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| --- | --- |
| **General** | **Comments** |
| Meets the purpose and objectives of the Inception Report:  The inception report (IR) is meant to ensure a common understanding of what the evaluation is about, how the work is to be performed, who is to do what, what is to be produced and when deliverables are expected. More precisely its objectives are to:   * Reconstruct the implicit and explicit logic of intervention of the CSP and its key assumptions * Finalize the evaluability assessment * Fine tune evaluation scope, subquestions and methodology as relevant and appropriate, also in view of the evaluability assessment * Develop the evaluation matrix * Identify specific data gaps * Develop data collection tools and test them as appropriate and feasible * Sample informants and filed visits for the main evaluation mission * Finalize the stakeholder mapping and analysis * Develop a detailed workplan with roles and responsibilities for the team and deadlines for each deliverable * Use gender-sensitive and human rights-based language throughout, including data disaggregated by sex, age, disability, etc. * Not exceed 15,000 words, excluding annexes * Be submitted in line with editorial requirements   Timeliness: inception report submitted according to the agreed timeline   * Template has been followed. * Acronyms are spelt out the first time they are used * Paragraphs and pages are numbered electronically * Cross-references are used   Tables and diagrams are used as relevant and are numbered   * Cover Page: * Uses OEV EQAS Template/Layout for CSPEs * Title of the evaluation identical to that in the ToR (unless agreed otherwise). * Date and status of the report (draft/final) indicated on the cover page |  |
| **1.Introduction** | |
| **1.1. Evaluation features** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Define CSPE and present rationale, objectives and users of the evaluation     - Briefly describe the purpose of the IR, its place within the evaluation process and the activities carried out in preparation of the IR     - Describe the appropriateness of analysing gender, equity and wider inclusion issues in the evaluation scope and propose a gender and equity-responsive methodology | **Assessment criteria**   * Definition of CSPE is clear and stresses the strategic focus of CSPEs * Sections on rationale, objectives and users from ToR have been adequately summarized * Purpose of the IR is clear and inception tasks listed are relevant, demonstrating that adequate research and consultations have taken place |
| **Comment:** | |
| **1.2. Context** | |
| **Expected content**  Building on the country context section of the ToR, fill information gaps, verify and update information given in the ToR to situate the type of activities and the role of WFP within the national context, in the framework of the 2030 Agenda. Key headings should include:   * General overview. Include basic information on:   + Geography: territorial extension and borders   + Demography: i) total population disaggregated by sex and age group, and ethnic groups as relevant; ii) life expectancy; iii) total fertility rate; and iv) adolescence birth rate   + Basic macroeconomic indicators, including poverty rate and GINI coefficient   + If applicable: disasters, including a timeframe graph with main disasters and affected people * National policies and the SDGs. Overview of national development plans and policies in the framework of the 2030 Agenda * If available, overview of National Voluntary Report on SDG Report on SDG * Food and nutrition security. Include IPC map. Include data on food insecurity levels, stunting, wasting disaggregated by sex * Agriculture. Data to include percentage agriculture of GDP and smallholder farmer productivity * Climate change and vulnerability * Education. Include data on literacy rates, primary and secondary school enrolment by sex and percentage of population with at least secondary education * Gender, equity and wider inclusion considerations. Elaborate on gender inequality index and related issues as well as other equity dimensions * Refugees and internally displaced people. Provide an overview as relevant to the country * Humanitarian protection * International assistance, UNDAF / UNSDCF | **Assessment criteria**   * Information is accurate, up-to-date and relevant to provide insights to the context of the country strategic plan * Context has been analysed to understand its implications on the strategic plan * Description of the context is appropriately nuanced and politically sensitive * Relevant indicators, if any, have been identified and trend data used * Good balance between amount of details and synthesis |
| **Comment:** | |
| **2. Subject of the evaluation** | |
| **2.1. [Subject evaluated]** | |
| **Expected content**   * Describe the strategic focus of the CSP, with key outcome areas and related outputs * Illustrate the logic of intervention of the CSP and its key assumptions, as reconstructed during the inception phase * Discuss the modes of engagement of WFP in the country (for instance: direct delivery, technical assistance, capacity development; advocacy etc.) * Build on the relevant section of the ToR and expand on the analysis of: * New data on the operations that fall within the scope of the evaluation * A quantitative overview of performance including: a) outcome and output targets achievement rate, as feasible with available data in reporting documents; and b) up-to-date budget implementation outcomes and activity * The performance data. For example, any discrepancy between target achievement rate and budget implementation for the same outcome (including for example, high rate of target achievement and low budget implementation, or the opposite) | **Assessment criteria**   * Expected content is covered * The strategic focus of WFP and its modes of engagement are situated in relation to the humanitarian or development context, and the country macroeconomic classification * The CSP performance is described and analysed as indicated in the expected content * GEWE, equity and wider inclusion dimensions are included, notably specifying if CSP design was informed by a gender analysis |
| **Comment:** | |
| **2.2. Scope of the evaluation** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Describe the scope in detail, highlighting any changes or refinements as compared to the scope stated in the terms of reference     - Present the key issues to focus on as identified in the inception phase. These issues should be clearly reflected in the evaluation matrix as operational components or lines of inquiry under the relevant evaluation subquestions     - As relevant, explain how any evaluability challenge will affect the scope of the evaluation in relation to specific evaluation criteria, questions or subquestions | **Assessment criteria**   * + - Basic standard context has been covered     - Within the standard overall scope, the specific focus of the evaluation and the period covered are clearly explained     - Key strategic issues that deserve particular attention are identified and explained     - Specific subquestions related to the COVID crisis response are included as relevant |
| **Comment:** | |
| **2.3. Stakeholder Analysis** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Building on the preliminary stakeholders’ analysis (SHA) in the ToR, add depth by providing necessary and relevant information to establish an overview of the key stakeholders and inter-relationships     - Widen the scope of the SHA to include other national and international actors at country level     - Ensure that the stakeholder analysis is GE responsive as well as considers wider equity dimensions and that it identifies the principal types of stakeholders e.g. duty-bearers, rights-holders, men and women, etc.     - Use appropriate analytical tools for this purpose, such as accountability maps, force-field analysis, power-to-influence, stakeholder matrix, partnership maps, etc.     - For each group of stakeholders, specify concrete agencies or individuals, describe their role in the subject of evaluation and analyse the nature of their stake/interest, including what they stand to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation | **Assessment criteria**   * Building on the SHA conducted at the ToR stage, the inception report provides a stakeholder analysis that: * Identifies the key actors that have a stake in the evaluation and explains their specific interests and relative power to influence the evaluation process or the use of the evaluation * Identifies the key actors that have a stake in the evaluation subject and can influence the development change WFP is trying to achieve in the country * Is gender and equity- responsive * Has a focus on accountability to affected populations |
| **Comment:** | |
| **3. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations** | |
| **3.1. Evaluability assessment** | |
| **Expected content**   * The evaluability assessment, highlighting challenges and opportunities and describing how the assessment has informed the choice of methods for data collection and analysis. The detailed evaluability assessment, including detailed analysis of data availability for output and outcome indicators should be presented in the annex | **Assessment criteria**   * Challenges and opportunities highlighted * Description of how the assessment has informed the delimitation of the evaluation scope and the choice of methods for data collection and analysis |
| **Comment:** |  |
| **3.2. Methodological approach** | |
| **Expected content**  In the framework of the approach outlined in the ToR, this section should provide an overview of:   * + - Overall approach to data collection, synthesis, analysis and validation of findings     - How data will be collected and analysed. It should discuss any implications of evaluability challenges in relation to specific evaluation criteria, questions or subquestions; data gaps highlighted; and mitigation measures identified     - Whether or not a set of lessons will be required in the evaluation report, if this is not already clearly indicated in the ToR     - Any major limitation deriving from the evaluability assessment, in relation to specific criteria and questions     - Possible solutions to minimize specific evaluability challenges related to any evaluation criteria, or standard question or subquestions | **Assessment criteria**  The methodology section covers the minimum expected content.  The methodological approach:   * + - Is coherent, logical and comprehensive and explains how it will mitigate limitations to validity and reliability of the findings and overall credibility of the evaluation     - Has proposed methods and evaluation criteria that are gender and equity sensitive     - Describes methods that are appropriate to consult with different types of stakeholders     - Presents justified modifications from the ToR |
| **Comment:** |  |
| **3.3. . Data collection methods** |  |
| **Expected content**   * + - Provide detailed overview of the data collection methods building on the preliminary methodology guide in the ToR. Explain and justify how the methodology is modified from that presented in the ToR     - Explain how data gaps will be filled and how information will be gathered, analysed and used to answer all the subquestions     - Define the nature of data collection methods and field instruments     - Ensure data collection tools integrate gender, equity and wider inclusion considerations. Ensure data collected is disaggregated by gender; provide an explanation if this is not possible     - Present the sampling strategy     - Present a summary description of fieldwork tools. (Actual fieldwork tools should be presented in an annex). Describe how these tools incorporate gender and equity considerations     - Specify how data will be checked and cleaned   Explain the strategy for data analysis, including how data will be triangulated for conclusion drawing, and expected displays of data (tables, graphs, photos, network maps) | **Assessment criteria**   * + - Data collection methods are described in detail, within the overall approach described in the previous section     - Choices for data collection methods are adequate given data needs, budget and time constraints     - Choices are justified and limitations explained     - Chosen methods are coherent with the overall methodological approach     - Reasonable/accurate assessment of data situation demonstrates that the team has adequately gathered and consulted data during the inception phase     - The sampling strategy is explained. Limitations to impartiality, if any, are addressed     - Data colletion tools are presented in an annex |
| **Comment:** | |
| **3.4. Data analysis** | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** |
| * Methods for data analysis and triangulation are explained | * + - Data analysis methods are described in detail     - Choices for data analysis methods are adequate and realistic     - Choices are justified and limitations explained     - Chosen methods are coherent with the overall methodological approach |
| **Comment:** | |
| **3.5. Ethical considerations** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Standard text is used and the standard table provided in the inception report template is duly completed     - Description of ethical issues, and which safeguards and measures will be put in place | **Assessment criteria**   * For each phase of the evaluation (inception, data collection, data analysis, reporting, and dissemination) ethical issues, risks and safeguards are clearly highlighted |
| **Comment:** | |
| **3.6. Risks and assumptions** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Highlight any potential risk to efficient and safe conduct of the evaluation process, including potential conflict of interest, logistic complications, safety issues etc.     - Specify the support that the team assumes to receive from the Office of Evaluation, or other actors involved (country office or regional bureau). Include, for example, transportation, interpretation or other as relevant and appropriate | **Assessment criteria**   * + - The expected content is covered and discussed in a way that demonstrates clear understanding of any potential risk and its implications for the evaluation * The support needs of the team are clearly spelled out and are realistic in view of the time and budget available |
| **Comment:** | |
| **3.7. Quality assurance** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Mechanisms for ensuring utility, credibility, and independence are clear and explicit     - Quality assurance is mentioned and built into the whole process     - Requirements are spelled out for the evaluation team to ensure validity and accuracy of data | **Assessment criteria**   * + - The expected content is covered |
| **Comment:** | |
| **4. Organization of the evaluation** | |
| **4.1 Roles and responsibilities** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Present the composition of the evaluation team and primary role and responsibilities of team members in line with expertise and evaluation requirements in the ToR, and the areas to be covered in the matrix     - Present a work-plan for each team member in line with the deliverables agreed according to roles and responsibilities (above). Explain how individual inputs will be translated into expected evaluation products | **Assessment criteria**   * + - Roles and responsibilities of evaluation team members are clarified     - Tasks to be undertaken and outputs delivered by each team member are clear and in line with the profiles     - Deliverables for each team member are clearly stated with deadlines and match the duration of the contract |
| **Comment:** | |
| **4.2 Timeline** | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Provide final agreed schedule of activities including consultation with stakeholders and interaction points (e.g. briefings, de-briefings, etc.) and deadlines for delivery of key evaluation products. These may also include feedback sessions with stakeholders on interim products * Prepare a field work schedule (by days, team member, locations, stakeholders, etc) to enable the country offices to organize appointments and arrange logistics | **Assessment criteria**   * The timeline provides a clear picture of how the evaluation process will unfold including dates for key deliverables |
| **Comment:** |  |
| **Annexes**  Minimum requirements for annexes include the following:  **Annex 1: Summary Terms of Reference**  **Annex 2: Evaluation Timeline**  **Annex 3: Methodology Guidance**  Selection criteria and locations for field visits  **Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix.** The purpose of the evaluation matrix is to provide a clear analytical framework that helps to reduce subjectivity in the evaluative judgement identifying for question and subquestions: i) dimensions of analysis; ii) operational components; iii) lines of inquiry and/or indicators as appropriate; iv) data sources; and v) data collection methods. For a template of the evaluation matrix refer to Annex 4 of the IR template  **Annex 5: Data Collection Tools.**Quantitative surveys and protocols for qualitative data collection, as relevant  **Annex 6: Field Mission Schedule.** Summary fieldwork agenda detailing the required schedule of meetings for each team member to be set up by the country office  **Annex 7: Evaluability Assessment***.* Building on the evaluability assessment conducted in the ToR expand on the following areas:   * The strategic objective statement itself: it may not reflect the activities that are supposed to contribute to it * The indicators: is the indicator suitable for assessing progress towards the expected outcome or changes in the outcome? Is the indicator reported by the country office? * The data available: is high quality quantitative data available to make an assessment at the strategic outcome level? * Availability of key informants * Restriction on field visits * State of implementation * Availability of secondary sources of evidence * Usefulness of the evaluation: implementation progress on CSP activities; opportunities (and constraints) for utilization; and timing of the evaluation * Resource constraints of the evaluation: time, expertise, budget   **Annex 8: Reconstructed Theory of Change**  **Annex 9: Results Framework/Line of Sight**  **Annex 10: Detailed Stakeholders Analysis.**Building on the preliminary stakeholders’ analysis in the ToR, add depth by providing necessary and relevant information to establish an overview of the key stakeholders and inter-relationships:   * The stakeholder analysis should identify WHO, WHY, HOW and WHEN the stakeholders will be included in the evaluation process and their level of participation * The stakeholder analysis will identify interests/concerns of specific stakeholders in the evaluation, what they have to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation, and how they will be involved in the evaluation * Use appropriate analytical tools for this purpose such as accountability maps, force-field analysis, power-to-influence, stakeholder matrix, partnership maps, etc. * The stakeholder analysis should be GEWE responsive and should identify the principal types of stakeholders e.g. duty-bearers, rights-holders, men and women, etc. Include ministries and/or other institutions addressing GEWE issues * For each group of stakeholders, specify concrete agencies or individuals, describe their role and analyse the nature of their stake/interest, including what they stand to gain or lose from the results of the evaluation * Determine whether different stakeholders may have different ways of valuing/evaluating the outcomes of assistance provided, as an input for the methodology development (e.g. participatory approaches for beneficiary perspectives)   **Annex 11: Communication and Knowledge Management Plan**  **Annex 12: List of People Interviewed**  **Annex 13: Bibliography / Evaluation Library**  **Annex 14: Acronyms** | **Comment**   * Minimum requirements are covered * If other annexes are included, a rationale is given * Annexes are numbered in the order in which they appear in text |