|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **General** | **Comments** | |
| **Accessibility**:   * The purpose of the ToR has been met? * The ToR adequately emphasize the strategic focus of the CSPE * The ToR provide a good substantive overview of the evaluation * The ToR provide clear instructions to the evaluation team * The ToR are written in a clear and accessible manner * Timeliness: ToR are submitted on time (in relation to when the contracting arrangements are expected to be completed and the inception phase starts) * Length: the ToR do not exceed 11,000 words (approx 25 pages) excluding annexes and table of contents   **Editing:**   * The ToR template has been followed. * Acronyms are spelt out the first time they are used * Paragraphs and pages are numbered electronically * Cross-references are used * Maps, visuals, tables and diagrams are used as relevant and are numbered * Sources are provided for data or quotes * The ToR are written in line with the WFP editing style guidelines   **Title:**   * Reflects the evaluation scope * Is clear without being too long |  | |
| **1. Background** | | |
| **1.1. Introduction** | | |
| **Expected content**   * Purpose of ToR * Definition of CSPE * Reference to purpose of CSPE | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text has been used * Definitions are relevant, meaningful and up-to-date | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **1.2. Context** | | |
| **Expected content**  This section provides information on:   * General overview. Include basic information on:  1. Geography: territorial extension and borders 2. 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 3. Basic macroeconomic indicators, including poverty rate and GINI coefficient 4. 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 * Food and nutrition security. Include IPC map. Include data on food insecurity levels, stunting and 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. Elaborate on gender inequality index and related issues * Migration, refugees and internally displaced people. Provide an overview as relevant to the country * Humanitarian protection * International development assistance | **Assessment criteria**   * Information is focused and concise * The section focuses on trend data that is up to date, relevant and important to the WFP country strategic plan and the evaluation * Data is commented on, not simply illustrative * The section helps to understand and situate the weight of ODA in the country economy * The section helps to understand the country situation in terms of humanitarian or development context and its implications for WFP interventions * The section helps to situate the CSP in the context of the 2030 Agenda at the country level | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **2. Reasons for the evaluation** | | |
| **2.1. Rationale** | | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Refer to standard text in the template | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text has been followed. Any addition to or deviation from it is well articulated and justified | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **2.2. Objectives** | | |
| **Expected content**   * Refer to standard text in the template * Gender equality included as an objective or mainstreamed across | **Assessment criteria**   * + - Standard text is used     - Text has been nuanced as required if more emphasis is placed on one objective and a rationale is clearly explained   Gender equality considerations have been included | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **2.3. Stakeholder Analysis** | | |
| **Expected content**   * Identify direct and indirect stakeholders of the evaluation and analyse how they are affected by the WFP country strategic plan in different ways[[1]](#footnote-1) (women, men, boys and girls from different groups such as beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty bearers). Focus more on internal stakeholders and direct counterparts of WFP at the country level * Specify who are the key stakeholders of the CSP’s evaluation * 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 should identify specific interests/concerns of some groups in the evaluation, which should be brought to the attention of the evaluation team and taken into consideration * Ensure that the stakeholder analysis is GEWE-responsive and that it identifies duty-bearers, rights-holders, men and women, etc. Include ministries or institutions addressing GEWE issues (government, donors, NGO or other) * Specifies the intended (primary and secondary, internal and external) users of the evaluation results and what use are they expected to make of these * Identify nternal Rerference group and establish roles and responsibilities | **Assessment criteria**   * + - Standard text is used     - All relevant stakeholders (internal and external) are identified, demonstrating impartiality * Good understanding of stakeholder expected interests, roles and relative influencing power * Stakeholders’ maps or diagrams used * Specific users are identified, in particular the beneficiaries * Intended use of the evaluation is stated * Identification of users is closely linked to the stated objectives and rationale of the evaluation * The stakeholder analysis is equity and gender-responsive. It also reflects how WFP commitments to AAP will be upheld * Internal Rreference group has been established and its roles and responsibilities have been set out | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **3. Subject of the evaluation** | | |
| **3.1. Subject of the evaluation** | | |
| **Expected content**  Provide information on:   * Duration of WFP presence in the country * Overview of the transition from previous to current CSP: i) recommendations and management responses from the evaluation of the previous cycle, if available; ii) relevant evaluation findings, recommendations and management responses from decentralized evaluations, joint evaluations and IAHE; and iii) key strategic shifts, in terms of thematic focus or modes of engagement (for example from direct implementation to technical assistance of policy advocacy) * Expected results (strategic outcomes and outputs) of the current cycle and related activities * Overview of planned and actual beneficiaries with breakdown by activity/component, disaggregated by sex and age * Budget overview including: i) needs-based budget, allocated resources; and ii) budget expenditure to date by outcome area. Possibly include a table illustrating these data. Ref Table 1 below. * Overview of main donors * Overview of key national counterparts and other partners * Staffing: Total number of people working in the CO disaggregated by: i) national and international; ii) sex; iii) country office and sub-offices; and iii) admin verus programme staff * Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE), equity and wider inclusion issues as relevant | **Assessment criteria**   * The expected content has been covered. * Information is presented in a way that allows capturing the key focus of the CSP and its evolution over time, if applicable, as well as any major shifts compared to the previous programme cycle * The modes of engagement of WFP are clearly explained (for example technical assistance, direct delivery or knowledge sharing) * Data on budget are commented upon and not simply illustrated, particularly as relates to level of funding by outcome area, budget implementation rates and key donors * GEWE, equity and wider inclusion dimensions explained | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **3.2. Scope of the evaluation** | | |
| **Expected content**  Building on the standard text in the template, the scope is refined as needed and relevant in terms of:   * + - Period covered.     - Gender, equity and wider inclusion issues   Emphasis on specific issues | **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 * Clear integration of gender, equity and wider inclusion issues within the scope * Exclusions are justified | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations** | | |
| The ToR specify an evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods that are sensitive to GEWE, equity and wider inclusion issues, and specify that evaluation data be disaggregated by sex and age.  **4.1. Evaluation questions and criteria** | | |
| **Expected content**   * Refer to standard questions and subquestions in the template * Refer to standard text on evaluation criteria | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text on evaluation criteria and standard questions are covered | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **4.2. Evaluation approach and methodology** | | |
| **Expected content** | **Assessment criteria** | |
| Refer to standard text in the template | * Standard methodology section of ToR is used * The rationale for any deviation from standard methodology is clearly explained | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **4.3. Evaluability assessment** | | |
| **Expected content**  Building on the standard text provided in the template, expand on availability and quality of data (baselines, indicators, output and outcome data etc.) and the implications for the evaluation’s data collection strategy  The evaluability assessment should also determine whether GEWE, equity and wider inclusion issues can be evaluated or not and identify measures needed to address the evaluability of GEWE, equity and wider inclusion issues in the design, data quality and context.[[2]](#footnote-2) Specifically, the evaluability assessment requires to identify whether the CSP has an adequate set of quantitative and qualitative indicators including GEWE (and information on their progress) to enable the assessment of GEWE, and options to address GEWE-related evaluability challenges during the evaluation process | **Assessment criteria**   * The assessment covers all the expected content * Any limitation is clearly described and implications for scope and methodology discussed, including reference to limitations for specific evaluation questions or subquestions * Availability and quality of gender-disaggregated data and existence/ gaps of gender-specific outcomes clarified | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **4.4. Ethical Considerations** | | |
| **Expected content**  Refer to standard text in the template  List any potential ethical issues that have already been identified for the conduct of the evaluation and propose mitigation measures | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text used * Quality assurance is built into the whole process by briefly showing how different products will be quality assured | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **4.5. Quality assurance** | | |
| **Expected content**  Refer to standard text in the template | | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text used * Quality assurance is built into the whole process by briefly showing how different products will be quality assured |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **5. Organization of the evaluation** | | |
| **5.1. Phases and deliverables** | | |
| **Expected content**   * + - Clarify the timing of evaluation phases, missions and products to be delivered     - Ensure adequate time is budgeted for data analysis and for review, feedback and revision of draft evaluation reports. The Office of Evaluation’s two-level quality assurance system and stakeholder engagement process identifies three draft report stages (D0, D1, D2) prior for final approval by the Director     - A stakeholder workshop should be planned at the preparatory phase, with appropriate time/funding provision * In planning, the EB Secretariat date for editing/translation of the summary evaluation report (SER) must be strictly adhered to | **Assessment criteria**   * Suggested tables in the ToR template are used * Reasonable amount of time for each of the phases and between them is ensured * Phases have clearly identified deliverables and stated responsible person | |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **5.2. Evaluation team composition** | | |
| **Expected content**  Describes:   * The expertise/profiles and languages needed * The expected team composition * Reporting lines and roles and responsibility of the team leader and team members | | **Assessment criteria**   * Required expertise is relevant to the characteristics of the CSP, including in relation to GEWE * The evaluation team is geographically and gender balanced and culturally diverse * The number of people to be included in the team is specified and is commensurate to the budget available, and the size and complexity of the programme |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **5.3. Roles and responsibilities** | | |
| **Expected content**  Refer to standard text in the template | | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text used |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **5.4. Security considerations** | | |
| **Expected content**   * Refer to standard text in the template * Specify any security considerations that may be relevant * Indicate any specific security considerations for women visiting the field sites and women respondents to the evaluation, and how measures will be put in place to mitigate any concerns | | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text used * Security considerations are relevant to the context for the evaluation * Security considerations take into account gender dimensions |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **5.5. Communication** | | |
| **Expected content**  Lay out of a communication and knowledge management plan, which should be further developed during the inception phase based on the technical note guidance and template | | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text used * Draft communication and knowledge management plan laid out * Communication issues (e.g. need for translation/ interpretation or separate communication among different stakeholder groups) are recognized |
| **5.6. Budget:** | | |
| **Expected content**  Lay out of a communication and knowledge management plan, which should be further developed during the inception phase based on the technical note guidance and template | | **Assessment criteria**   * Standard text used * There is clear reference to the sources of funding of the CSPE * Expected costs of the evaluation should not be mentioned |
| **Comment:** | | |
| **Annexes**  Requirements for Annexes include:   * Map * Country fact sheet * Timeline * Preliminary stakeholder analysis * Draft communication & knowledge management plan * Line of sight (if not in main text) * Evaluability assessment * WFP presence in years pre-CSP. (Main types of operations, activities, number of transfers and beneficiaries) * Key information on beneficiaries and transfers * Table of planned and actual beneficiaries with breakdown by activity/component, disaggregated by sex and age * Table x: actual versus planned beneficiaries (by gender) in [name of country] [year] * Figure x; Actual beneficiaries by transfer modality in [name of country] * If applicable (IDP/refugees) beneficiaries by residence status in [name of country] [timeframe](% base on yearly averages) * Template for evaluation matrix * Approved CSP document (link) * Role and composition of IRG * Bibliography * Acronyms | | **Comment**   * All required annexes are present |
| **Comment:** | | |

1. Use guidance from Page 60 of UNEG *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations,* 2014 and OEV TN on Gender [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Use guidance from Page 56 of UNEG *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*, 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)