytical approach that may evolve and be refined during the course of the synthesis in light of how evidence will cluster around specific topics of interest.

29. Moreover, to the extent needed in order to probe and corroborate emerging insights from the synthesis, the team may also need to refer to recent WFP Strategic Evaluations, other types of assessments and reviews, and other Policy Evaluations issued prior to 2011.

30. The synthesis team is not expected to carry out a new set of evidence quality reviews for all the policy evaluations included in the synthesis, but to take into account and rely on the results of the post-hoc evaluation quality assurance systems consistently used by OEV.²² Nonetheless,

18 Some preliminary analysis on the the hierarchy of normative work in WFP was already included in the OEV note on the Top 10 Lessons for policy work in WFP. This synthesis is expected to update, expand and add nuances to that analysis.

19 This is with the understanding that not all policies in WFP have strategies relating to them.

20 The WFP database currently in use to upload and track evaluation recommendations and their related management response.

21 As outlined in the Section 1.2.

22 The assumption being that each policy evaluation text and related content of the management response underwent multiple rounds of reviews, inputs, stakeholder feedback and quality assurance during the drafting and finalisation stage before submission to the Executive Board.

should specific issues or discrepancies relating to evidence quality emerge at the analysis stage, the synthesis team is expected to highlight and probe them further as needed.

3.3 Proposed approach and methodology

31. While a fully-fledged synthesis methodology will be developed and refined at the inception stage, Table 2 contains some suggested approaches and data analysis strategies for the four areas of inquiry relating to the main questions of the synthesis.

Table 2: Overview on proposed approach to the synthesis

Areas of inquiry	Type of analysis	Possible data collection methods
<p>I. Coverage of key themes in relation to the WFP SPs and other normative documents</p>	<p>Recurring themes within and across policy areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content mapping / content analysis • Interviews with a cross section of ‘policy owners’ in WFP, evaluation managers, evaluation team leaders and internal reference group (IRG) members (*) to understand and probe how depth and breadth of coverage of key themes for each evaluation has been negotiated and evolved during each evaluation. • Key Informants Interview (KIIs) with Regional Programme Policy Advisors.
<p>II. Quality and effectiveness of policy-making and policy implementation</p>	<p>Relationship between factors affecting quality of policy-making and policy implementation and uptake.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content analysis of the policy evaluations and related normative work and guidance. (**) • Content analysis of other reviews and strategic evaluations that covered the themes emerging from the first area of inquiry. • Pattern matching • Data analysis on the WFP database of evaluation recommendations and management response information. • Individual and small group interviews with a cross-section of policy internal reference groups members and Senior Regional Programme Advisors to understand learning from policy evaluations, and probe how support to implement new or revised policy directions unfolds. • KIIs with Regional Programme /Policy Advisors. • Individual and small group interviews with a cross-section of WFP Staff in management positions to understand and probe the nature of policy decision making and support to implementation of policy directions.
<p>III. Extent of management response</p>	<p>Extent of management response to recommendations from policy evaluations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis on the WFP database of evaluation recommendations and management response information. • Pattern matching building on the findings from the second and third areas of inquiry. • Individual /small group interviews to understand the extent of change and uptake associated with policy evaluations.
<p>IV. Learning from evaluations</p>	<p>Relationship between management response and learning and uptake from policy evaluations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data mining and data analysis on the WFP database of evaluation recommendations and management response information. • Pattern matching building on the findings from the first and second areas of inquiry. • Individual /small group interviews to understand the type of learning and the extent of change and uptake associated with policy evaluations. • KIIs with Regional Programme/ Policy Advisors.

NOTES: (*) Depending on the topic of the evaluation, Internal Reference Group members (IRG) comprise WFP staff from different Divisions and technical units in Headquarters, Regional Bureaux and Country Offices.

()** Three of the 11 policy evaluation reports considered for this synthesis have already been coded for prior synthesis work by OEV. All information related to the coding will be shared with the synthesis team.

32. Based on the analyses from the desk review and additional primary information, this synthesis report is expected to: **a)** introduce new, or corroborate existing insights into WFP policy-making, including aspects related to policy coherence, and the policy implementation processes; **b)** introduce new, or corroborate existing, insights into how WFP learns and drives changes that are also informed by policy evaluation results; and, **c)** put forward recommendations to OEV strengthen policy evaluations in WFP to enhance uptake and use.

33. An additional deliverable of this synthesis will be a short method note (to be featured in annex) to describe not only the methodology followed to carry out the synthesis, but also put forward some recommendations to OEV as it moves forward to commission synthesis work more systematically.

4. Organization of the Synthesis

4.1. Policy Synthesis Team, Roles and Responsibilities

34. This synthesis will be managed by WFP OEV. Francesca Bonino has been appointed as the synthesis manager. Her responsibilities include: drafting the synthesis TOR; conducting the 1st level quality assurance; setting up the internal reference group; liaising with the consultants who will carry out the synthesis; organizing the feedback workshop and other presentations; soliciting stakeholders' feedback on the draft report. Second level quality assurance will be carried out by Deborah McWhinney, Senior Evaluation Officer in OEV. Evaluation Officer, Ramona Desole, will provide additional research support.

35. The synthesis manager will work closely with an external evaluator who, as the team leader (TL), will team up for this assignment with a senior researcher and a data analyst.

36. Under overall guidance from the TL, the research team's responsibilities include: finalise and submit for review the synthesis methodology and protocol for data extraction and analysis; develop a synthesis matrix; conduct in-depth reviews of the full body of policy evaluations (2011-19), their related management response matrices and recommendations database; carry out key informants interviews; draft the synthesis report for feedback and discussion at an internal stakeholder workshop; submit the revised draft synthesis to OEV and address WFP comments before finalisation.

37. The Director of Evaluation will approve the draft synthesis report on satisfactorily meeting of WFP evaluation quality standards, which are expected to be systematically applied throughout the synthesis process.

38. The main body of the final report is expected not to exceed 20 pages or 7,000 words.

4.2. Communication

39. The synthesis product will be in English. A communication plan will be set out including details about how to communicate the synthesis report within and outside WFP. The use of a workshop and videos will be considered.

40. The internal reference group will serve as an important point for communication. The synthesis along with the management response to the recommendations will be presented to the WFP Executive Board in June 2020. The final synthesis report will be posted on the public WFP

website and OEV will ensure dissemination of lessons through its inclusion in the annual evaluation report. All relevant Headquarter divisions will be encouraged to circulate the final synthesis report with their staff and WFP external stakeholders.

4.3 Timeline

	WFP Synthesis of Policy Evaluations (2011-2019) Key actions	Dates
A	Phase 2 Inception	
	A1 Start up and team orientation	
	Mobilize synthesis team	4-Nov 7-Nov 2019
	Introductory calls - synthesis team and OEV	8-Nov
	A2 Desk review of documents	
	Initial review of documents and e-library	11-Nov 13-Nov
	A4 Prepare draft synthesis method note	
	Draft synthesis method note	14-Nov 18-Nov
	A5 Revise draft method note based on QA feedback	
	OEV review of draft synthesis method note	19-Nov 20-Nov
	Synthesis Team revises draft method note based on QA2 comments	21-Nov 22-Nov
	A6 Finalize draft method note based on DoE comments	
	DoE review and comment on synthesis method note	23-Nov 24-Nov
	Synthesis Team revises and finalizes synthesis method note	25-Nov 26-Nov
B	Phase 3 - Desk review, content analysis and interviews	25 Nov 20 Dec
	B1 In-depth review of relevant information across evaluations	25-Nov 20-Dec
	In-depth review of relevant information across evaluations	
	B2 Conduct content analysis and desk reviews	25-Nov 20-Dec
	Conduct content analysis and desk reviews	
	B3 Conduct interviews with IRG and other stakeholders	25-Nov 20-Dec
	Conduct interviews with IRG and other stakeholders	
C	Phase 4 - Reporting	
Draft zero	1) Synthesis Team Prepares draft synthesis report (D0)	6-Jan 31-Jan 2020
	2) EM 1st round review of draft zero synthesis report	1 – 2 Feb
	3) QA2 review of the zero draft	3-Feb 4-Feb
	4) EM compiles comments (EM + QA2 comments) and send it back to TL	4 Feb
D1	5) Synthesis Team revise draft synthesis report based on EM+QA2 feedback (D1)	5-Feb 11-Feb
	6) EM sends D1 for DOE review with recommendation memo from QA2	DoE comment window 12-17 Feb
D2	7) Synthesis team revises and submits draft synthesis report reflecting DoE's comments (D2)	18 Feb – 24 Feb
	8) EM checks and shares draft synthesis report with IRG	25-Feb
	9) IRG comment window to review of draft 2 synthesis report	IRG comment window 26-Feb 5 Mar
	10) Stakeholder workshop in Rome	3-Mar

	11) Deadline for stakeholder comments	5-Mar
	12) OEV consolidates comments matrix and sends it to the Synthesis Team	5 Mar
D3	13) Synthesis Team revises and submit synthesis report (D3) and response to comments	6-Mar 11-Mar
	14) EM check feedback addressed and share with QA2	12-Mar
	15) QA2 review and comment on D3 synthesis report	12 Mar
	16) Synthesis team revises and submits draft synthesis report based on QA2 comments	13-Mar
	17) EM submits D3 to DoE with recommendation memo on approval/DoE comment on D3 of Synthesis	DoE comment window 16-Mar 19-Mar
D4	18) Revise and submit draft synthesis report (D4)	20-Mar 23-Mar
	19) DoE shares D4 synthesis report with EMG for comment	EMG comment window 25-Mar 3-Apr
	20) EM consolidates comments and shares with TL	4-5 Apr
Final report	21) Revise and submit final synthesis report	6-Apr 8-Apr
	22) DoE review of final synthesis report	DoE final review 9-10 Apr
	23) DoE final submission of the synthesis report	10-Apr deadline EB Secretariat

Legend: DoE: Director of Evaluation, WFP; EB: Executive Board EM: Evaluation Manager (WFP Evaluation Officer assigned to the synthesis); EMG: Executive Management Group (of WFP); IRG: Internal Reference Group; LTA: Long Term Agreement with OEV; LTA-QA: Quality Assurance review carried out by the LTA firm before submitting any interim or final deliverable; QA2: second level quality assurance in OEV RA: Research Analyst from WFP Office of Evaluation assigned to support the evaluation process; RMP: WFP Performance Management and Monitoring Division; TL: Team Leader (independent consultant/from independent evaluation firm)

ANNEXES

Annex 1: WFP Internal Reference Group (IRG) composition

Expected coverage of policy themes based on past policy evaluations	
HQ-level IRG member	
C&V / CBT	Tahir Nour
Capacity strengthening	Maria Lukyanova
Gender	Jacqueline Paul
Humanitarian policy and humanitarian principles	Rebecca Richards
Nutrition	Jennifer Rosenzweig
Partnerships	Frederick Ranitzsch
Performance measurement	Elise Benoit
Programme - Humanitarian and Development	Deborah Yohendran
Protection	Samir Wanmali
School feeding	Edward Lloyddevans
Social Protection	Sarah Laughton
RB-level membership in the IRG	
RB membership of the IRG includes Colleagues in the Policy / Programme Advisors role	
RBB	Ellen Kramer, Regional Programme Advisor
RBC	Rebecca Lamade, DRD a.i. Programme, Strategy and Performance and Siemon Hollema (Head of Programme)
RBD	William Affif, Sr Regional Policy & Programme Advisor
RBJ	TBC
RBN	Ross Smith – Snr. Regional Programme Advisor and Francis Opiyo
RBP	Giorgia Testolin – Snr. Programme Advisor

Annex 2: Suggested Reporting Format

Executive Summary

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

1.2 Purpose

1.3 Methodology

SECTION 2. FINDINGS

2.1 Analysis of recurrent findings from policy evaluation

2.2 Contribution to learning on WFP policy processes

2.3 Learning and uptake from policy evaluations

2.4 Analysis of management responses to policy evaluation recommendations

SECTION 3. CONCLUSIONS

SECTION 4. LESSONS

SECTION 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Suggestions for OEV on conducting policy evaluation synthesis

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Figures and Tables

Annex 3: E-library

Bibliographic entries	Year
EVALUATIONS INCLUDED IN THE SYNTHESIS SCOPE	
Extract from the ACE database - Follow up actions to recs from PEs 30 Sep 2019	2011-2019
Implementation status of evaluation recommendations	2019
CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	
Capacity Development Policy - An Update on Implementation 2009	2009
Capacity Development Policy 2009 _Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	2017
CASH AND VOUCHER	
Cash and voucher Policy	2008
Cash and voucher Policy Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	2014
CORPORATE PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY	
Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014 - 2017)	2014
Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017) Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	2017
GENDER	
Gender policy	2009 & 2015
Gender Policy 2009 Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	

HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES	
2004 WFP Humanitarian Principles	2004
Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access, Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	2018
NUTRITION	
Nutrition Policy	2012 & 2017
Nutrition Policy 2012, Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	2015
PROTECTION	
WFP Humanitarian Protection policy & Update	2012 & 2014
WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy, Evaluation, Annexes and Management Response	2018
SAFETY NETS	
Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy	2012
Evaluation of the Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy	2019
WFP EVALUATION SYNTHESSES AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES	
Annual and Regional Operation Evaluations Series	
Annual Synthesis of OpeEval 2013-2014	2014
Annual Synthesis of OpeEval 2014-2015	2015
Annual Synthesis of OpeEval 2015-2016	2016
Annual Synthesis of OpeEval 2016-2017	2017
RBB OpeEval Series Regional Synthesis	2017
RBC OpeEval Series Regional Synthesis	2017
RBD OpeEval Series Regional Synthesis	2017
RBJ OpeEval Series Regional Synthesis	2017
RBN OpeEval Series Regional Synthesis	2017
RBP OpeEval Series Regional Synthesis	2017
CPEs in Africa	
Synthesis report of WFP's country portfolio evaluations in Africa (2016–2018) and Management response	2019
Impact evaluations of WFP programmes in the Sahel	
Synthesis report on four evaluations of the impact of WFP programmes and Management response	2017
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS	
Annual evaluation reports	2011-2017
AUDIT REPORTS	
Capacity development	
Internal Audit of WFP's Country capacity strengthening, Desk review and Management comment	2016
Cash and voucher	
Internal Audit of Financial Service Providers for Cash Based Transfers and Management comment	2017
2015 Internal Audit of Cash and Voucher Modalities in the Field - Project Design and Set Up and Management comment	2015
WFP POLICY FORMULATION DOCS	
WFP Policy Formulation	2011
Compendium of policies relating to the Strategic Plan	2018

ED Circular Executive management for policy, operations and strategy	2017
Top 10 Lessons for Policy Quality in WFP	2018
Top 10 Lessons for Policy Quality in WFP_In Brief	2018
WFP STRATEGIC PLANS AND RELATED DOCS	
WFP Strategic Plan 2008-2013 and related docs	2008-2013
WFP Strategic Plan (2014-2017) and related docs	2014-2017
WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) (IRM) and related docs	2017-2021
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTS	
Annual Performance Reports	2011-2018
WFP RISK MANAGEMENT	
Enterprise Risk Management Policy	2015
Internal Audit of Operationalization of WFP's Enterprise Risk Management and Management comment	2017
Corporate Risk Register Circular	2012
Corporate Risk Register	June 2019
Risk Appetite Statement	2016
MOPAN	
MOPAN WFP Report	2019
MOPAN WFP Brief	2019

Annex 4: Communication and learning plan

41. Internal (WFP) Communications Plan

When Evaluation phase	What Communication product information	To whom Target group or individual	What level Organizational level of communication e.g. strategic, operational	From whom Lead OEV staff with name/position + other OEV staff views	How Communication means	When	Why Purpose of communication
Preparation		HQ, RB and CO (as needed)	Consultation	Andrea Cook, DoE Deborah McWhinney, QA2 Francesca Bonino, ESM Ramona Desole, EA	Consultations, meetings, emails	Sep 2019	Review/feedback For information
TOR	Draft ToR Final ToR	HQ HQ	Strategic	Andrea Cook, DoE Deborah McWhinney, QA2 Francesca Bonino, ESM Ramona Desole, EA	Emails Web	Sep. 2019	Review / feedback For information
Desk review/ Analysis/ Synthesis	Aide-memoire/PPT	OEV	Operational	Francesca Bonino, ESM Ramona Desole, EA	Emails, Meetings at HQ	Oct / Nov 2019	Sharing preliminary findings. Opportunity for verbal clarifications
Synthesis Report	D1	HQ	Operational & Strategic	Francesca Bonino, ESM Deborah McWhinney, QA2	email	Feb 2020	Review / feedback
	Final Report	HQ, RB and CO (as needed)	Strategic	Andrea Cook, DoE Deborah McWhinney, QA2 Francesca Bonino, ESM Ramona Desole, EA	email	Feb / March 2020	Review / feedback (EMG on SR)
Post-report/EB	2-page synthesis brief	HQ RB and CO	Informative	Andrea Cook, DoE Deborah McWhinney, QA2 Francesca Bonino, ESM Ramona Desole, EA	email	March 2019	Dissemination of evaluation findings and conclusions
Throughout	Sections in brief/PPT or other briefing material	HQ RB and CO (as needed)	Informative & Strategic		Email, in-person interactions	As opportunities arise (roughly every 1.5 month)	Information about linkage to Strategy Evaluations and other new / ongoing Policy Evaluations

42. External Communications

When Phase of the synthesis plus planned month/year	What Communication product/information	To whom Target organization or individual	From whom Evaluation management, evaluation team, etc.	How Communication means	Why Purpose of communication
TOR, Sept 2019	Final ToR	Public	OEV	Website	Public information
Reporting, edited version March 2020	Final report and Management Response	Public	OEV and RMP	Website	Public information
Evaluation Brief, March 2020	2-page evaluation brief	Board members and wider Public	OEV	Website	Public information
EB Annual Session, March 2020	Synthesis summary	Board members	OEV & RMP	Formal presentation	For EB consideration