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Foreword

The Centralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (CEQAS) is one of the building blocks for implementation of the WFP Evaluation Policy (2016-2021). As such, it is the WFP Office of Evaluation's primary means of safeguarding the international evaluation principles of:

- **Independence**: by setting standards that increase the impartiality in the evaluation process and the reporting on findings
- **Credibility**: by setting standards that ensure evaluations are evidence-based and follow transparent and systematic processes
- **Utility**: by building milestones into evaluation processes for timeliness and reporting standards to ensure accessibility.

The CEQAS guides all evaluations undertaken by the WFP Office of Evaluation and its consultants.

The CEQAS is a comprehensive system covering all types of evaluations: strategic, policy, country strategic plan, and synthesis.

The CEQAS is a working tool for WFP evaluation staff and its consultants covering all stages of the evaluation cycle. It is not a comprehensive handbook on evaluation and does not replace the rich range of evaluation literature.

The CEQAS builds on the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group, the OECD-DAC Evaluation Network, related tools from the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP), and the wider evaluation literature and community of practice.

The CEQAS pack for each evaluation type consists of:

I. **Guidance for process and content**
II. **Template for ToR**
III. **Quality checklist for ToR**
IV. **Internal reference group ToR**
V. **Template for inception report**
VI. **Quality checklist for inception report**
VII. **Template for evaluation report**
VIII. **Quality checklist for evaluation report**
IX. **Template for summary evaluation report**
X. **Quality checklist for summary evaluation report**
XI. **Communication and knowledge management plan**

Initiated in 2007, the evaluation quality assurance system (EQAS) is subject to periodic and systematic update in line with the Office of Evaluation's evolving needs and international best practice. CEQAS was comprehensively reviewed and updated in 2013. In 2017, the guidance was further updated to strengthen the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment (GEEW) and to take account of the start of implementation of the “Integrated Road Map”. In 2019, further revision was made to CEQAS for country portfolio evaluations to transform them into country strategic plan evaluations (CSPEs). Further updates and new materials will continue to be added as needed, to ensure EQAS continues to reflect emergent best practice and management requirements.

*Andrea Cook, Director of Evaluation, June 2020*
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Introduction

1. Country strategic plan evaluations (CSPE) are required in the penultimate year of implementation of any country strategic plan (CSP), in line with the Country Strategic Plan Policy approved in 2016. They encompass the entirety of WFP activities during a specific country's strategic plan. They evaluate the performance and results of the country strategic plan as a whole and provide evaluative insights to make evidence-based decisions about positioning WFP in a country and about strategic partnerships, programme design, and implementation. CSPEs feed evidence to country offices in the process of preparing country strategic plans and provide lessons that can be used in the design of new programmes and activities.

2. **Overview of the guidance.** These guidance materials apply to the management and conduct of CSPEs. They are structured following the five phases of an evaluation, focusing on processes, outputs and quality standards that will be used for each of them. The five phases are:
   1. Preparation
   2. Inception
   3. Evaluation, including fieldwork
   4. Reporting
   5. Follow-up and dissemination

3. **The process guidance** shows the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder: evaluation managers (EM); research analysts (RA); evaluation team leaders and teams; WFP stakeholders, including headquarters (HQ), regional bureaux (RBs) and country offices (COs); other stakeholders; the Director of Evaluation (DoE); and the Regional Head of Unit (HoU), or other senior evaluation officers as relevant.

4. **The content guides** are provided for the outputs produced during each of the evaluation phases. This guidance, together with the templates that provide the annotated table of content for each product, is used by the evaluation manager, the second level quality assurer, the research analyst, evaluation team leaders and evaluation teams.

5. **The quality standards** provide a brief introduction of general principles, while the quality checklists are templates for use by the quality assurers (both first and second levels).

6. Links are provided to other Office of Evaluation guidance, such as technical notes if the issues cuts across all types of evaluation. If there is specific guidance related to CSPEs then it is included as an annex to these overall guidelines. In some cases, it is both.

7. **Overview of time taken to conduct a CSPE.** The time for conducting a CSPE is approximately ten months from the initial preparation to the follow-up and dissemination phase, when the reports are presented to the Executive Board. However, the core of the process, which includes inception, evaluation and reporting, would normally last up to six months. The table below illustrates the duration of each phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Average time (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inception</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reporting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Follow-up and dissemination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The set timeframe aims at feeding the CSPE report into the process of developing a new country strategic plan and allows for delinking the preparation and follow-up and dissemination phases of the evaluation. This gives some flexibility for evaluation managers and other staff supporting the CSPE process in the Office of Evaluation. The key stages where the evaluation team needs to be fully involved are the inception, evaluation and reporting phases. The preparation phase, including the preparation of the standard
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terms of reference (ToR) and selection of an evaluation team, through one of the long term agreement (LTA) companies or by identifying a team of individual consultants, may be completed well in advance of the start of the inception phase. The follow-up and dissemination phase is closely tied to the timing of Executive Board sessions in terms of completion, however key activities will be completed within 45 days of closure of the report stage.

9. **Quality Assurance (QA):** Quality assurance cuts across all phases as it includes clearance of all evaluation outputs.

10. The evaluation team leader and, when relevant, the consultancy company that hired her or him, have the primary responsibility for timely delivery of evaluation reports that meet the Office of Evaluation quality standards. In addition, there are two levels of quality assurance within the Office of Evaluation, as described below.

11. **First level quality assurance (QA1)** is undertaken by the evaluation manager for the outputs to be produced by the evaluation team at each stage of the process: inception report, two draft and one final version of the evaluation report. The evaluation manager should engage throughout the process of preparing the documents and not just review the submitted draft. For documents produced by the evaluation manager, QA1 will be undertaken by the relevant Regional Head of Unit or other senior evaluation officer designated as second level quality assurer by the Director of Evaluation.

12. **Second level quality assurance (QA2)** is undertaken by the relevant Head of Unit or designated senior evaluation officer on all documents produced by the evaluation team. The QA2 should be done together with the QA1, using the standard quality assurance checklists for each product and should not involve a separate round of comments to the evaluation team. This means that the QA1 and QA2 comments should be agreed upon and consolidated before sending the product back to the evaluation team. Where appropriate, the QA2 may directly provide a recommendation for clearance to the Director of Evaluation.

13. **Final approval of documents.** All documents to be approved by the Director of Evaluation.

**Figure 1: Overview**
Phase 1: Preparation

14. The terms of reference (ToR) are the major output of the preparation phase and they provide the first substantive overview of the evaluation. They constitute the evaluation manager's main instrument to instruct the evaluators on the assignment and explain what is expected from them. They are annexed to the contract of the consultancy firm conducting the evaluation, or of each member of the evaluation team when the latter is integrated by individual consultants, and the terms of reference document is a binding contract between them and the Office of Evaluation.

15. The earlier that gender equality and women's empowerment (GEEW) approaches are incorporated into the evaluation thinking, the higher the chances that they will be thoroughly analysed during its implementation. The evaluation manager should use this preparation phase to incorporate GEEW in the evaluation during its planning and preparation stages.

16. Once the terms of reference are final, a mandatory two-page summary ToR document is prepared as a communication tool, which is especially useful for communicating with in-country stakeholders.

17. In addition to developing the terms of reference, there are other components of the preparation phase:

18. **Internal reference group (IRG).** During the preparation phase the evaluation manager is responsible for identifying members of the internal reference group and for informing them of their roles in the evaluation process. The internal reference group should mainly be composed of senior country office staff and key technical leads from the regional bureau. Selected headquarters staff may be included, depending on the CSPE context and the availability of expertise at regional bureau level. Where no technical lead is in post at regional bureau level, headquarters technical staff should be invited to the internal reference group.

19. **Communication and knowledge management plan.** In the early stages of the evaluation, the evaluation manager is responsible for drafting in consultation with the country office and regional evaluation officers (REO) a communication and knowledge management plan defining the ways in which the various stakeholders will be involved throughout the evaluation process and how the findings of the evaluation will be communicated and disseminated in order to stimulate learning in WFP and beyond. The plan should be developed also in consultation with the communication advisor in the Office of Evaluation. For more details, please refer to the Communication and Knowledge Management Technical Note and Template.

20. **Procurement of an evaluation team.** Finally, the preparation phase also includes procurement of an evaluation team to undertake the evaluation. Annex 1 has the scoring table to be used for the assessment of the proposals and selection of the company with the long term agreement that will conduct the evaluation. Once the appropriate company with the long term agreement has been selected has been selected, the evaluation manager will draft a decision memo to be submitted to Director of Evaluation for approval. The decision memo should include a justified recommendation on the long term agreement to select, a copy of the terms of reference and a copy of the long term agreement scoring table with the results of the assessment.

1.1 PROCESS GUIDE

21. The purpose of the process guide is to provide a step-by-step description of the process leading to the finalization of the terms of reference, highlighting roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. The steps, including the roles, responsibilities and actions are provided in Figure 1.
**Figure 2: Process map for preparation and finalization of the terms of reference**

- Collects key documents
- Identifies key stakeholders: internal (WFP) and external (governments, institutions, partners), and establishes an internal reference group
- Undertakes preliminary consultations with some of the stakeholders (including always the CO, RB programme staff and REO) to get an overview of: stakeholders and their concerns; the logic of intervention underlying the CSP; related operations, ideally starting to develop a database; data availability and constraints

- Under supervision of the evaluation manager:
  - Builds an E-library
  - Collects standard documents (corporate, regional and country level)
  - Liaises with CO focal point for additional documentation
  - Prepares standard tables and graphs
  - Reviews and provide comments to the evaluation manager on the ToR
  - Supports the preparation of membership list for the internal reference groups

- Preparations draft ToR (including communication & knowledge management plan and internal reference group composition)
- Submits draft ToR to the QA2
- Liaises with the country office to ensure that CSPE has been budgeted appropriately and quantifies funding gaps if any

- Reviews ToR
- Gives feedback to evaluation manager: either
  - a) clearance for Director of Evaluation approval
  - b) request for revision

- If cleared, sends draft ToR for comments to the Country Office; or
- Revises draft ToR, if necessary: repeat previous step
- Sends out renewed call for expression of interest to LTAs

- Provide comments on the ToR
- CO will have two weeks to comment on the ToR

- Reviews the comments and determines which require revisions to the ToR
- Revises the ToR
- Prepares a comments’ matrix that captures the comments and the way in which the evaluation manager has addressed them
- Requests and reviews options for evaluation teams (e.g. LTA proposals), rates them and prepares the decision memo to be submitted to the Director of Evaluation for approval [see technical notes on options for contracting evaluation teams and LTA guidance on share point. Refer to Annex 1 for LTA scoring table]

- Approves the final ToR
- Approves the selection of the LTA

- Sends the final ToR to members of the Internal Reference Group (IRG).
- Sends the ToR to Communications Unit for posting on the WFP website (internal and external)
- Finalizes evaluation team’s selection and initiates recruitment
- Keeps a record of the national evaluation consultants for the Office of Evaluation’s roster
1.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE CONTENT GUIDE

22. The purpose of this guidance material is to assist evaluation managers in drafting the terms of reference for CSPEs. The terms of reference should follow the structure and minimum standard content described in the template for ToR with its annotated table of content, but the content will be adapted to the specific subject under evaluation. Guidance is provided section by section for easy reference. The terms of reference should not be longer than 11,000 words, excluding annexes.

Table 1: Content guide for the terms of reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Introduction</td>
<td>Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Country context</td>
<td>Building on the country fact sheet and standard tables and graphs indicated in the ToR template with annotated table of content provide the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ General overview. Include basic information on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) geography: territorial extension and borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) demography: i) total population disaggregated by sex and age group, and ethnic groups as relevant; ii) life expectancy; iii) total fertility rate; iv) adolescence birth rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) basic macroeconomic indicators, including poverty rate and GINI coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) if applicable: disasters, including a timeframe graph with main disasters and affected people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Food and nutrition security. Include Integrated Food Security Classification (IPC) map. Include data on food insecurity levels, stunting, wasting disaggregated by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Agriculture. Include data on: percentage agriculture of gross domestic product and smallholder farmer productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Climate change and vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Education. Include data on: literacy rates, primary and secondary school enrolment by sex and percentage of population with at least secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Gender. Elaborate on gender inequality index and related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Refugees and internally displaced people. Provide an overview as relevant to the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Humanitarian protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ National policies and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Provide an overview of national development plans and policies in the framework of the Agenda 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ If available, provide an overview of National Voluntary Report on Sustainable Development Goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Ref. Annex 1 of this document
### 2. Reasons for the Evaluation

#### 2.1 Rationale

Standard text provided in the [ToR template with annotated table of content](#).

#### 2.2 Objectives

Standard text provided in the [ToR template with annotated table of content](#).

#### 2.3 Stakeholders and users of the evaluation

Standard text provided in the [ToR template with annotated table of content](#) supplemented by evaluation manager and based on stakeholders' analysis:

- Identify direct and indirect stakeholders of the evaluation and analyse how they are affected by WFP country strategic plan in different ways (women, men, boys and girls from different groups such as beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty bearers).

- Specify the key stakeholders of the evaluation. These will include WFP staff, immediate partners (whether government, donors, non-governmental organizations (NGO) or other) and, most importantly, beneficiaries.

- 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.

- Ensure that the stakeholder analysis is GEEW-responsive and that it identifies the principal types of stakeholders for example, duty-bearers, rights-holders, men and women, etc. Include ministries or institutions addressing GEEW issues (government, donors, NGO or other).

- Include indirect stakeholders who have an active and important role in the subject/sector under evaluation, but are not directly involved in the portfolio, which is subject to the evaluation.

- Specify the intended users of the evaluation results and what use are they expected to make of these.

- Establish internal reference group following the criteria described in the [internal reference group terms of reference](#) attached to this guide.

The internal reference group should include key staff from country office, regional bureau and selected headquarters technical divisions.

**Note:** The stakeholders' analysis is as complete as possible at this stage but still preliminary. Further discussions with stakeholders during the inception phase will be needed to determine and verify their interests and concerns.

The identification of users is closely linked to the stated objectives of the evaluation.

---

3 Use guidance from Page 60 of UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, 2014.

4 Ref. Annex 2: IRG ToR and Composition
3. Subject of the evaluation

3.1. WFP country strategic plan in [name of the country]

This section should be descriptive and should include information on:

✓ Duration of WFP presence in the country
✓ Overview of the transition from previous to current country strategic plan: 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 inter-agency humanitarian evaluations (IAHE); 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: needs-based budget, allocated resources, and 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 country office disaggregated by: i) whether they are national and international; ii) sex; country office and sub-offices; iii) administrative versus programme staff.

3.2. Scope of the evaluation

Building on the standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content, elaborate on the CSPE timeframe and particular areas of focus as appropriate.

4. Evaluation questions, approach and methodology

4.1. Evaluation questions

Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content

4.2. Evaluability assessment

Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content, expand on the following:

✓ Availability and quality of data (baselines, indicators, output and outcome data etc.) and the implications for the evaluation’s data collection and analysis strategy
✓ The evaluability assessment should also determine whether GEEW and equity dimensions can be evaluated or not and identify measures needed to address the evaluability of GEEW and equity dimensions of design, data quality and context.\textsuperscript{5} Specifically, the evaluability assessment requires to identify whether the WFP country portfolio has an adequate set of quantitative and qualitative indicators including GEEW (and information on their progress) to enable the assessment of

\textsuperscript{5} Use guidance from Page 56 of UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, 2014.
GEEW, and options to address GEEW-related evaluability challenges during the evaluation process.

4.3. Approach and methodology
Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content

4.4. Quality assurance
Complete with relevant details the standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content, including text on ethical considerations

4.5 Ethical considerations
Use standard text below

“Ethical consideration shall be taken into the methodology. It will also define risks and appropriate management measures, including issues related to data confidentiality and protection issues, protecting vulnerable respondents, and ensuring that the evaluation team avoids causing harm, and set out ethical safeguards that include provisions for the reporting of ethical concerns.

The team will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the WFP [NAME OF COUNTRY] Country Strategic Plan nor have conflicts of interest. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the 2016 UNEG norms and standards, the 2007 UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct as well as the principles of ‘do no harm’. The evaluation team will also commit to signing Annex 9 of the long term agreement regarding confidentiality, internet and data security statement.”

5. Organization of the evaluation

5.1. Phases and deliverables
Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content supplemented. Also:

✓ Provide an overview of the phases of the evaluation, including key milestones. The primary criterion driving evaluation timing is utility: (i) by when are advanced evaluation findings needed to feed into the future country strategic plan planning process at country level; and (ii) when is the scheduled Executive Board date for country strategic plan approval. The final CSPE report should be presented to the same Executive Board. Provide a timeline summary of key evaluation milestones and the detailed timeline, as provided in the ToR template

✓ Ensure adequate time is budgeted for first and second level quality assurance, feedback and revision of draft evaluation reports and clearance by the Director of Evaluation

✓ In planning, the Executive Board Secretariat submission date for editing/translation of the summary report should be strictly adhered to (three months ahead of the Executive Board session).

5.2. Evaluation team
Standard table in the ToR template with annotated table of content to be completed by evaluation manager.
State:
✓ The expertise/profiles and languages needed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The expected team composition (number of team members, balance of national &amp; international consultants, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Tasks to be undertaken and outputs to be delivered by each team member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Reporting lines and overall responsibility of the team leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ That the evaluation will be conducted by a gender-balanced, geographically and culturally diverse team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ That the evaluation team will have appropriate skills and attitude to assess the GEEW dimensions of the evaluation as specified in the scope, approach and methodology of the ToR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Communication</td>
<td>Standard text provided in the ToR template with annotated table of content supplemented. Also:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Using the Communication and Knowledge Management Plan Technical Note as guidance, develop a communications plan. Summarize it in this section and, in the evaluation timeline, attach the full plan in annex. It sets out how stakeholders will be involved throughout the process (for example, consultation on ToR inception, debriefings, workshops, report comments, etc.), and how findings of the evaluation will be communicated (for example, briefs, infographics, videos) and disseminated (for example, workshops to share findings and discuss way forward, summary report presented to Executive Board session, evaluation briefs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Consider from the stakeholder analysis whom to disseminate to, whom to involve and how to identify the users of the evaluation, duty bearers, implementers, beneficiaries, including GEEW perspectives and target groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The communication and knowledge management plan should include a GEEW-responsive dissemination strategy, aiming to: i) disseminate evaluation findings including GEEW to diverse groups of stakeholders who have interest in and are affected by GEEW issues; and ii) promote the fullest possible use of GEEW issues of the evaluations within the United Nations system, NGOs partners, and the government ministries among stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Highlight interaction points (for example, de-briefings, reference group discussions) and how these will be conducted (meeting, teleconference, email, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Following any fieldwork an exit debriefing with country office staff is mandatory. Other stakeholders to be included in accordance with the communications plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Request that an evaluation page on both the Office of Evaluation's site on WFPGo and the WFP.org-Evaluation Library be set up as a platform for sharing information amongst stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Following report approval, evaluation briefs should be developed by the evaluation manager to highlight key findings and lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Specify the need for translation and the language of each report. All key evaluation products should be produced in the official language of the country concerned.

5.1. Budget

Insert the following phrase: “The evaluation will be financed through the country strategic plan budget.”

Annexes

Minimum requirements for annexes include:

✓ Map
✓ Country fact sheet
✓ Timeline
✓ Preliminary stakeholder analysis
✓ 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 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](percentage base on yearly averages)
✓ Template for evaluation matrix
✓ Approved CSP document
✓ Bibliography/E-library
✓ Acronyms

1.3 QUALITY STANDARDS FOR THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

23. The terms of reference are expected to follow the template and provide information for each of the foreseen sections. These sections are included in the terms of reference, as they are important to ensure the evaluation is well set up.

24. Quality assurance aims to ensure that enough background research has been undertaken to set out terms of reference that will adequately guide the conduct of the evaluation. The quality checklist (a separate template) includes:

a. Criteria concerning the content (accuracy, adequate level of detail to understand the issues without being too detailed, well substantiated choices for instance when narrowing down the scope, etc.)

b. Checking whether the required content has been included in the terms of reference
c. Process (for instance timeline).

25. The relevant Head of Unit or designated senior evaluation officer, carries out quality assurance of terms of references, using the quality checklist to provide systematic and constructive feedback.

1.4 ANNEXES FOR THE PREPARATION PHASE

✓ ToR template with annotated table of content
✓ Quality checklist for ToR
✓ Internal reference group ToR and composition
✓ Scoring table for long term agreement
✓ Communication and knowledge management plan

1.5 DISSEMINATION

Draft terms of reference should be shared with internal reference group members for comments before finalizing them. Once finalized, they should be shared for information with internal reference group members and WFP senior management and posted on WFP internal and external websites. Please refer to the communication protocol for CSPE here
Phase 2: Inception

26. The inception phase serves to ensure that the evaluation team (leader and team members) develop an in-depth understanding of the CSPE terms of reference and can translate them into a work plan according to which the evaluation will be carried out. The work plan includes the process of conducting the evaluation as well as the data collection and analysis methods selected to answer the evaluation questions.

The inception phase involves initial analyses of background materials and discussions with stakeholders that will give the evaluation team a greater understanding of issues and concerns related to the country strategic plan and its implementation. 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.

27. Within this framework, the main objectives of the inception phase are to:
   - Reconstruct the implicit and explicit logic of intervention of the country strategic plan and its key assumptions
   - Finalise the evaluability assessment
   - Fine tune evaluation scope, sub-questions and methodology as relevant and appropriate, also in view of the evaluability assessment
   - Develop the evaluation matrix
   - Develop data-collection tools and test them as appropriate and feasible
   - Sample informants and field visits for the main evaluation mission
   - Finalize the stakeholder mapping and analysis
   - Refine the communication and learning plan
   - Develop a detailed workplan with roles and responsibilities for the team and deadlines for each deliverable.

28. Section 2.1 explains the activities that should be conducted during the inception phase; Section 2.2 provides guidance on the expected content of the inception report; and Section 2.3 concerns quality standards. Annexes include the template for the evaluation matrix.

2.1 INCEPTION PHASE PROCESS GUIDE

29. The inception phase requires that the terms of reference are final and that at least the team leader has been hired. Team members should have been identified and hired as well, unless the inception phase is needed to determine the skill set that is required. The following will have been completed and provided to the evaluation team:
   - Terms of reference
   - Library of relevant documents on a file sharing platform.

30. The process guide clarifies the roles, responsibilities and participation during the inception phase and provides a step-by-step description of tasks, particularly those leading to the finalization of the inception report for the evaluation.

31. A headquarters briefing should be held early in the inception phase to ensure the team is fully appraised of the Office of Evaluation’s requirements for CSPEs and that it has the opportunity to interact with WFP headquarters stakeholders. This will be virtual or in person depending on the circumstances, but the physical presence of the team leader and selected team members in Rome for the briefing will add value in terms of team-building with the evaluation manager and preparation of the inception mission. The briefing is not generic but requires the evaluation team to have conducted an initial literature review and preparation so that the briefing is also structured around their specific questions.

32. Inception missions are instrumental to the objectives of the inception phase as listed above. They are also an important opportunity to enhance the ownership of the evaluation by the country office and national counterparts. More specifically, the objectives of the inception mission are to:
• Communicate the terms of reference (evaluation purpose, issues, methods and approach) stakeholders in the country
• Meet stakeholders to understand their perspectives and concerns related to the subject under evaluation and its implementation
• Reconstruct the implicit and explicit logic of intervention of the country strategic plan and its key assumptions
• Finalise the evaluability assessment
• Fine-tune evaluation scope, sub-questions 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
• 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.

33. For CSPEs, the inception mission is conducted by the evaluation team leader, together with the evaluation manager. The research analyst may also attend the inception mission, subject to approval by the Director of Evaluation/regional Head of Unit and the Head of Analytics and Research Unit (ARU). The decision will be made taking account of (i) data needs (where the research analyst can add most value); and (ii) logistics and budget proportionality.

The inception mission will usually last five working days and generally regional bureau stakeholders will be engaged through teleconferencing, if possible, during the headquarters briefing. When necessary, the inception mission may include a visit to the regional bureau, for instance, when the regional bureau is leading a Level 2 (L2) or Level 3 (L3) emergency response under the country strategic plan.

**Figure 3: Overview of roles and responsibilities for the inception phase**

- **Evaluation Manager**
  - Provides the team with relevant documents (background materials on the subject of the evaluation and EQAS documents) for preparation prior to the inception phase
  - Participates in the inception mission and provides inputs for the inception report
  - Briefs the country office on the purpose of the CSPE and expectations

- **Research Analyst**
  - Provides the evaluation team with access to the E-library. Supports the evaluation manager in identifying and highlighting key reading material
  - Supports the preparation of (i) the electronic briefings; and (ii) the in-country inception mission
  - Prepares and print booklet for the evaluation team if needed (select content with the evaluation manager)
  - Prepares PowerPoint presentation on datasets and delivers presentation to the evaluation team
  - Follows up with stakeholders on documents mentioned during the briefings
  - Participates in the inception mission (if needed) to support data collection and analysis

- **Evaluation Team Leader**
  - Reviews terms of references and other relevant documentation in preparation for the inception briefings
  - Leads the inception mission and the development of the inception report in line with the content guide
34. **Preparation of the inception report.** The inception report is a working document that forms the agreement between the evaluation manager and the evaluation team on the operational plan for the evaluation and makes transparent to the country office what is expected of them and what they can expect to receive. Therefore, revisions of the draft inception report will be kept to fundamental issues only, while minor changes might be noted and dealt with in the evaluation report as appropriate. Fundamental issues are those that affect the evaluation scope, methodology and fieldwork where evaluation manager and evaluation team leader/team do not agree. Disagreements should be sorted out before the inception report is considered final and the evaluation team can move on to the evaluation phase.

**Figure 4: Process map for inception report preparation**

- **Evaluation Team Leader**
  - Drafts the inception report and submits it to the evaluation manager as per the agreed deadline

- **Evaluation Manager**
  - Reviews the inception report
  - Consults with the regional Head of Unit on major issues that need his/her input, views or agreement
  - Provides feedback to the evaluation team (using the quality checklist)

- **QA2**
  - Reviews and provides comments to the evaluation manager on the inception reports, or clears for submission to the Director of Evaluation for final approval

- **Evaluation Team**
  - Revises the inception report, if and as necessary
  - Submits a revised inception report to the evaluation manager

- **Evaluation Manager**
  - Reviews the revised draft inception report and requires further revision as necessary
  - Consults with the regional Head of Unit or designated QA2 on pending issues, methodology questions, etc.
  - Clears the inception report in accordance with the quality assurance and submits it to Director of Evaluation

- **OEVD**
  - Approves inception report

- **Evaluation Manager**
  - Circulates final inception report to WFP stakeholders for their information and liaises with Communications Unit for wider dissemination in line with the approved communication plan
2.2 INCEPTION REPORT CONTENT GUIDE

35. The purpose of the template and this guidance material is to assist the evaluation team and the evaluation team leader in drafting the inception report. A template for the inception report will be provided by the evaluation manager to the evaluation team. The inception report should follow the structure described in the templates, but the content will be adapted to the specific country strategic plan under evaluation. It should not exceed 15,000 words, excluding annexes. Guidance is provided section by section for easy reference.

Table 2: Content guide for the inception report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Includes standard text describing the purpose of the inception report, its place within the evaluation process and the activities carried out in preparation of the inception report (including persons met and documents reviewed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1. Evaluation features</strong></td>
<td>Define CSPE and present rationale, objectives and users of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefly describe the purpose of the inception report, its place within the evaluation process and the activities carried out in preparation of the inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe the appropriateness of analysing gender in the evaluation scope and propose a gender-responsive methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2. Country context</strong></td>
<td>Building on the section of the terms of reference with this same title, fill information gaps or update information so that the evaluation report will be able to give an overview of the national context in which the portfolio being evaluated is situated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Subject of the evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Building on the terms of reference, this section should:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1. WFP country strategic plan</strong></td>
<td>✓ Describe the strategic focus of the country strategic plan, with key outcome areas and related outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Illustrate the logic of intervention of the country strategic plan and its key assumptions, as reconstructed during the inception phase. Also illustrate how the logic of intervention was informed by previous evaluations, if at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ As appropriate and relevant, discuss the delivery modalities and the modes of engagement of WFP in the country (for instance: technical assistance, capacity development; advocacy etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Expand on the analysis of new data on the operations that fall within the scope of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Provide 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Briefly comment on 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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Evaluation scope and methodology

#### 3.1. Scope

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 sub-questions.

As relevant, explain how any evaluability challenge will affect the scope of the evaluation in relation to specific evaluation criteria, questions or sub-questions.

#### 3.2. Methodological approach

Provide an overview of the following:

- Overall approach to data collection, synthesis, analysis and validation of findings.
- 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 sub-questions.
- Proposed mechanisms to ensure confidentiality, data protection and management of ethical issues that may arise in the course of the evaluation.

#### 3.3. Data collection

Within the approach described in Section 3.3., elaborate in detail on methods and techniques for data collection from primary and secondary sources, including sampling for selection of field visits and key informants.

Describe how the proposed methods are gender-sensitive and appropriate to consult with different types and groups of stakeholders, including different vulnerable groups within the affected population.

#### 3.4. Quality assurance

- Mention any step that the evaluation team will take to ensure the quality of the evaluation process and products (for example, how data errors arising from proposed data collection methods will be addressed).
- Indicate any potential conflict of interest that any of the evaluation team members may have and how it will be managed.
- Include the following text in the inception report:

  “WFP has developed a Centralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (CEQAS) based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (ALNAP and DAC). It sets out process maps with in-built steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products. It also includes checklists for feedback on quality for each of the evaluation products. CEQAS will be systematically applied during this evaluation and relevant documents have been provided to the evaluation team.”

  By inserting this text, the team leader confirms that it is valid. If the team has not received CEQAS documents, this should be raised with the evaluation manager.

#### 3.5. Ethical considerations

Expand on the terms of reference section on ethics to explain how any ethical considerations will be taken into account in the collection of data and in reporting and how any potential negative consequence of the evaluation will be prevented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Risks and assumptions</td>
<td>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 can expect from it will receive from the Office of Evaluation or other actors involved (country office or regional bureau), including, for example, transportation, interpretation or other as relevant and appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Organization of the Evaluation

**4.1. Roles and schedule**
The purpose of this chapter in the inception report is to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team members as well as to communicate to stakeholders how the evaluation will unfold and what input is expected from them at what stage in the process.

**4.2. Updated detailed timeline**
Update the detailed evaluation schedule contained in the terms of reference, based on discussions and agreements with the country office, regional bureau and with the evaluation manager.

**5. Issues to be agreed with the Office of Evaluation**
Summarize and highlight any issues related to changes in the evaluation scope, questions, or budget that require a formal agreement before moving forward.

### Annexes
Minimum requirements for annexes include the following:

**Annex 1: Summary Terms of Reference** (see template [here](#))

**Annex 2: Bibliography**

**Annex 3: Methodology** guidance covering all fieldwork tools, including:
- Quantitative surveys and protocols for qualitative data collection, as relevant
- Summary fieldwork agenda detailing the required schedule of meetings for each team member to be set up by the country office
- Selection criteria and locations for field visits
- List of people met/interviewed

**Annex 4: Stakeholders Analysis**: Building on the preliminary stakeholders’ analysis in the terms of reference, add depth by providing necessary and relevant information to establish an overview of the key stakeholders and interrelationships. Specifically:
- Identify direct and indirect stakeholders of the evaluation and analyse how they are affected by the WFP country strategic plan in different ways (women, men, boys and girls from different groups such as beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty bearers including ministries and other institutions)
The stakeholder analysis should identify who the stakeholders are and why, when and how they 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 GEEW-responsive and should identify the principal types of stakeholders, for example, duty-bearers, rights-holders, men and women, etc. Include ministries and/or other institutions addressing GEEW 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 (for example, participatory approaches for beneficiary perspectives).

Annex 5: Evaluability Assessment. Building on the evaluability assessment conducted in the terms of reference, expand on the following areas:

- The strategic outcome 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 country strategic plan activities; opportunities (and constraints) for utilization; timing of the evaluation
- Resource constraints of the evaluation: time, expertise, budget.

Annex 6: Evaluation Matrix. The purpose of the evaluation matrix is to provide a clear analytical framework that helps to reduce subjectivity in the evaluative judgment identifying for question and sub-questions: 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 5 of this document.

Annex 7: Detailed Timeline

Annex 8: Communication and Knowledge Management Plan

---

Use guidance from Page 60 of UNEG Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, 2014.
2.3 QUALITY STANDARDS FOR AN INCEPTION REPORT

36. The inception report is expected to follow the template and the content guide provided.

37. Quality assurance aims to ensure that enough research, stakeholder consultations and analysis have been undertaken to decide on the methodology of the evaluation and to guide its conduct. A CSPE inception report quality checklist (see Annex 3 of this document) includes:
   - Criteria concerning the content, especially related to the methodological approach, evaluation matrix, data-collection methods and sampling criteria
   - Criteria concerning the workplan, its feasibility and likelihood to generate a credible evaluation
   - A check on whether the required content has been included in the inception report
   - Process (for example, a timeline).

38. The evaluation manager carries out first level quality assurance of the inception report, using the quality checklist to provide systematic and constructive feedback. The evaluation manager clears the inception report in consultation with the regional Head of Unit or designated senior evaluation officer and submits to the Director of Evaluation for approval.

2.4 ANNEXES FOR THE INCEPTION PHASE

   - Inception report template with annotated table of content
   - Quality checklist for the inception report
   - Template for evaluation matrix

2.5 DISSEMINATION

39. The draft inception report should be shared for feedback with the country office, upon initial clearance by the evaluation's QA2 and the Director of Evaluation approval. The final version of the inception report is shared with the country office and internal reference group members. More details can be found in the CSPE section of the Office of Evaluation Communication Protocol.
Phase 3: Evaluation, including fieldwork

40. The evaluation phase is the phase when the evaluation team collects, synthesizes and analyses information and data, from primary and secondary sources as indicated in the inception report. It is the time when the Evaluation Team pulls together the evidence that it will report.

41. The details of the evaluation phase are determined by the methodology chosen for a given evaluation. Therefore, it may differ for each evaluation. The principles provided here are generic but apply to all CSPEs.

3.1 EVALUATION PHASE PROCESS GUIDE

42. The evaluation phase requires that the inception report is finalized and the entire evaluation team has been hired. In this phase the operational plan found in the inception report is implemented.

43. The evaluation phase is conducted by the evaluation team. The evaluation phase consists, in general, of the following steps: team briefing, desk review and in-country activities.

44. **Team briefing(s).** The team leader will brief all team members to ensure they have understood the requirements of the evaluation and the operational plan in the inception report. The team briefing(s) should also serve to come to clear agreements on the reporting requirements by each team member.

45. **Desk review.** A thorough review of existing documentation, concerning the country portfolio and associated relevant literature and data should start at the inception phase. During the evaluation phase this will be expanded as needed and each evaluation team member should have a complete understanding of the documented evidence/information concerning his/her part in the CSPE. This level of preparation is essential to ensure best use of the time in the field when additional information and data should be collected.

46. **Remote interviews (teleconference).** The evaluation team should have remote interviews with relevant people in the regional bureaux and headquarters as relevant. The team leader should have a call with senior management and other team members as well as calls with the relevant people related to the areas (strategic outcomes) they have been assigned to.

47. **In-country activities.** These will include:
   - Initial briefing during which:
     - The evaluation team explains to stakeholders the purpose and conduct of the evaluation. The extent to which national counterparts are involved at this stage will have to be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the country context and WFP operational modalities
     - The country office explains to the evaluation team the agenda of meetings during their country visit (who are the stakeholders, their interests, significance and role in making and/or implementing the subject under evaluation, etc.)
   - Interaction with WFP and other stakeholders through interviews, focus group discussions, possibly surveys and participatory evaluation methods, and collection of additional documentation and data, depending on the evaluation design
   - Exit debrief.

3.2 EVALUATION PHASE CONTENT GUIDE

48. **Exit debrief.** During the debriefing at the end of the fieldwork, the evaluation team should present an exit debrief (usually a PowerPoint presentation) to report back on the process, share early impressions, clarify any information gaps and highlight next steps. Debriefing to the country office is mandatory, and may include other stakeholders (for example, regional bureau, headquarters, partners and beneficiaries) as agreed with the country office management and set out in the communications plan for the evaluation.
agreed at the terms of reference stage (refer to Communication and Learning Plan Technical Note); the evaluation manager may propose, and should agree to, variations.

49. The exit debrief is a working document of the evaluation team and will not be commented on or revised. It will serve as a reference document to stakeholders, including the evaluation manager, once they receive the evaluation report.

50. The exit debrief will be made available to the evaluation manager and the country office management. It should include as relevant:
   - Any changes from the inception report that were made or need to be made
   - The remaining gaps in data collection needs and where help is required
   - New risks that have arisen since the inception phase and mitigating factors
Phase 4: Reporting

51. The reporting phase brings together the findings of the evaluation team in a concise analytical evaluation report. The main output of the phase is the evaluation report.

4.1 PROCESS GUIDE

52. The reporting phase is undertaken after the evaluation phase to analyse, integrate and interpret all data collected. While it is the fourth phase in the evaluation process, inputs to the evaluation report can be drafted at earlier stages: some parts of the report might have been developed at the stages of the terms of reference (for instance, the purpose of the evaluation will not have changed by the time the report is prepared) or during the inception or evaluation phase (for instance the portfolio analysis).

53. The reporting phase involves two levels of quality assurance by the Office of Evaluation and by the WFP internal reference group. The Office of Evaluation’s evaluation manager conducts the first level quality assurance, coordinates stakeholder comments and consults with the regional Head of Unit. The regional Head of Unit or designated senior evaluation officer conducts the second level quality assurance and recommends approval of the report by the Director of Evaluation.

54. A stakeholder workshop will be held in-country during the process of preparing the report. The workshop should present a complete final draft of the report and be timed to feed into the new country strategic plan design process. The evaluation manager and the team leader would normally participate in the learning workshop. The Head of Unit and/or the designated senior evaluation officer, or the Director of Evaluation may participate.

The purpose of the workshop is to highlight the critical factors that are shaping progress towards expected results, or lack thereof, refine draft conclusions and discuss the way forward in response to the draft recommendations. This will provide clear inputs to stakeholders to inform the design of the new country strategic plan. In fact, this kind of workshop could piggyback on a country strategic plan formulation workshop.
Figure 4: Process map for full evaluation report review and finalization

- **Team Leader**
  - Prepares the draft evaluation report in line with EQAS standards (template for evaluation reports)
  - Submits the draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager as per the agreed timeline

- **EM**
  - Reviews draft evaluation report and completes quality checklist
  - If the report requires major revisions: reverts to the team leader
  - If the report requires minor revisions: requests the regional Head of Unit or designated senior evaluation officer for second level quality assurance

- **Research Analyst**
  - Reviews and provide comments on the different evaluation reports, specifically on data accuracy and consistency, and on other topics as requested by the evaluation manager and as relevant to research analyst role

- **QA2**
  - Reviews the draft evaluation report
  - Provides comments
  - Agrees with evaluation manager on course of action (required revisions, or submission to the Director of Evaluations)

- **EM**
  - Following team leader revisions, ensures quality assurance process and, once cleared by the QA2, submits to Director of Evaluation for approval for circulation to stakeholders

- **OEV/D**
  - Circulates evaluation report for comments to stakeholders

- **Stakeholders**
  - Reviews the draft evaluation report
  - Provide comments within two weeks of receipt of the report

- **Research Analyst**
  - Collects internal reference group comments in evaluation matrix and share it with the evaluation manager

- **EM**
  - Organizes in-country stakeholder workshop
  - Reviews and compiles all comments, organizing them by topics or parts of the report and level of criticality.
  - Discuss key issues with Head of Unit, if required
  - Forwards and discusses comments with team leader
  - Agrees with team leader on necessary revisions

- **Team Leader**
  - Reviews /discusses comments with evaluation manager
  - Revises draft evaluation report as appropriate
  - Explains how comments were taken into account (comments matrix)

- **EM**
  - Reviews the revisions

- **QA2**
  - Recommends, if appropriate, that the Director of Evaluation approves the report

- **OEV/D**
  - Approves report

- **QA2**
  - Sends the report for professional editing and reviews in detail the edited version of the evaluation report
4.2 EVALUATION REPORT CONTENT GUIDE

55. The evaluation report conveys the results of the evaluation in a way that corresponds to the information needs of intended users and answers the four evaluation questions and related sub-questions. Evaluation teams have the final responsibility for the content of the evaluation report.

56. Data should be presented in a clear and concise manner (in tables, diagrams, etc.) as appropriate for effective communication. They should be systematically analysed and interpreted. Findings should be evidence-based and relevant to the evaluation questions under review. The evaluators should make a clear distinction between facts borne out by evidence and assumptions or plausible associations they draw from the evidence. Conclusions should follow logically from the analysis of data and findings. The report should be balanced and impartial and use constructive language. Recommendations should be limited to six and should be relevant, realistic (implementable), and prioritized or sequenced.

57. The evaluation report, excluding the summary evaluation report (SER) and the annexes, should not exceed 28,000 words (approximately 50 pages). In order to minimize repetitive formatting work by the team and the Office of Evaluation, ensure that the evaluation team is provided with and complies with the template and this content guide. The report should not exceed 150 pages including annexes and should be compliant with the Office of Evaluation's editorial guidelines.

Table 3: Content guide for the evaluation report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Evaluation features</td>
<td>Brief overview of the evaluation features to explain why and how the evaluation was carried out. It should include information about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The reasons for the evaluation; objectives and scope of the evaluation stakeholders and users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Methodology and limitations, main activities including timing and duration of fieldwork, evaluation team, and quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ How findings were validated, including from a GEEW perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section should be short. Full details are to be provided in annexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Country context</td>
<td>Build on the country context section of the terms of reference and the inception report, with any update as needed and relevant. Key headings of this section should include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ General overview. Include basic information on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) geography: territorial extension and borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) basic macroeconomic indicators, including poverty rate and GINI coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) if applicable: disasters, including a timeframe graph with main disasters and affected people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Food and nutrition security. Include IPC map. Include data on food insecurity levels, stunting, wasting disaggregated by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Agriculture. Data to include: percentage agriculture of GDP and smallholder farmer productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Content guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Climate change and vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Education. Include data on literacy rates, primary and secondary school enrolment by sex and percentage of population with at least secondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Gender. Elaborate on gender inequality index and related issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Refugees and internally displaced people. Provide an overview as relevant to the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Humanitarian protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ National policies and the SDGs. Overview of national development plans and policies in the framework of the Agenda 2030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ If available, overview of National Voluntary Report on Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3. The WFP country strategic plan in [name of the country]

This section should be descriptive and provide the basis for the analysis in the findings and conclusion sections. It should not pre-empt the analysis of the findings section.

The description of the country strategic plan should include the following:

- The objectives and the intervention logic of the country strategic plan and its key assumptions
- Main elements of the results framework
- Country strategic plan budget and levels of funding by outcome area
- WFP gender work in the country, how it relates to the rest of the WFP portfolio and its implications
- Accountability to affected population and other cross-cutting issues as relevant
- Planned and absolute numbers and percentage of beneficiaries by activity/component, disaggregated by sex and age
- Key changes in the external and internal environment and the evolution of the country strategic plan in response to these changes.

**Mandatory:** include a graphic representation of the major phases in the evolution of the country strategic plan over time and major changes in the external context.

- “New” initiatives and their relative weight (for example, cash and vouchers, P4P, grants/trust funds, etc.)
- Overview of the country office’s analytical work (for example, needs assessments, food security, market, livelihoods, protection, conflict analysis, GEEW analysis, monitoring systems, research, reviews, decentralized evaluations etc.)

**Note:** much of this analysis will have been developed and presented in the terms of reference and inception report. It should be updated and further deepened, if work done during the evaluation phase indicates this is necessary in order to provide a sound overview of the context in which the portfolio was developed and implemented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation findings</td>
<td>This chapter of the <strong>evaluation report</strong> presents the findings of the evaluation against its four key questions and related sub-questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section should provide the evidence – from data analysis and information received from various stakeholders – that substantiates the conclusion of the evaluation team (presented in Section 3 of the <strong>evaluation report</strong>). This section of the evaluation report should distinguish clearly between findings (facts, evidence, views of stakeholders, etc.) and the views of the evaluation team. Visual aids (graphs, tables, etc.) should be used to present data in a clear and easily accessible way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findings should take into consideration different stakeholder groups, including GEEW representation. Findings should be examined with the appropriate level of GEEW analysis as defined/agreed in terms of reference and inception report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In relation to GEEW, this chapter should: i) include an analysis and interpretation of data by sex and age; ii) provide evidence of findings (if any) in terms of the achieved GEEW transformative gains and empowering changes for women, men, girls and boys; and iii) provide evidence that findings have taken into consideration the perspectives of the different stakeholder groups. Findings should also analyse and report on equity dimensions, where appropriate and if feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Q.1 To what extent is the WFP strategic position, role and specific contribution based on country priorities and people's needs as well as WFP strengths?</td>
<td><strong>Sub-questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 To what extent is the country strategic plan relevant to national policies, plans, strategies and goals, including achievement of the national Sustainable Development Goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 To what extent did the country strategic plan address the needs of the most vulnerable people in the country to ensure that no one is left behind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 To what extent has WFP strategic positioning remained relevant throughout the implementation of the country strategic plan considering changing context, national capacities and needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 To what extent is the country strategic plan coherent and aligned with the wider United Nations and to what extent does it include appropriate strategic partnerships based on the comparative advantage of WFP in the country?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2 – What is the extent and quality of the specific contribution of WFP to country strategic plan strategic outcomes in Country X?</td>
<td><strong>Sub-questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 To what extent did WFP deliver expected outputs and contribute to the expected country strategic plan strategic outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section should include at the beginning a description of country strategic plan targets achievement rates as feasible with available data in reporting documents. The target achievement rate should then be discussed and analysed in terms of quantitative and qualitative contributions to outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 To what extent did WFP contribute to achievement of cross-cutting aims (humanitarian principles, protection, accountability to affected populations, gender equality and other equity considerations)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 To what extent are the achievements of the country strategic plan likely to be sustainable?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 In humanitarian contexts, to what extent did the country strategic plan facilitate more strategic linkages between humanitarian, development and, where appropriate, peace work?

**EQ3: To what extent has WFP used its resources efficiently in contributing to country strategic plan outputs and strategic outcomes?**

**Sub-questions:**
1. To what extent were outputs delivered within the intended timeframe?
2. To what extent was coverage and targeting of interventions appropriate?
3. To what extent were WFP activities cost-efficient in delivery of its assistance?
4. To what extent were alternative, more cost-effective measures considered?

**EQ4 – What are the factors that explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the country strategic plan?**

**Sub-questions:**
1. To what extent did WFP analyse or use existing evidence on the hunger challenges, the food security and the nutrition issues in the country to develop the country strategic plan?
2. To what extent has WFP been able to mobilize adequate, predictable and flexible resources to finance the country strategic plan?
3. To what extent did the country strategic plan lead to partnerships and collaborations with other actors that positively influenced performance and results?
4. To what extent did the country strategic plan provide greater flexibility in dynamic operational contexts and how did it affect results?
5. What are the other factors that can explain WFP performance and the extent to which it has made the strategic shift expected by the country strategic plan?

**3. Conclusions and recommendations**

**Purpose:** This section of the evaluation report draws together the findings of the evaluation in an overall assessment and includes lessons learned and recommendations. All conclusions should be substantiated by the findings presented in previous sections. Recommendations should take into consideration different stakeholder groups.

**3.1. Overall assessment**

Provide a brief and balanced assessment of the main findings related to the four evaluation questions. Conclusions should connect findings across different evaluation criteria and discuss the implications from a strategic perspective that can be useful for accountability and strategic decision making. They should be pitched at a higher level of analytical abstraction and should go beyond the synthesis of the findings. For example, they could discuss any trade-off between efficiency and timeliness of delivery, relevance, appropriateness of targeting and protection, or any other relevant connection that may emerge from the analysis presented in the previous sections of the report.

Conclusions should refer to the intervention logic of the (interim) country strategic plan and discuss the underlying assumptions, highlighting any plausible causal linkages to national development goals and the relevant SDGs. In so doing, they should consider sustainability and up-scaling by government institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main conclusions</strong></td>
<td>Main conclusions may also help in drawing a line of sight from findings to recommendations. Conclusion should refer to GEEW and social inclusion, namely to what extent and why WFP achieved transformative GEEW results and managed to reach marginalized, vulnerable, and hard-to-reach groups. <strong>Note:</strong> Do not introduce new evidence at this stage. This is the time to conclude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2. Key lessons for the future (optional)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> This section of the report should synthesize the critical factors that are shaping or hindering progress and that should be considered when designing the new country strategic plan. Both internal and external factors should be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3. Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>This section includes a series of short paragraphs describing up to six recommendations flowing logically from the findings and conclusions. Each recommendation is presented in one paragraph. Recommendations should: ✓ Be few (six maximum) and do not exceed 1000 words. ✓ Follow logically from the findings and conclusions ✓ Be relevant, actionable and realistic (implementable) ✓ Be prioritized and grouped by type of recommendation(s) (for example, strategic/operational; short/medium term; or appropriate alternative in agreement with evaluation manager) ✓ Where appropriate, include recommendations on how to improve: GEEW results, targeting of interventions and social inclusion ✓ Be targeted at specific key actors/stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annexes</strong></td>
<td>✓ Annexes should support/expand on text in the main report. They should not include all working documents of the evaluation team. ✓ They should be listed in the order in which they are cited in the main text ✓ If the full report, including annexes, exceeds 100 pages consider separating essential annexes (to be included) and supplementary annexes (second volume) ✓ Mandatory annexes: • Terms of reference (without the annexes of the terms of reference) • Methodology - should summarize intended and actual methods applied and clearly elaborate any limitations to validity. Where appropriate, provide reflection on experience and lessons for future evaluation • Evaluation matrix • Recommendations: link to findings • Bibliography • List of people met/interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Content guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As feasible, include a separate annex to analyse GEEW in more detail, as it relates to the WFP country strategic plan(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Supplementary annexes would typically include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary fieldwork agenda, detailing the required schedule of meetings for each team member to be set up by the country office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data-collection tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any other type of technical annexes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 ANNEXES FOR THE REPORTING PHASE

✓ [Template with annotated table of content for evaluation report](#)

✓ [Quality checklist for evaluation report](#)

\(^7\) There may be specific GEEW-related issues/topics (for example in relation to reproductive health, human rights, gender-based violence) that may be of particular interest for the evaluation and would require a more in-depth analysis. As an example, see the country portfolio evaluation of Sri Lanka’s specific case study on gender.
Phase 5: Follow-up and dissemination

58. It is important that evaluation reports are accessible to a wide audience, as foreseen in the evaluation policy, to ensure the credibility of WFP – through transparent reporting – and the usefulness of evaluations. Consider from the stakeholder analysis whom to disseminate to, whom to involve and identify the users of the evaluation, duty bearers, implementers, beneficiaries.

59. The evaluation dissemination should specifically consider GEEW dimensions. A GEEW-responsive dissemination strategy might include: i) dissemination of evaluation findings on GEEW to diverse groups of stakeholders who have interest in, and are affected by, GEEW issues; and ii) promoting the fullest possible use of GEEW issues of the evaluations within the United Nations system, non-governmental organization partners, and the government ministries among stakeholders. Alternative ways to present GEEW-responsive evaluation findings to women and individuals/groups who are marginalized should be considered.

60. This section provides an overview of the final steps in the evaluation process to ensure that evaluations are accessible to the audience of WFP. Detailed guidance and communication options can be found in the Communication and Knowledge Management Plan Technical Note. This section also covers some of the final administrative issues that have to be addressed by the evaluation manager. Specifically, this phase consists of the following components:

- Production of the summary evaluation report
- Editing and design of full evaluation report
- Dissemination of evaluation products
- Executive Board preparation and presentation
- Archiving of closed evaluations
- Administrative completion

5.1 FOLLOW-UP PROCESS

61. **Summary evaluation report.** As with all documents submitted to the Executive Board, the summary evaluation report should be edited and translated into the four United Nations languages. This task is the responsibility of the Executive Board Secretariat. The evaluation manager’s responsibilities are to:

- Prepare the summary evaluation report, keeping it fully aligned with the evaluation report, but placing emphasis on specific areas identified by the Office of Evaluation as important for stakeholders (in discussion with the regional Head of Unit and the Director of Evaluation); and send the summary evaluation report to the regional Head of Unit or designated QA2 for feedback and to the evaluation team leader for validation

- Send the final summary evaluation report and fully amendable and legible versions of figures and charts included in the report if necessary to the Office of Evaluation knowledge management and communication consultant for sharing with the Executive Board Secretariat for editing and translation (as per deadline, usually 11 weeks before the Executive Board session)

- Review the edited summary evaluation report and eventually clear revisions with the team leader if necessary

- Obtain the clearance of the Director of Evaluation for sending the draft version to Oversight and Policy Commitee (OPC) for comment and the edited summary evaluation report for translation

- Coordinate with the Office of Evaluation communication unit for final editing and formatting of the full evaluation report and summary evaluation report, prior to posting on the internet and intranet

- Check that the summary evaluation report has been published on WFPGo and WFP.org Executive Board webpage at least two weeks before the evaluation round table and four weeks before the

---

8 Note that whole set of figures and charts should be all editable i) either in the report; ii) or in separate file (e.g. excel).
Executive Board session. If it has not been done, liaise with the Office of Evaluation’s Communication and Knowledge Management Unit.

Figure 5: Process map for follow-up

- **Evaluation Manager**
  - Prepares the summary evaluation report for the CSPE outlining key findings, conclusions and recommendations
  - Prepares email (three to four paragraphs) to highlight major findings of the evaluation

- **Regional HoU or Designated QA2**
  - Reviews the summary evaluation report and provides preliminary feedback. Document is also shared with evaluation team leader for validation

- **Director of Evaluation**
  - Clears the draft Executive Board summary evaluation report for OPC’s comments
  - Circulates the draft Executive Board summary evaluation report to OPC in WFP, using the email prepared by the evaluation manager

- **Stakeholders**
  - OPC provides comments on the draft Executive Board summary evaluation report (two weeks for comments)
  - Unit responsible for management responses coordinates its preparation

- **Evaluation Manager**
  - Ensures report is revised, if necessary, in consultation with regional Head of Unit or designated QA2 and evaluation team leader (if needed)

- **Director of Evaluation**
  - Approves the final version of summary evaluation report
Figure 6: Process map for summary evaluation report submission to the Executive Board

- Submits final summary evaluation report and fully amendable and legible versions of figures and charts included in the report to the Office of Evaluation knowledge management and communication consultant for sharing with the Executive Board Secretariat for editing and translation, as per Executive Board deadline, i.e. 11 weeks before the Executive Board session

- Supports the evaluation manager in reviewing the final summary evaluation report and with the quality assurance process

- Edits Executive Board summary evaluation report
- Clears edits with the evaluation manager, who consults with the Director of Evaluation, in the Office of Evaluation
- Sends the final summary evaluation report for translation

- Reviews the edited summary evaluation report in consultation with the regional Head of Unit or designated QA2 and eventually clears revisions with the evaluation team leader, if necessary
- Clears the edited summary evaluation report for translation

- Uploads final Executive Board summary evaluation report on the Executive Board website

- Arranges meeting with key stakeholders, the regional Head of Unit or designated QA2 and the Director of Evaluation, prior to the informal roundtable (normally two weeks before the formal Executive Board session), if issues need to be discussed prior to presentation to the Executive Board
- Prepares talking points, PowerPoint presentation and Executive Director memorandum in consultation with the regional Head of Unit or designated QA2

- Approves final summary evaluation report, talking points, PowerPoint presentation and Executive Director memorandum (normally ten working days before OPC meeting, five working days before the Executive Board formal and informal sessions)
62. **Preparation of the management response.** The evaluation policy specifies that a management response to each evaluation will be submitted to the Executive Board at the same time as the summary evaluation report. Therefore, it is important to submit the evaluation report and the summary evaluation report in a timely manner that allows for the timely preparation of the management response.

63. The management response is prepared under the coordination of the Division for Performance Management (RMP). It is not the Office of Evaluation’s responsibility.

64. The preparation can begin based on the draft summary evaluation report, but should be updated in case there are any changes to the recommendations during the finalization of the summary evaluation report.

65. The evaluation manager is responsible for sending the draft evaluation report to the dedicated RMP focal point(s) at least six weeks before the Executive Board Secretariat deadline for Executive Board documents, i.e. about four and a half months before the Executive Board session, and for keeping the focal point informed of any changes to the final text of the recommendations during the finalization of the summary evaluation report.

Note: Early submission to the Division for Performance Management is necessary to allow for the consultation, drafting and review by concerned stakeholders of the management response, which, as an Executive Board document, is also subject to the Executive Board Secretariat deadline for editing and translation (seven weeks before the Executive Board session). To save time in the process, the evaluation manager can advise the Division for Performance Management of the draft recommendations, especially if only minor revisions are expected as a result of the review process.

66. **Report editing, formatting and web publishing.** The evaluation policy specifies that full evaluation reports are public documents available notably on WFPGo and the WFP.org Evaluation website. In order to publish the full evaluation report on the website ahead of the informal round table and Executive Board session and facilitate access to it, the evaluation manager is responsible for:

- Sending the full evaluation report to the Office of Evaluation knowledge management and communication consultant for editing and final formatting as per corporate/Office of Evaluation standards as soon as the evaluation report has received approval by the Director of Evaluation and no later than 2 months before the Executive Board session. More details can be found in the Office of Evaluation’s Technical Note on Evaluation Report Formatting Guidelines.

- Ensuring that the final summary evaluation report (i.e. after editing and final approval) is copied into the full evaluation report as the executive summary.

- Submitting the edited and formatted evaluation report, including the summary evaluation report, for “final approval” of the Director of Evaluation.

- Alerting the post hoc quality assessment (PHQA) coordinator that the report is ready for PHQA, as required.

- Drafting and clearing with the Director of Evaluation, an introductory paragraph to the evaluation report for the WFP.org Evaluation webpage. This paragraph should not exceed 600 characters and include a breakdown and categorization of main findings (which should not exceed seven categories).

- Selecting for “tagging” from a predefined list of (a) types of evaluation, (b) countries, and (c) topics relevant to the evaluation, in order to facilitate the search for the report and ensure that relevant links are created. The list will be provided by the Office of Evaluation Communication and Knowledge Management Unit.

- Reviewing the formatted version of the evaluation report and, when satisfactory, sharing it with the Communications and Knowledge Management Unit to review and publish the report and the introduction on the WFPGo and WFP.org Evaluation website and create the required links to topics and countries.

- Checking that the full evaluation report has been published on WFPGo and the WFP.org Evaluation website at least two weeks before the Executive Board session and before the informal round table.
• Reviewing and approving the formatted document from the Office of Evaluation's Communication and Knowledge Management Unit, which is responsible for the final formatting of the full evaluation report, including for example, ensuring that the list of acronyms is complete, that the tables are rightly numbered, that pages break in right places, etc.

67. **Dissemination of evaluation reports and products.** The evaluation report should be disseminated actively, including briefs to be disseminated to in-country stakeholders, in addition to the evaluation report and the summary evaluation report.

68. The evaluation manager, supported by the research analyst, is responsible for:

• Preparing a two-page evaluation brief, using the Office of Evaluation format, and clearing it with the Head of Unit or designated QA2 before submitting to the Director of Evaluation for approval. This is done immediately after the evaluation report has received final approval

• Requesting that the Office of Evaluation Communications and Knowledge Management Unit review and publish the evaluation brief on WFPGo and the WFP.org Evaluation websites and ensure it is published at least two weeks before the evaluation round table and four weeks before Executive Board session

• Drafting an email to be sent out by the Director of Evaluation to share the final version of the reports with WFP colleagues. The email should:
  ✓ Include the link to the page on the evaluation website that contains all the key documents and attach the evaluation brief separately
  ✓ Be sent to: all members of the OPC including the Executive Director; Directors of all divisions and country offices, including all WFP offices (which now includes the formerly-titled liaison offices) and those already targeted according to each specific evaluation (please provide the list of evaluation-specific stakeholders to the Office of Evaluation senior staff assistant for inclusion in addition to the distribution list)
  ✓ Be sent at least two weeks before the evaluation round table and four weeks before Executive Board session

• Where relevant, requesting other divisions/units to create a link to the report on their websites through the Office of Evaluation knowledge management and communication consultant

• Sending an email (as above) to relevant external stakeholders/partners, such as local partners, evaluation groups (ALNAP, UNEG, DAC EvalNet), inter-agency working groups, etc. interested in the evaluation. Refer to, and add to as desired, the list of stakeholders to be provided by the Office of Evaluation communication team

• Sending the same email to the evaluation team and to any of the external experts (if needed, and depending on how they have been integrated into the overall process)

• Developing evaluation products that may reduce barriers to information and exchange lessons learned and experiences specifically related to GEEW aspects. Such products may include the dissemination of lessons learned and best practices; and the development of presentations and summaries, including using audio-video material

• Using creative dissemination methods, such as brown bag lunches (timing to be discussed with the Director of Evaluation, the Office of Evaluation, to ensure coordination of various similar events on other evaluations), etc. to further disseminate the evaluation and stimulate discussions

• Identifying, if possible, ways to disseminate key lessons from the country strategic plan evaluations to stakeholders within countries, ideally down to the beneficiary level, if relevant.

Guidance on dissemination methods and options can be found in the Communication and Knowledge Management Plan Technical Note.

69. **Executive Board preparation, presentation and reporting.** All Office of Evaluation-managed evaluations are presented to the WFP Executive Board. In addition, by Executive Board request, an informal round table to discuss evaluations in greater depth is held two weeks before each Executive Board session. These round tables are organized by the WFP Executive Board Secretariat, in consultation with the Office of
Evaluation and the Division for Performance Management, who are responsible for the management response.

70. In preparation of the Executive Board session, when the evaluation is presented, the Director of Evaluation will brief the Oversight and Policy Committee (OPC) on completion of each evaluation.\(^9\) The evaluation manager will:

- Prepare talking points and PowerPoint presentation for the Director of Evaluation’s introduction of the evaluation to the round table - at least two weeks before the evaluation round (talking points: max 800 words for OPC meetings and Executive Board round table sessions, to be reduced to 450 words for Executive Board formal sessions; PowerPoints: slides to be prepared in line with the above talking points. For the Executive Board formal session: no more than seven slides, with five slides of content).\(^{10}\) Talking points should be bullet-style, in 14 font, covering evaluation description, context, key findings (mix of positive and negative), overall conclusions, lessons/key messages, and summary of recommendations.

- Check with the Executive Board Secretariat whether they have received any advance statements/questions from Executive Board members (to be done around one week before the Executive Board session)

- If queries have been received from Executive Board members, draft a response and clear it with the regional Head of Unit or designated QA2 in first instance and then the Director of Evaluation

- Prepare a short (600 words) strategic memorandum for the Executive Director

- Attend a preparatory meeting with the concerned regional bureaux and country directors, called by the Director of Evaluation (or regional Head of Unit or designated QA2). The meeting may also involve the Deputy Executive Director, if necessary. Timing: prior to the actual session when the evaluation is presented, but close enough to the round table and Executive Board session to serve for its preparation. Purpose: to discuss any issues that may arise and the process of handling questions.

71. During the Executive Board session, the Director of Evaluation introduces the evaluation report. Attendance by the evaluation team leader may be considered by the Director on an exceptional basis, consistent with the budget and communications process planned for the evaluation in the terms of reference.

72. The evaluation manager will:

- Attend the specific informal round table and Executive Board session and know the report well enough to respond to detailed questions, if required

- Take notes of the discussion during the session and pass responses to detailed questions to the Director of Evaluation as required

- Within two days of receipt, review the summary highlights (five to ten lines) of the session prepared by the Executive Board Secretariat and amend or clear through the Director of Evaluation

- Review the summary record of the session prepared by the Executive Board Secretariat and clear the revised version with the Director of Evaluation

- Discuss with the Director of Evaluation and Head of Communication Unit possible follow-up to the Executive Board through communication or meetings with WFP stakeholders.

73. **Archiving of closed evaluations.** Through the evaluation process, a wide range of formal and informal outputs are created, including documents, data, communications, etc. Such products are an integral part of the evaluation process and should therefore be retained for future reference – for transparency, accountability and internal learning purposes. The Office of Evaluation’s Evaluation Information Management System on Share Point facilitates this.

---

\(^9\) For OPC meeting/briefing, the talking points are the same as those prepared for the round table and the PowerPoint only includes the conclusions and recommendations as provided in the round table PowerPoint. Both should be approved by the Director of Evaluation approximately ten working days before the OPC meeting.

\(^{10}\) For the round table session, the Executive Board Secretariat’s deadline is five working days for the PowerPoint and 24 hours for the talking points ahead of the event. For the Executive Board formal session: the Executive Board Secretariat’s deadline is five working days for the PowerPoint and 96 hours for the talking points ahead of the event.
74. The evaluation manager, with support from the research analyst is responsible for:
   - Selecting files for inclusion in the system
   - Delivering a fully archived evaluation, including primary data and reference library, at the end of the evaluation cycle.


75. **Finalization of administrative matters.** Within one month of the finalization of the evaluation report, the evaluation manager should:
   - Finalize with the Office of Evaluation's business support associate any outstanding payments by reviewing the status of travel expense claims and payments (to consultants as per attendance sheet or firms as per invoices), etc. in cases where individual consultants have been hired to carry out the evaluation (not a long term agreement firm)
   - Finalize the performance assessment requirements in the Performance and Competency Enhancement (PACE) system for each consultant hired directly by the Office of Evaluation, in cases where individual consultants have been hired to carry out the evaluation (not a long term agreement firm)
   - Complete/update management information system requirements, including data on long term agreements.

**Note:** for teams hired through a long term agreement service provider, the contract would be to deliver a product complying with the Office of Evaluation's quality standards for a fixed price. Hence the number of contractual days agreed upfront for producing the report should not be increased if additional days were required to attain the expected quality (except in truly exceptional cases).

For teams hired as “when actually employed” (WAE) consultants, human-resource regulations apply. Assessment forms and separation clearances are compulsory to close the contracts.

Filling in/updating the Office of Evaluation’s management information systems is an Office of Evaluation requirement to allow for sharing of information and for adequate reporting on the evaluation function.

### 5.2 CONTENT OF THE SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT

**Table 4: Content guide for the Summary evaluation report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Summary evaluation report (SER)   | **Purpose:** The summary evaluation report (SER) is a stand-alone document for presentation to the Executive Board. It should provide a complete and balanced synthesis of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. Graphics and charts from the main report should be used extensively, as they give an overview in few words (for example, the graphic of portfolio evolution over time in response to changing context). It should include:  
  ✓ **Introduction:** Main points of the evaluation features, context and WFP portfolio  
  ✓ **Key findings** on the four evaluation questions  
  ✓ **A specific section on GEEW** to reflect the evaluation's findings, including progress towards the WFP Gender Policy objectives  
  ✓ **Findings:** These should also analyse and report on equity dimensions, where appropriate and if feasible |

---

37
Section | Content guide
---|---
✓ Conclusions: | Overall assessment and summary conclusions taken directly from the evaluation report
✓ Recommendations: | From the table in the evaluation report
  • Where appropriate, recommendations and lessons should provide adequate information on how to improve GEEW-related work in order to attain the WFP Gender Policy objectives
  • Recommendations should reflect equity dimensions, where appropriate and if feasible

Note: the summary evaluation report should not exceed 5,000 words including the Executive Summary. Recommendations should not exceed 1000 words.

5.3 SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY STANDARDS

76. The summary evaluation report is expected to meet the standards set out in the Quality Checklist, and to follow the template, providing high quality information in each section. The Head of Unit carries out the first level quality assurance of the summary evaluation report, using the quality checklist to provide systematic and constructive feedback. Should the report require only minor revisions, clearance to release for comment can be sought from the Director of Evaluation. Should the report require major revision, the Head of Unit reverts to the evaluation manager and requests necessary revisions before submitting the report to the Director of Evaluation for clearance to circulate to the OPC for comment.