



Joint Evaluation on the collaboration among the United Nations Rome-based Agencies

Terms of Reference

Contents

1. Background	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Context	1
2. Reasons for the Evaluation.....	8
2.1 Rationale	8
2.2 Objectives of the evaluation	9
2.3 Stakeholders of the Evaluation	9
3. Subject of the Joint Evaluation	11
3.1 RBA Collaboration Framework	11
3.2 Scope of the Joint Evaluation	12
Evaluation Approach, Questions, and Methodology	14
4.1 Overview of Evaluation Approach	14
4.2 Evaluability Assessment	14
4.3 Evaluation Questions	15
4.4 Methodology	17
4.5 Quality Assurance processes	20
5. Organization of the Evaluation.....	21
5.1 Phases and Deliverables	21
5.2 Evaluation Team	22
5.4 Communication	25
5.5 Budget	26
6. Risks and mitigation strategies.....	26
Abbreviations and acronyms	27
Annex 1 - Documents consulted.....	28
Annex 2 – Individuals interviewed	29
Annex 3 – Timeline	30
Annex 4 – Communication and Learning Plan	31
Annex 6 – MAP of RBA collaboration by category, level and type	35
Annex 7 – Criteria for selection of country case studies	37
Annex 8 – Country and Regional Presence of the Rome-based UN Agencies.....	39

1. Background

1.1 Introduction

1. Corporate or strategic evaluations provide organizations with an opportunity to assess and take stock of what has been achieved at the organizational level against their objectives. They provide opportunities for learning what works, the conditions that enable successful interventions, and looking ahead, what can be done to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization in delivering results.

2. The evaluation offices of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), as part of their approved programmes of work for 2020-2021 are undertaking an independent, joint evaluation on collaboration among the United Nations Rome-based agencies (RBA).¹ These Terms of Reference are for this joint evaluation.

3. The Terms of Reference have been prepared following a document review and consultation with stakeholders in the three agencies at global, regional and country levels (see Annex 2 for the list of stakeholders interviewed). An external evaluation consultant prepared the Terms of Reference, with oversight from the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) established for this evaluation represented by Senior Evaluation Officers from the respective evaluation offices.

4. The purpose of the Terms of Reference is to provide the framework for the scope, approach, methodology, management and governance of the evaluation. It will provide key stakeholders with information about the evaluation and will serve as the basis for the recruitment of an independent evaluation firm to develop proposals for the conduct of this joint evaluation.

5. The Terms of Reference are structured as follows:

- Chapter 1 provides information on the background and context of the evaluation;
- Chapter 2 discusses the rationale and objectives of the evaluation, and identifies the stakeholders and users of the evaluation;
- Chapter 3 gives an overview of RBA Collaboration (the subject of the evaluation) and defines the scope of the evaluation;
- Chapter 4 discusses the methodology and approach, and frames the key evaluation questions;
- Chapter 5 discusses how the evaluation will be organized; and,
- Chapter 6 sets out the risks inherent in implementing the evaluation and mitigation strategies.

1.2 Context

United Nations Rome-based Agencies

¹ The respective Governing Bodies of IFAD and FAO requested this evaluation.

6. Rome hosts three UN agencies with mandates related to food security and agriculture. FAO and IFAD are specialized UN agencies funded by their own respective Member States who form their different governing bodies. WFP is the leading operational arm of the United Nations system for the provision of food assistance and a member of the United Nations Development Group with its own Executive Board of Member States. In addition to the different mandates and strategic objectives of FAO, IFAD and WFP outlined below, the three agencies also have different governance structures, programmatic specificities and instruments to support them.

7. FAO is a specialized agency of the United Nations founded in 1945 with the mandate to: i) facilitate, promote and support policy dialogue and partnerships at all levels; ii) analyse, monitor and disseminate data and information; iii) support the development and implementation of normative instruments including international agreements, codes of conduct, and technical standards; and iv) advise and support capacity development at the country and regional levels to prepare, implement, monitor and evaluate evidence-based policies, investments and programmes (including technical assistance to Governments and partners such as other UN agencies). The Organization has a comprehensive network of decentralized offices giving it a long-term country presence. FAO also has a humanitarian mandate, providing emergency assistance and supporting the resilience of livelihoods in disaster and crisis situations. Currently the emergency and resilience portfolio represent over half of the FAO field program.

8. IFAD is the only United Nations specialized agency and international financial institution focusing exclusively on reducing poverty and food insecurity in rural areas through agriculture and rural development and by working with rural organizations and communities. Established in 1977, IFAD has provided investment vehicles for governments, other development partners and the private sector to benefit smallholder farmers, pastoralists, artisanal fishers and other rural people. IFAD's financing in the form of loans and grants are for programmes aligned with countries' development strategies. IFAD contributes to shaping national policies and generates knowledge and policy advice to assist countries in reducing poverty in rural areas by supporting inclusive and dynamic rural transformation.

9. WFP is the leading humanitarian organization addressing the challenges of global hunger and nutrition. While WFP's mandate clearly articulates humanitarian and development responsibilities, the organization calls for the prioritization of emergency, life-saving and development-enabling work that benefits the poorest and most marginal people. Established in 1961 by FAO and the UN General Assembly, it offers common services in humanitarian settings, including procurement, logistics, engineering and information technology connectivity solutions. WFP operates in volatile situations, such as conflict and following natural disasters; emergency preparedness and risk management; humanitarian-development joint needs assessment and combined data analysis; and purchasing power and supply chain capabilities that strengthen national markets and capacities.

10. The country and regional presence varies considerably between the three agencies. See Annex 8 for a mapping of countries where each of the agencies is implementing programmes.

UN RBA collaboration past and present

11. Collaboration among the UN Rome-based Agencies has been on the agenda of the respective agency Governing Bodies for several years, with the drive for collaboration

intensifying around global challenges such as the food crisis of 2008 and the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development.

RBA collaboration 2009-2015

12. In 2009², FAO, IFAD and WFP developed a joint document “*Directions for Collaboration of the Rome-Based Food Agencies*”.³ The document presents a strategic approach to collaboration that goes beyond response to an immediate crisis and considers longer-term priorities for joint action. The collaboration strategy sought to strengthen RBA capacities in providing guidance and support to the international community and to countries in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), especially MDG1.

13. While the “*Directions*” document did not define “collaboration”, it articulated principles (Box 1), specified a four-pillar framework for further collaboration and listed expected outcomes of the joint collaboration presented below. In addition, collaboration was classified into four categories: i) agricultural investment; ii) policy formulation, capacity building, knowledge management and advocacy; and iii) emergency and rehabilitation, including risk management; iv) administration.

Box 1: Principles agreed to by the three agencies to guide their collaboration

- i. Partnerships are an integral part of the mandates of the three agencies;
- ii. Partnerships is not an end in itself; rather, it is a means for greater synergy, effectiveness and efficiency;
- iii. A proactive approach is taken in learning from experiences in partnerships;
- iv. Collaboration is pursued in the context of United Nations System-wide coherence; and,
- v. Collaboration is driven by country-level processes.

14. The framework for collaboration identified the areas of engagement as follows:

- i. *Policy*: Strengthening collaboration on policy development and advice to governments and in mapping needs and monitoring systems. Prioritising areas where joint strategic programming is possible.
- ii. *Operations*: Continuously strive to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations on the ground through, for example, joint operational activities at regional, country and local level.
- iii. *Advocacy and communication*: A framework for collaboration on communication and advocacy that encourages the three agencies to align their messages and resources on priority thematic areas in international fora.

² In 2007, the Executive Boards of WFP and IFAD urged the RBA’s to “undertake a joint document on the directions that future purpose-driven operational partnerships could take at the global, regional and country levels.” This was instigated by an IFAD evaluation in 2005 indicating that IFAD needed to work in partnership with the other Rome-based Agencies, and the 2007 Independent External Evaluation of FAO call for an organization-wise strategy on partnerships, including elements for the renewal of partnerships with the UN system and the Rome-Based Agencies in particular.

³ FAO. 2009. “*Directions for Collaboration of the Rome-Based Food Agencies*”, presented to the 137th session of Council, Rome, 28 September – 2 October 2009, CL 137/INF/10

iv. *Administrative collaboration*: Expanding into areas where shared administration and management services are practical and make financial sense.

15. The expected outcomes of collaboration as set out in the “*Directions*” document were:

- i. Strengthened national and international policy development, implementation and access to information;
- ii. More effective participation and advocacy in international fora and the creation of globally recognised tools and frameworks;
- iii. Improved mobilisation of resources and overall performance, increased capacity to operate in multidisciplinary contexts; and
- iv. Increased effectiveness and efficiency savings.⁴

16. The “*Directions*” document called for the three RBAs to develop an action plan for achieving the outlined objective. While no action plan was developed, annual and ad hoc meetings were held among the leadership of the RBAs to share information on RBA collaboration.

17. In 2015, IFAD prepared a position paper on “*Collaboration of United Nations Rome-based agencies*”⁵ that reflected on the challenges posed by the post-2015 development agenda and the unique opportunity that Rome-based agencies had to respond to these challenges. There was also a high-level technical seminar jointly organised by the RBAs on “*Enhancing the evaluability of Sustainable Development Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture in November 2015*”. This was one of the first examples of a joint approach to evaluability of one of the SDGs.

RBA collaboration 2016 to the present

18. In November 2016, the RBAs jointly published a paper, “*Collaboration among United Nations Rome-based Agencies: Delivering on the 2030 Agenda*”, which builds on the 2009 “*Directions*” document. This document drew on internal and external reviews and evaluations, direction from Member States, and the experiences, good practices and lessons learned at country, regional and global levels.⁶ Annual progress reports relating to the commitments made in the 2016 paper have been presented formally to the Governing Bodies of the three agencies since 2017.

19. The *2016 RBA Collaboration paper* posits a common vision (SDG2) of ending hunger and malnutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture and rural transformation through holistic approaches. The focus is on SDG2 but set within the broader context of the other 16 Sustainable Development Goals. It recognizes that each agency has distinctive strengths and comparative advantages that can be leveraged for greater effectiveness in supporting the achievement of these goals – more effectively together than working in isolation of one another. The paper reiterates the guiding principles of collaboration set out in the 2009 “*Directions*” document.

⁴ Ibid, para #7

⁵ IFAD. 2015. “*Collaboration of the United Nations Rome-based agencies. IFAD perspective – Position Paper*”, 2015. <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/115/docs/EB-2015-115-R-23.pdf>

⁶ FAO, IFAD, WFP. 2016. “*Collaboration among the United Nations Rome-based Agencies: Delivering on the 2030 Agenda*”, 30 November 2016.

20. The *2016 RBA Collaboration Paper* identified four pillars of collaboration listed below. Select examples of activities that fall under these four pillars of RBA collaboration can be found in Annex 5.

- Working together at the country and regional level⁷
- Cooperating at the global level⁸
- Collaborating on knowledge and themes⁹
- Joint corporate services¹⁰

21. The *2016 RBA Collaboration paper* acknowledges the systemic and structural challenges to collaboration, including the distinct governance structures, different government counterparts, funding cycles, business models, levels of decentralization and organizational cultures.

22. On 6 June 2018, the three Rome-based Agencies signed a five-year tripartite *Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)* that sets out the objectives, principles and areas of collaboration agreed to by the three agencies. The objective of the MoU is to enhance collaboration, coordination and synergies among the three agencies at global, regional and country levels to play a more strategic role in supporting Member States with the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, specifically SDG 2, “End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture”. A second objective of the MOU is to avoid unnecessary overlap and, perceived and actual competition, and duplication of work. The MoU seeks to ensure that intentions and commitments on partnership and collaboration articulated at headquarters translate into concrete collaboration at country, regional and global level.¹¹

23. The MoU reiterates the principles of collaboration set out in the 2016 RBA Collaboration paper. It further emphasizes the RBA partnership as a strategic priority and the need to leverage the comparative advantages of the respective agencies and includes two general principles for collaboration.

Box 2: General principles for collaboration

Reciprocal exchange of expertise: Each Party is expected to respect the leadership of the other in areas of comparative advantage with reference to respective mandates.

Mutual engagement: The 2030 Agenda reflects an ambitious and comprehensive approach to food and agriculture and requires the Parties to work together from the initial stage of discussions with national governments and UN country teams, ensuring that their collective

⁷ This entails regional teams developing processes to enable new opportunities for collaboration and projects to be replicated or scaled up as well as country teams meeting regularly in line with UN country team and coordination mechanisms to agree on complementary roles and inform each other of strategic and programmatic plans.

⁸ To ensure coordinated RBA approach to advancing the food security and nutrition agenda at major global policy fora. Joint support of the Committee on Food Security and joint preparation of the State of Food Insecurity in the World (SOFI) are included under this pillar.

⁹ Such as resilience, climate change, financial inclusion, value chain approaches for nutrition, South-South and triangular cooperation, food security information, gender, and food losses and waste.

¹⁰ Joint corporate services at HQ and in the field, sharing common office premises, and joint activities in evaluation, audit, investigation, finance and administration.

¹¹ FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2018. Memorandum of Understanding between Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and World Food Programme (WFP), p.4

views are reflected in national planning processes. Each Party will endeavour to invite the other Parties to participate in global, regional country-level forums or discussions regarding SDG2 or relevant thematic areas, thereby enhancing opportunities for collaboration and constructive input.¹²

Source: 2018 RBA MoU

24. The MoU sets out areas for collaboration at country, regional, global levels and corporate services.¹³

25. *Collaboration at country level:* The MoU proposes that existing collaboration be enhanced and scaled up in areas of joint formulation of outcomes and programmes, joint food security assessments, and interaction in thematic groups, capacity development, resilience initiatives, and emergency preparedness and response operations. The MoU commits the Parties to document and disseminate good practices on collaboration at country level to facilitate the uptake by other country offices. At country level, the Parties commit to systematically consult and engage with the other parties when embarking on major country programming exercises, namely, FAO's Country Programming Framework, IFAD's Country Strategic Opportunities Programme and WFP's Country Strategic Plans. The MoU commits the Parties to joint efforts in: (i) data and analysis to contribute to a common understanding of country contexts, needs and capacities; (ii) accountability and reporting - promoting the principle of joint accountability for collective outcomes, and a joint reporting mechanism to measure progress towards achieving collective outcomes for specific joint initiatives; and (iii) costing collective outcomes with the Parties working together to develop new outcome-based financing approaches.

26. *Collaboration at regional level:* The Parties commit to ensure that regional strategies, programmes and activities are aligned with the global level RBA framework and strategy, as well as with Governments' commitments to achieve the SDGs. The MoU encourages the Parties to identify opportunities for joint/complementary projects, use each other's resources geographically and thematically, and sharing knowledge.

27. *Collaboration at global level:* The Parties commit to seeking synergies on key global initiatives using strategic dialogue and joint communications and raising awareness. The Parties also commit to maintaining the joint RBA website.¹⁴

28. *Collaboration on corporate services:* The MoU commits the Parties to continue to collaborate in the area of corporate services in line with sound fiduciary and financial management principles. Collaboration on corporate services is subject to the availability of resources, consistency with each Party's legal requirements and the decisions of their respective governing bodies.

29. The MoU makes provision for the monitoring and reporting of progress on RBA collaboration. The Parties commit to annual reporting from their country offices to their respective regional offices, regional hubs, and regional bureaux and headquarters on the

¹² Ibid

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ The "Zero Hunger - Working together to achieve a world without poverty and hunger by 2030" website [<https://zerohunger.world/web/guest/home>] was established in 2016 as a joint UN Rome-based agencies website to share news, documents, events, videos and photos on joint initiatives to eradicate hunger and malnutrition.

joint achievements and challenges, and significant issues that may arise during the reporting period. The Parties are required to convene high-level meetings twice a year to discuss results and significant emerging issues. In addition, the RBA Senior Consultative Group comprising senior staff of the Parties, is expected to meet three times a year to review the overall implementation of joint activities and address major strategic, operational or policy issues.

30. In 2019, the Rome-based Agencies developed an action plan to operationalize the main provisions of the MoU. The Joint RBA Action Plan 2019-2020 is a rolling two-year plan that is updated annually. The RBAs agreed that the concrete activities and outputs in the Action Plan will serve as a basis for the joint annual progress report on RBA collaboration and will be monitored by RBA focal points. Furthermore, the Action plan is an internal RBA management working document that is utilized to guide and further strengthen the collaboration among the agencies. It sets out the main activities and outputs, delivery dates, lead organization and support organization for these activities and outputs at the country, regional and global and thematic levels, as well as collaboration on corporate services.

Context of UN Reform

31. Collaboration among Rome-based Agencies should also be seen in the broader context of past and current reforms of the United Nations calling for greater collaboration among United Nations agencies and system-wide coherence. Collaboration between FAO and WFP often takes place in the framework of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, the longest-standing and highest-level humanitarian coordination forum of the UN system. At country level, the two agencies work together with other United Nations agencies, and others to deliver effective and coordinated responses that save lives and enhance livelihoods through the Food Security Cluster. Bilateral collaboration between FAO and WFP also includes joint resilience programming for nutrition sensitive interventions; analysis and monitoring (Early Warning, climate analysis, food security and livelihoods assessments) and studies/researches. While RBA collaboration is central to enhanced system-wide coherence, it is also recognized that partnership goes beyond the three agencies, and the RBAs must also continue to leverage partnerships with other development actors such as with other UN entities, the Private Sector, Civil Society, IFIs and others to meet the SDGs – for example, WFP with UNHCR and UNICEF; IFAD with the World Bank and other IFIs.

32. Recent UN reform efforts have included the development of an UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework¹⁵ at country level, which is based on the principles of: an integrated and multi-dimensional programming approach in line with the 5Ps of the 2030 Agenda – people, prosperity, planet, peace and partnerships; leaving no one behind; human rights-based approach to development; gender equality and women’s empowerment; sustainability; and, accountability. The new Cooperation Frameworks are rooted in four key objectives: (1) must clearly articulate the United Nation’s collective response to help countries; (2) must embody the spirit of partnerships; (3) must help turn our collective promise to leave

¹⁵ General Assembly resolution 72/279 elevates the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (now renamed the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework) as “the most important instrument for planning and implementation of the UN development activities at country level in support of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda).”

no one behind; (4) must provide UN country teams with the tools to tailor responses to a Member State's specific needs and realities.¹⁶

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1 Rationale

33. Collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies has evolved over the past decade, mainly in response to repeated calls from the Governing Bodies to strengthen collaboration. The joint annual progress reports (2017-2019) presented to Governing Bodies demonstrate that collaboration indeed is happening at the global, regional and country levels. To date, however, there is no evaluation of this collaboration that can provide credible evidence of the contribution of the RBA's collaborative efforts towards the achievement of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals and assist in understanding the conditions necessary for effective collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies. The joint evaluation of RBA collaboration was requested by the Governing Bodies of IFAD and FAO, and approved by WFP's Executive Board:

- At its 127th Session, FAO's Programme Committee approved OED Indicative Rolling Workplan 2020-2022 including the joint evaluation of RBA collaboration. Subsequently, the FAO Council stated its interest in further discussion on RBA collaboration within the repositioning of the UN development systems and on progress made in strengthened partnerships and collaboration in strategic, administrative and financial areas.¹⁷
- IFAD's IOE included a joint evaluation of RBA collaboration in its Results-based Work Programme 2020¹⁸ following consultations with IFAD Management and governing bodies that highlighted the importance of RBA collaboration in achieving the targets of SDG2. This evaluation addresses the recommendation to evaluate the collaboration among the UN RBAs from IOE's 2018 *Evaluation Synthesis Report on Building Partnerships for Enhanced Development Effectiveness*. IFAD's Executive Board approved the Programme of Work of IOE during its 128th session in December 2019.
- WFP's Director of Evaluation included the joint evaluation of RBA collaboration in the OEV Work Plan for 2020-2022 which was approved by the WFP Executive Board at its Second regular session 18-21 November 2019.¹⁹

¹⁶ UNSDG. The Cooperation Framework. <https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/cooperation-framework>

¹⁷ The Council further "...requested FAO, together with WFP and IFAD to provide a first assessment regarding the feasibility of integrating administrative functions, and greater collaboration in some oversight functions to be submitted to the 2020 end-of-year sessions of the FAO Council and Executive Boards of IFAD and WFP for collaboration". FAO. 2019. Report of the Council of FAO. Hundred and Sixty-third Session, 2-6 December 2019. Rome.

¹⁸ IFAD.2020. IFAD's 2020 results-based programme of work and regular and capital budgets, the IOE results-based work programme and budget for 2020 and indicative plan for 2021-2022, and the HIPC and PBAS progress reports. Document GC43/L.6/Rev1, 12 February 2020. <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/gc/43/docs/GC43-L-6-Rev-1.pdf>

¹⁹ WFP.2019.WFP Management Plan. Executive Board Second Regular Session 18-21 November 2019. WFP/EB.2019/5-A/1 <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000108558/download/>

2.2 Objectives of the evaluation

34. The joint evaluation serves the dual purpose of accountability of the RBAs to their respective Governing Bodies, and for organizational learning in the respective agencies. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

- i. To assess whether and to what extent collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies is contributing to the achievement of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, particularly at the country level;
- ii. To assess the approach to collaboration among the RBAs as set out in the 2016 Collaboration Paper and more recently in the 2018 MoU, including the accompanying action plan and other processes and mechanisms established to date.
- iii. To generate evidence on the enablers and constraints to effective collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies.
- iv. To identify lessons learned and good practices in tripartite and bipartite collaboration that can be used to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies, and potentially improve joint resource mobilization particularly at the country level.
- v. To make recommendations on the future strategic direction of collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies.

2.3 Stakeholders of the Evaluation

35. A detailed stakeholder analysis will be conducted during the inception phase of the evaluation. The following is a provisional list of main stakeholders in the evaluation.

36. *Governing Bodies*: The Governing Bodies of the Rome-based Agencies are key stakeholders of the evaluation. They have an interest in the collaboration agenda and have over the years pushed for better collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies. The evaluation will provide them with evidence to make informed decisions about enhancing collaboration to contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

37. *Management*: The Executive Management of the Rome-based agencies, as the leaders of their respective organizations who set the tone and strategic direction of collaboration are key stakeholders. Their views on the current state of collaboration and how they see the future are important for the evaluation. The evaluation will provide them with evidence to make informed decisions about enhancing collaboration to contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

38. *Headquarters*: The divisions at headquarters of the three Rome-based Agencies will be important sources of information for the evaluation, not only global and thematic collaboration, but also in relation to regional and country-level collaboration. The list of stakeholders is large and their interests diverse, and will have to be analysed further as part of the stakeholder analysis in the inception phase.

39. *Regions*²⁰: The regional hubs/offices (and sub-regional hubs/offices) of the Rome-based Agencies play an important role in ensuring that strategies, programmes and activities at the regional and country level are aligned with the global level, and that opportunities for collaboration (project programming and formulation and information sharing) are utilized.

40. *Country-based Programmes*: A large proportion of collaboration processes (as recorded by WFP²¹ and in the 2009 paper) takes place at the country level. The country teams and offices responsible for country programmes/Country Strategic Plans are primary stakeholders and sites for data collection on operationalizing collaboration. Their exposure to the practicalities (and challenges) in collaboration is relevant for the evaluation.

41. *National partners*: Collaboration is not an end in itself and country governments should benefit from the collaborative efforts of the Rome-based Agencies. The views of country governments and other national partners, including institutions and partners at the sub-national level, on the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of collaboration are important for the evaluation.

42. *Programme and project participants/beneficiaries*: Participants, such as farmers' associations, and beneficiaries have a stake in the quality/effectiveness of collaboration. Results relevant to beneficiaries of projects/programmes involving Rome-based Agencies' collaboration can indicate whether it makes a difference to the intended beneficiaries.

43. *Other UN agencies*: United Nations agencies at country level are stakeholders that should be considered in this evaluation. They have an interest in the Rome-based Agencies' contribution to the Common Country Assessment and the process of developing the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework. Some agencies collaborate with one or more of the Rome-based Agencies. Other UN agency members of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee are also key partners of WFP and FAO.

44. *International Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid Partners (Donors)*: Donors play a critical role in collaboration among Rome-based Agencies as their rules (including funding modalities, reporting requirements), priorities and preferences can facilitate collaboration or inadvertently undermine collaborative efforts. Engaging donors (traditional and emerging donors) as stakeholders of the evaluation will be necessary. This engagement should cover the capitals of donor countries and the countries where funding is deployed.

45. *Other partners*: Civil society, research centres, farmers' organizations and the private sector are important partners in the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The respective Rome-based Agencies have a range of partners at global, regional and country level, and in instances have common partners. The views of partners on collaboration would be useful for the evaluation. The results of the evaluation may be of interest to partners, especially those who work with two of the Rome-based Agencies.

²⁰ A mapping of the regions as defined by IFAD, FAO and WFP is in Annex 6.

²¹ WFP. 2016. Update on Collaboration Among Rome-based Agencies: A WFP perspective 2015-2016

3. Subject of the Joint Evaluation


3.1 RBA Collaboration Framework

46. Section 1.2 of the TOR outlined RBA collaboration from 2009 to the present, and how RBA collaboration has evolved over the period. It is evident from section 1.2 that RBA collaboration assumes different forms – tripartite collaboration (three RBAs) or bipartite collaboration (two RBAs); is pursued at different geographic levels (global, regional, country), and covers strategic/programmatic/thematic issues as well as joint corporate services/administration matters. The collaboration may also include other UN agencies.

47. Various documents have guided RBA collaboration over time. The 2018 Tripartite Memorandum of Understanding, as the formal agreement of the three agencies to work together, will serve as the primary guiding document for the joint evaluation. The *2016 RBA Collaboration* paper that informed the MOU and provided the detailed rationale for RBA collaboration will complement the 2018 MOU.

48. The pillars of RBA collaboration as set out in the 2018 MOU provide the framework for structuring collaboration and monitoring and reporting progress on RBA collaboration. Figure 1 captures the main elements of the RBA collaboration framework. It illustrates the pillars of collaboration, the enablers of collaboration, for example, agencies' mandates, and the governance structures for RBA collaboration. The framework also identifies the broader context in which RBA collaboration takes place, including the United Nations reform agenda, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and national and regional contexts and priorities. Neither the 2018 MOU nor the 2016 RBA Collaboration paper on which the MOU is based, included an explicit theory of change. The RBA collaboration framework as illustrated in Figure 1 may serve as a starting point for the evaluation team to develop a theory of change for RBA collaboration.

Figure 1 - Framework of Rome-based UN Agency Collaboration



3.2 Scope of the Joint Evaluation

49. The evaluation will cover the period November 2016 (when the 2016 *RBA Collaboration paper* was presented to the Governing Bodies) to the present. It will however take into consideration the history of collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies, in particular, the period 2009 (when the *'Directions Paper'* was presented) to November 2016.

50. The evaluation will cover tripartite and bipartite collaboration. Examples of collaboration between two of the Rome-based Agencies with other United Nations agencies may be included in the evaluation to the extent that they form an important part of the RBA collaboration. For example, FAO and WFP working jointly with UNICEF in a resilience intervention would fall within the scope of the evaluation. IFAD-FAO partnership on investment is another example of dual collaboration falling under the scope of this evaluation. IFAD's collaboration with another agency, for example, UNIDO, would not.

51. The evaluation will cover activities under the four pillars of RBA collaboration as set out in the RBA collaboration framework and the MoU (2018). Interviews with key informants (Annex 2) emphasized the need to focus on collaboration at country level, as this is where collaboration should ultimately impact on the lives and livelihoods of people and in line with expectations set by the SDGs and 2030 Agenda. The focus on the country level, however, is not to the exclusion of the other pillars of RBA collaboration. A typology of collaborations will be developed during the inception phase based on levels and modalities of engagement.

52. The evaluation will cover programmatic and joint corporate services/administrative activities.

- i. Programmatic activities can be categorized as strategic/policy, operations/programmes or advocacy/communications and include:
 - **Country-specific activities** (for example, joint strategies, frameworks and analysis, support to specific project design and implementation, technical assistance, knowledge products, joint resources mobilization, joint partnership development with external stakeholders, common programmes or common initiatives with the UNSDCF, coordination, clusters and technical working groups)
 - **Regional and global activities** (for example, studies, conferences, programmes, knowledge products, guidelines and tools, joint advocacy and platforms)
- ii. Joint Corporate Services/Administrative activities include:
 - Logistic collaboration in countries
 - Common procurement framework
 - Procurement to common initiatives in addition to human resources, IT or administration
 - Collaboration on oversight functions, including evaluation activities

53. It will be necessary to strike an appropriate balance between the programmatic activities and joint corporate services/administrative activities to be evaluated. The annual progress reports (2017-2019) show that the majority of RBA collaboration activities are programmatic, and it is therefore appropriate to focus on programmatic activities. Key informants interviewed confirmed the focus of the evaluation on programmatic activities. The evaluation will also cover large-scale joint corporate services. The evaluation team will be required to finalise a detailed mapping of RBA activities to prioritize the activities to be evaluated based on initial work done for these Terms of Reference. The following table presents only a sample of the 130 joint initiatives presented in the RBA Joint Annual Progress Reports from 2017 to 2019 by various categories. Examples of these joint initiatives are presented in Annex 6 by category, level and agencies.

Table 2 - Mapping of Joint Initiatives Sample (2017-2019)

Categories of Collaboration	Level			Agencies			
	Global/HQ	Regional	Country	Tripartite	FAO-WFP	FAO-IFAD	IFAD-WFP
Strategic/Policy	10	6	6	12	4	1	0
Programme/Operations	1	4	65	24	34	5	10
Corporate Services/Administrative	22	3	4	21	2	1	0
Administrative	17	0	0	11	3	2	1
ALL	50	13	74	67	43	9	11

Evaluation Approach, Questions, and Methodology

4.1 Overview of Evaluation Approach

54. The evaluation will comply with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016). This is an independent evaluation and the Evaluation Team is required to adopt a rigorous evaluation approach to ensure the quality and credibility of the evaluation. The evaluation will be utilization-focused, contributing to organizational learning and informing decision-making. The Evaluation Team will ensure that the principles of human rights, gender equality and ethics are integrated into all stages of the evaluation.

55. It is expected that the evaluation will be both summative (evaluating the results of past interventions) and formative (evaluating the design and preliminary results of current interventions). It should also be forward-looking, documenting lessons learned and good practices to inform future collaboration.

56. The evaluation will be theory-based, and the Evaluation Team is expected to develop a theory of change at the inception phase, and update this as an output at the end of the evaluation. The evaluation will place emphasis on the criteria of relevance, coherence²², effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

57. Key stakeholders at global, regional and country levels have expressed support for the evaluation and will ensure that the Evaluation Team has access to staff and information. They will also facilitate access to external stakeholders, where appropriate. The current COVID-19 pandemic will impact on the availability of staff and stakeholders (discussed further under section 6 of the Terms of Reference).

58. The governance arrangements and quality assurance processes developed for this evaluation will ensure that the evaluation process is impartial.

4.2 Evaluability Assessment

59. UNEG Standard 4.2 on evaluability states the necessity to assess whether an evaluation is able to provide timely and credible information for decision-making by verifying if the intent of the subject to be evaluated is clear; whether sufficient data are available or can be collected at a reasonable cost; and whether there are no factors that may undermine an impartial evaluation process.²³

60. The collaboration framework as presented in the 2016 *RBA Collaboration paper* is activity- and process-focused and does not set out clearly the outputs, outcomes or impact pathways. The Joint RBA Action Plan 2019-2020 contains a mixture of activities and outputs. This plan is a starting point for developing a theory of change, along with the framework of RBA collaboration shown in Figure 1 above. The Action Plan, however, does not contain

²²The criterion “coherence” is a new addition to the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. It seeks to answer the question of how well an intervention fits internally and externally with other interventions. External coherence includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort. Internal coherence is not applicable in this case.

²³ UNEG. 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation, p.22

performance indicators. The evaluation team is expected to develop a Theory of Change during the inception phase, to address evaluability challenges including the lack of indicators.

61. Interviews with key informants indicate that there is “lots of collaboration happening” especially at country-level, but the information is not captured systematically and, therefore, is not used to inform or improve collaborative efforts. Prior to 2017, there was no methodology articulated for determining which activities should be considered as RBA collaborations. Annual progress reports on RBA collaboration 2017-2019 are qualitative and rely to a large extent on self-reporting. Therefore, the Evaluation Team will need to collect and thoroughly review data from a range of sources and using different data collection instruments, so that data can be triangulated as much as possible. Governing Bodies have a keen interest in the potential cost-savings from collaboration on corporate services, and while financial information does exist, the Evaluation Team will need to develop models to conduct cost-benefit analyses.

62. In addition to the RBA Annual Progress reports, there are evaluations that partly address collaboration. For example, FAO, IFAD and WFP country programme/strategic plan evaluations have a mandatory section that addresses partnerships, including collaboration with the other Rome-based Agencies. Collaboration is also covered in other evaluations under the cross-cutting area of partnerships. The evaluation team will need to conduct a systematic desk review of evaluations conducted by the three evaluation offices, including exercises conducted in a collaborative manner such as the country programme evaluations in Cameroon in 2017, IFAD’s 2018 *Evaluation Synthesis Report on Partnership*, and evaluation of the CFS. Further, there are opportunities to draw from on-going evaluations that include questions related to RBA collaboration including among others the evaluation of the Joint Programme on Rural Women’s Economic Empowerment (JP-RWEE), the evaluation of the WFP Policy on South-South and Triangular cooperation and the FAO evaluation on the humanitarian development peace nexus.

63. The choice between country mission and desk review of country-specific evidence will be made based on the availability of documentary evidence. Those countries with joint initiatives that have been well documented will be prioritised for desk reviews whereas those that may have important partnerships underway but limited documentation will be considered for more in-depth data collection using a range of tools and methods (e.g. key informant interviews, focus group discussions, observations) in addition to document review.

64. The final evaluation scope will be made with evaluability in mind so as to maximise data rich programmes and mitigate risks of weak or unreliable data.

65. The evaluation is likely to yield credible and timely information for decision-making, subject to effectively addressing the evaluability challenges outlined above.

4.3 Evaluation Questions

66. The Joint Evaluation will address four key questions, with a number of sub-questions. The Evaluation Team will refine the evaluation questions and sub-questions during the inception phase, and detail them further in an evaluation matrix. The four over-arching

questions are articulated around the following areas: a) Relevance, b) Results, c) Enabling and constraining factors, d) Added value of collaboration.

67. Question 1: How relevant is RBA collaboration in contributing to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development? This overarching question aims to explore the relevance and alignment of RBA collaboration to global, regional and national agendas, priorities and needs.

- i. How does RBA collaboration complement and support the UN reform agenda and the priorities and expectations of national, regional and global partners at global, regional and country levels?
- ii. How relevant is RBA collaboration for achieving the strategic objectives and goals of the respective UN Rome-based Agencies?
 - a. Within each Rome-based Agency and at different levels of the agency
 - b. Across the Rome-based Agencies (including complementarities, overlaps and grey areas and gaps)
- iii. To what extent are collaboration frameworks ambitious and transformative while building on and reflecting the respective mandates and comparative advantages of the three agencies?

68. Question 2: What are the positive, negative, intended and unintended results of RBA collaboration to date? The emphasis will be on results at the outcome level as expressed in the theory of change that will be built during the evaluation process. The question aims to elucidate the underlying assumptions and explicit commitments of RBA collaboration and the extent to which they have held true. The evaluation will generate evidence of changes (results) and identify factors or conditions that can plausibly explain the results, as well as any evidence of unintended benefits and/or negative impacts.

- i. What results, progress or achievements have been made in the implementation of RBA collaboration since the adoption of the 2016 RBA Position paper, the 2018 Memorandum of Understanding?
 - a. At global level
 - b. At regional and sub-regional level
 - c. At national, sub-national and local levels
- ii. To what extent and how do the results of RBA collaboration reflect and embed cross-cutting issues such as gender, social inclusion and equity, environmental safeguards, protection and others?
- iii. What are the major lessons learned from the practical implementation of RBA collaboration and what is the potential for replication/adaptation, scaling-up and longer-term sustainability, especially in the post-COVID-19 context?

69. Question 3: What factors have enabled or hindered the effectiveness of RBA collaboration? This question seeks to generate evidence on the factors that have been key in facilitating or enabling effective collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies. It will explore the incentives and disincentives that may exist in the respective organizations and in the macro context (global, regional and country). It will also examine the 'collaboration infrastructure' that includes the governance of RBA collaboration; administrative aspects;

and, the units/divisions responsible for the planning, coordination, monitoring and reporting on RBA collaboration.

70. What corporate values, positioning, commitment and support has been offered/developed by the agency leadership at global, regional and country levels to RBA collaboration, if any?

71. What are the main drivers and hindering factors affecting RBA collaboration at the global, regional and national levels?

- a. UN system and coordination mechanisms at all levels
- b. Joint commitments and agendas across the humanitarian, development and peace nexus
- c. Financing dynamics and respective resource commitments
- d. Comparative and complementary advantages required to support national systems

72. Are the existing frameworks, tools, programmatic approaches, operational modalities, systems, business processes, communication and knowledge platforms in each Agency geared to promote, support and report on RBA collaboration across all its objectives and levels in a consistent way?

73. **Question 4: What is the added value of RBA collaboration (as opposed to single Agency processes and results) across the different aspects and levels?** This question will analyse the evidence and findings derived from the three questions above through the specific lens of whether the collaborative modality adds value to the requirements of external stakeholders (member states, communities and households, other partners) as well as compared to single agency relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

- i. To what extent is there existing evidence that collaborative modalities (as opposed to single agency delivery) bring added value to:
 - a. the lives and livelihoods of households and communities at country level
 - b. strengthening the capacities of national and sub-national institutions and other national entities and groups
 - c. the generation of information, data, evidence and knowledge in support of SDG 2 targets
- ii. What are the benefits of collaboration for each of the RBAs in terms of strategic positioning and delivery of results at all levels, as opposed to single agency?
- iii. Are there cost-savings/efficiency gains from RBA collaboration, can these be quantified reliably and do the benefits of collaboration outweigh the costs (financial, transaction, time, reputational, other)?

4.4 Methodology

74. The Joint Evaluation will adopt a theory-based approach. It will be necessary for the evaluation team, as part of the inception phase, to develop a theory of change to inform the evaluation. Given the wide range of collaborations and the complexity of the tripartite

relationships, the team will be asked to consider developing “theories” of change for different types of collaboration and at a level of granularity that can meaningfully support the evaluation team’s analysis and assessment. This will require an initial review of documents, analysis of available data, and soliciting the views of a sample of key informants. It will be necessary to develop the theory/ies of change, with the Evaluation Management Group²⁴ and a select number of key stakeholders. The theory/ies of change should be updated again at the conclusion of the evaluation as a key deliverable.

75. The evaluation will use the criteria of **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability**. The revised definitions of these OECD-DAC criteria will apply.²⁵ The evaluation will adopt a mixed methods approach, integrating qualitative and quantitative data collected through multiple instruments (key informant interviews, surveys, country case studies/field observation, and exhaustive document review, including a detailed synthesis of evaluative evidence). It is envisaged that most of the data will be qualitative, and it is imperative that the Evaluation Team is equipped with appropriate tools for analysing large volumes of qualitative data.

76. Assessments of efficiency will focus on various levels and may include:

- **Global level:** RBA collaboration infrastructure (efficiency of processes, mechanism, platforms, RBA units in support of RBA collaborations - e.g. planning, coordination, communications, monitoring and reporting).
- **Joint corporate services:** e.g. hosting agreements in the field; IT services and IT security; environment (Greening).
- **Country level:** Prioritise tripartite activities with ‘longevity’ – for example, the 5-year resilience programme (funding from Canada) and the Joint Programme on Rural Women’s Economic Empowerment, Joint Strategy initiative.
- **Case study of RBA collaboration on COVID-19.** Drawing on collaboration in the response to this global pandemic at various levels.

77. During the inception phase the Evaluation Team is required to prepare a detailed evaluation matrix to guide the data collection and analysis. The evaluation matrix should be informed by the theory of change and set out each evaluation question and sub-questions, the indicators to be used in answering the questions, and the sources of data and data collection methods.

78. The Evaluation Team will be required to conduct a detailed stakeholder analysis in the inception phase to identify potential interviewees at the global, regional and country levels. It will be essential to conduct a detailed mapping of existing tripartite and dual collaboration activities at global, regional and country levels as well as develop a clear definition of what is and what is not a ‘collaboration’.

79. The evaluation team will be required to identify a sample of initiatives/programmes for a “deep dive” analysis based on the following criteria:

²⁴ The Evaluation Management Group is made up of Senior Evaluation Officers from IFAD, FAO and WFP’s Evaluation Offices.

²⁵ OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. 2019. Better criteria for better evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria and Principles for Use. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

- Tripartite collaboration represented at global, regional and country levels (minimum 3 examples per level)
- Bilateral collaboration among the sets of 2 agencies (3 examples of each combination of 2 RBAs)
- Four categories of collaboration (1 example from each – strategic/policy, programmes/operations, administrative, advocacy/communications)
- One example from each pillar (global, regional, country and corporate)
- Initiatives that have been in place for a minimum of 3 years (summative focus) and those that were established in the last year (formative focus)

80. *Desk reviews* will be carried out with the following aims:

- a. Identification of relevant strategy, policy and operational guidance documents, and information analysis;
- b. Identification of portfolio and grant projects and programmes relevant to the topic;
- c. Assessment of qualitative information from reports;
- d. Assessment of quantitative data for previously identified joint portfolio and grants projects and programmes;
- e. Identification of relevant joint projects and programmes for in-depth analyses.

81. The desk review will include a large volume of documents from the three agencies, including their policies, strategic plans, annual reports, budgets, reports to Governing Bodies, and past audits and evaluations. In order to assess collaboration at country level, the evaluation will review joint project documents, funding proposals, memoranda of understandings etc. In addition to the agencies' documents, the evaluation team may consider conducting a review of the literature on organizational collaboration to identify various models and frameworks for collaboration in public sector and private sector organizations. A synthesis of evaluative evidence will also be required.

82. *Key informant interviews.* The joint evaluation will include semi-structured interviews with RBA staff at different levels and locations, including Management and staff in relevant departments and decentralized offices. Representatives of global and regional organizations involved as partners of the RBAs will also be interviewed. Finally, the evaluation team will interact with representatives of the Executive Board when deemed relevant.

83. *Focus group discussions.* FGDs may be held jointly with representatives of all three agencies or with representatives of individuals agencies, partners and/or other key stakeholders.

84. *Country studies.* The evaluation team will undertake field missions based on criteria to be defined by the EMG (see section 3.2). The aim of these case studies will be to: (i) (during the inception phase) explore hypotheses and validate data-collection tools and the theory of change; (ii) gather data and search for evidence in order to design evaluation questions and validate hypotheses and selection criteria related, in particular, to the "deep dive" analysis; and (iii) (during data collection phase) gather in-depth data from a range of interlocutors and sources. The evidence findings from these country visits will be triangulated with other sources to provide analytical responses to the evaluation questions. A thorough desk review will be conducted prior to country visits.

85. In view of the resources and time available, between 6-10 countries will be visited (in person or virtually). This means that not all sampled programmes and initiatives will be subject to field visits. Priority will be given to countries selected to represent a wide range

of collaboration between two or more Rome-based agencies. Those countries with more than one example of RBA collaboration will be identified in order to maximize efficiency of time and budget resources, and for better comparison across projects. The Evaluation Team is also expected to finalise a full set of criteria and to present a selection of countries for the country-level in the inception report. A debrief presentation will be made at the conclusion of each country visit to relevant stakeholders.

86. The evaluation will include the following country studies:

Table 3 - Country studies matrix

Phase	Type of study	Number of countries (max.)
Inception	Inception visit (remote)	2
Data collection	Field visits (remote or in person)	6-10
	Desk review	4-6

87. *Electronic survey.* An e-survey will be considered to capture knowledge, views and experiences of RBA managers and staff, as well as technical experts from government agencies, managers of RBA-supported projects and partners such as research centres, NGOs, private sector actors and farmers’ associations. Specific questions will be targeted to each stakeholder group. The survey will be anonymous, and it will not be possible to track individual respondents.

88. The evaluation team will be responsible for developing the detailed data collection instruments, namely, interview protocols for different categories of stakeholders, frameworks for detailed document review, questionnaire(s) for online surveys, and a framework for case studies.

89. In keeping with UNEG Norms and Standards, the evaluation team is required to integrate gender equality, disability inclusion and human rights in their data collection instruments and approach. Where appropriate, data should be disaggregated by sex and explanations provided where it is not possible. Data collection instruments should contain gender-sensitive language and should be vetted to ensure that they are sensitive to the culture in which they are to be applied. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will reflect gender sensitivity.

90. *Contingency planning in a COVID-era.* The evaluation methodology takes the COVID-19 pandemic into consideration, using data collection methods that limit the need for travel, should the safety conditions not improve, and will apply the “do no harm” principle. More detailed planning with the evaluation team will take place during the inception phase.

91. Debrief presentations should be planned at the conclusion of the data collection phase. The EMG will facilitate this engagement with key stakeholders. The evaluation will take a participatory approach – regularly engaging with and integrating feedback from global, regional and country-based actors and following-up.

4.5 Quality Assurance processes

92. The Evaluation Management Group is responsible for quality assurance of all substantive aspects of the evaluation, including the evaluation team selection and first-level

quality assurance of the inception report, the draft report, and the final evaluation report. The members of the Evaluation Management Group may forward deliverables for internal peer review within their respective organizations and will consult with the Management Advisory Group and external advisors periodically throughout the evaluation.

93. Quality assurance checklists and technical notes from WFP will be used with adaptations as needed.

5. Organization of the Evaluation

5.1 Phases and Deliverables

94. The evaluation will be conducted in five phases. The overall timeline for the evaluation is March 2020 to December 2021. The evaluation phases and summary timeline are shown in Table 3. The detailed timeline is in Annex 1. The inception, data collection and analysis will occupy the second half of 2020 and the first half of 2021. The report writing, circulation of draft reports and presentation to the Governing Bodies will take place in the second half of 2021. The timeline will be monitored carefully. Given the current context with the implications of the COVID pandemic, adjustments will be made as needed.

Table 4 - Proposed timeline and deliverables 2020-2021

Phases	Feb – July 2020	Aug’20 – Jan ‘21	Feb – March 2021	April – Sept. 2021	Sept. – Dec. 2021	Deliverables
Phase 1. Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TOR, stakeholder consultation, evaluation team identification and contracting 	X					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoU TOR Approach Paper (IFAD)
Phase 2. Inception <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefing evaluation team Inception 		X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inception Report
Phase 3. Data collection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data and documents review, fieldwork 			X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country debriefs HQ debrief
Phase 4. Reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft reports Comment and revision 				X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ER Draft/ Final SER Draft/ Final
Phase 5. Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior Consultative Group Informal joint briefing 					X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ER Final²⁶ Oct. 2021

²⁶ The final evaluation report may be jointly presented during the Fifth Annual Joint Informal Meeting of the three RBA Governing Bodies.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Board/ Programme/Evaluation Committees & Management Response 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WFP/FAO – Nov; IFAD- Dec
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5.2 Evaluation Team

95. The evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluation company through a competitive recruitment process that will benefit from WFP’s experience and support.²⁷ WFP’s Office of Evaluation will contract the evaluation company using its standard administrative procedures for the procurement of evaluation companies holding long-term agreements for evaluation services. WFP will share the Terms of Reference with the companies that have expressed an interest in this evaluation. The Evaluation Management Group will make the final selection of the evaluation company with approval by the Steering Committee. The Procurement Division of WFP will be responsible for contracting the selected evaluation company.

96. The selected company must have evaluation and technical capacities for conducting corporate/strategic evaluations within the United Nations system and experience evaluating organizational collaboration. In addition, experience in conducting corporate/strategic evaluations for one or more of the RBAs will be an advantage. The company will have a multi-disciplinary team with expertise in the following:

- Evaluation design, development of data collection instruments, application of data analysis tools.
- Expertise in using or adapting technologies innovatively to conduct evaluation under difficult conditions such as those presented by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Technical expertise in food & agriculture, food security and nutrition, rural development, development finance /economics, institutional development/governance/ organizational strategy, corporate services (procurement, human resources). At least one team members should have expertise in humanitarian and resilience evaluations and/or sector expertise. At least one of the team members should have technical skills to assess gender dimensions as well as other equity issues (youth, disability, indigenous peoples, etc.).
- Solid knowledge and expertise on organizational collaboration.
- Language expertise in French and Spanish in addition to English.

97. The evaluation team should comprise women and men, and preferably be diverse in terms of their regions or country of origin. The inclusion of national evaluation consultants in country-level data collection is encouraged.

98. The **Evaluation Team Leader** will be responsible for the overall team functioning, ensuring that all team outputs are delivered according to timelines and quality standards, is the primary interlocutor with the Evaluation Management Group and is accountable to the Group. The Team Leader requires proven experience as Evaluation Team Leader, advanced

²⁷ The WFP Office of Evaluation has conducted a formal procurement process to establish long-term agreements with a wide range of qualified, independent evaluation firms. These firms have been invited to bid on this evaluation.

technical evaluation skills and demonstrated ability to lead complex, strategic and joint evaluations with UN agencies. It is envisaged that the Team Leader will have at least 10 years' experience as a Team Leader and a minimum of 5 previous jobs as Team Leader of a complex, global evaluation. Experience evaluating organizational collaboration will be an advantage. The Team Leader should have 5 or more years' experience evaluating WFP, FAO or IFAD programmes, a good understanding of the United Nations system, the UN reform agenda and a working knowledge of at least one of the RBAs. They should have strong analytical, organisational and communication skills.

99. The primary responsibilities of the Team Leader include:

- Leading the detailed design of the evaluation and setting out the methodology and approach in the inception report;
- Allocating areas of work to team members and guiding them in implementation;
- Overseeing the data collection and analysis, and the production of working papers;
- Responsible for the end of field work and debriefing presentation
- Leading the drafting of the report and consolidating the inputs of team members;
- Representing the evaluation team in meetings with the EMG; and
- Delivering the inception report, draft report and final evaluation report and executive summary for the Executive Board/Council.

100. The **Evaluation Team members** should be made up of women and men and have an ability to carry out an evaluation in English and at least 2 other UN languages²⁸. The team should include people from varied geographic backgrounds including the global South, and should include members with a knowledge of FAO, IFAD and WFP. The team will need to include strong technical expertise in assessing joint collaboration among multilateral organizations and experience in evaluating joint programmes/initiatives at global, regional and country level. Expertise in specific sectoral areas related to the mandates of the three Rome-based agencies is also required. Experience having applied approaches to evaluating partnerships and/or collaborations is also a requirement. Experience evaluating topics related to UN reform will be an advantage.

101. The evaluation team members are required to contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology; undertake documentary review prior to fieldwork; conduct fieldwork that may include field visits to sampled countries, interviews at headquarters and selected regions and surveys; analyse data collected; prepare inputs/working papers in their technical area; and contribute to the preparation of the inception report, and the draft and final evaluation report.

102. The evaluation team selected should certify that no conflicts of interest exist in their appointment to conduct the evaluation. The evaluation team will act impartially and respect the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations system.²⁹

5.3 Roles and Responsibilities

²⁸ The official UN languages include English, French, Spanish, Chinese and Arabic.

²⁹ [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system](#)

103. The evaluation offices of the Rome-based Agencies will jointly manage the evaluation. Structures have been put in place for the governance and management of the joint evaluation.

104. **Evaluation Steering Committee:** The committee comprises the heads of the three RBA evaluation offices.³⁰ It is responsible for giving strategic direction to the joint evaluation, approving the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, approving the selection of the evaluation firm, and approving the final report for consideration by the governing bodies of the Rome-based Agencies.

105. **Evaluation Management Group:** The Evaluation Management Group comprises senior staff of the evaluation offices.³¹ Other staff of the evaluation offices may be co-opted to assist the Evaluation Management Group with its tasks. The Evaluation Management Group ensures that the evaluation is conducted according to the Terms of Reference and in compliance with the UNEG Norms and Standards. The Evaluation Management Group is expected to pay particular attention to ensuring that the evaluation is independent, credible and meets the quality standards.

106. The Evaluation Management Group manages and quality assures key deliverables at all phases of the evaluation, with specific responsibilities to:

- i. Provide inputs on key evaluation decision points and quality assure key deliverables:
 - Terms of Reference Criteria for selection of company to conduct the evaluation, and the selection of the company
 - Inception report (including final clearance of the methodological approach and the selection of countries/sites for field missions)
 - Evaluation report (drafts for circulation and final draft)
 - Organise and oversee the interviews conducted
 - Organise and oversee the field visits in close cooperation with country staff
- ii. Act as a liaison for the evaluation with their respective organizations.
- iii. Keep the Evaluation Steering Committee informed of progress with the evaluation and alerting the Committee to issues that require intervention by the Committee. EMG updates on progress to the Evaluation Steering Committee and the reference group will be in joint form.
- iv. Keep other structures informed of progress, for example, the RBA Management Reference Group and the Member States Reference Group and obtain their inputs during the evaluation process.

107. An **Evaluation Coordinator**³² has been appointed to support the Evaluation Management Group in ensuring that the evaluation produces independent, credible

³⁰ Members of Evaluation Steering Committee: Masahiro Igarashi, Director OED-FAO, Fabrizio Felloni, OIC – IOE-IFAD, and Andrea Cook, Director OEV-WFP

³¹ Members of EMG: Rachel Sauvinet Bedouin, Senior Evaluation Officer, OED-FAO, Marta Bruno, Evaluation Officer responsible for humanitarian evaluation portfolio, OED-FAO; Chitra Deshpande, Senior Evaluation Officer: IOE-IFAD; and Deborah McWhinney, Senior Evaluation Officer, OEV-WFP.

³² Valentina Di Marco has been recruited as the Evaluation Coordinator and is under an IFAD contract.

evidence that meets the high professional standards in line with UNEG norms and standards and codes of conduct for evaluation in the United Nations system. The Evaluation Coordinator supports evaluation processes from preparation, through to design and completion. The Evaluation Management Group jointly manages the Evaluation Coordinator, though her contract is with one of the agencies.

108. RBA Management Advisory Group: The RBA Management Reference Group comprises the RBA Senior Consultative Group with the inclusion of senior (e.g. Director and ADG levels or above) managers responsible for corporate administration and programmes.

109. The functions of the RBA Management Advisory Group are to:

- Provide inputs to the Evaluation Management Group during the evaluation process
- Facilitate access to all sources of evidence and data at country and agency level
- Facilitate preparation of a consolidated management response to the evaluation

110. Member State Engagement: Representatives from the WFP Executive Board members, FAO's Council and IFAD's Evaluation Committee will be consulted at various stages of the evaluation through existing mechanisms and, if necessary, in an *ad hoc* manner. These representatives will be asked to:

- Provide feedback to the Evaluation Management Group at key milestones of the evaluation process.
- Facilitate discussion in their respective Boards.

5.4 Communication

111. Transparent and open communication at each phase of the evaluation is essential for the credibility of the evaluation. The Evaluation Management Group, with the support of the Evaluation Coordinator, is responsible for communication to the evaluation governance structures, key stakeholders, staff in the respective agencies, Member States' representatives, regional organizations, and country governments. A formal communication plan will be developed during the inception phase of the evaluation.

112. The Evaluation Management Group will disseminate Information Notes/Briefs that provide an overview of the evaluation and summarise specific deliverables, such as the inception report. The Evaluation Coordinator will ensure that information on the evaluation is uploaded onto the websites of the respective evaluation offices. Branding will be joint as agreed with the EMG. The EMG will develop a detailed communication plan for the dissemination of the findings and key deliverables, including the final evaluation report. The report and respective management responses will be published on the websites of all three RBAs in line with their respective evaluation policies.

113. The Evaluation Management Group will organize stakeholder consultations at critical points of the evaluation, for example, during the inception phase and debriefings following the fieldwork to discuss draft evaluation findings and emerging conclusions and recommendations.

114. Documents for the evaluation are contained in a document repository in Microsoft Teams for the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Coordinator will manage the repository, ensuring that the Evaluation Team shares draft deliverables using the Teams platform.

115. English is the working language for the evaluation. Should translation be required for fieldwork, this should be included in the proposed budget by the evaluation firm. The inception report and the main report will be produced in English. The evaluation team will also produce a Summary Evaluation Report. The Summary Report and Management Response will be translated in all official United Nations languages for presentation to the respective Governing Bodies.

5.5 Budget

116. The evaluation is funded jointly with equal contributions from the evaluation offices at FAO, IFAD and WFP.

6. Risks and mitigation strategies

117. The following risks to the evaluation and mitigation strategies to address these risks have been identified:

118. The Covid-19 pandemic represents the most serious risk to the completion of the entire evaluation by 31 December 2021. It is unclear at this stage when travel restrictions will be lifted. To address this risk, the briefings and interviews during the inception phase will be done remotely. For the main data collection phase, interviews will be done remotely if travel restrictions are still in place. The evaluation will also use online surveys that will not require travel. Country case studies will be conducted on the basis of reports and remote interviews without field missions in the event that travel is not feasible and assuming that secondary information is available.

119. The evaluation is potentially a sensitive one as it deals with the important issue of mandates and organizational boundaries. It is therefore critical that key stakeholders are identified at the outset and consulted throughout the evaluation process. It will be essential to maintain transparency and regular communication about the evaluation to avoid any unforeseen reactions when the final draft report is presented. Ensuring that key stakeholders are on board from the outset will also increase the prospects for implementing the recommendations of the evaluation. The use of an external evaluation company and external advisers on quality assurance will ensure the independence and credibility of the evaluation.

120. Data for the evaluation is dispersed across three agencies and at three levels (global, regional and country level). Furthermore, the quality of the data will be variable. The evaluation team, with the assistance of the Evaluation Coordinator, will need to build a detailed, well-structured inventory of available data and sources.

Abbreviations and acronyms

EMG	Evaluation Management Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
OECD-DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
RBA	United Nations Rome-based agency
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal(s)
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme

Annex 1 - Documents consulted

FAO, IFAD, WFP.2019. Joint RBA Action Plan 2019-2020

FAO, IFAD, WFP. 2016. *“Collaboration among the United Nations Rome-based Agencies: Delivering on the 2030 Agenda”*, 30 November 2016.

FAO, IFAD, WFP. 2017. Joint Progress Report on RBA Collaboration

FAO, IFAD, WFP. 2018 Joint Progress Report on RBA Collaboration

FAO, IFAD, WFP. 2018. Memorandum of Understanding between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agricultural Development and World Food Programme, June 2018.

FAO, IFAD, WFP. 2019. Joint Progress Report on RBA Collaboration

FAO. 2009. *“Directions for Collaboration of the Rome-Based Food Agencies”*, presented to the 137th session of Council, Rome, 28 September – 2 October 2009, CL 137/INF/10

IFAD, 2018. Evaluation Synthesis. *“Building partnerships for enhanced development effectiveness – a review of country-level experiences and results”*

IFAD. 2015. *“Collaboration of the United Nations Rome-based agencies. IFAD perspective – Position Paper”*, 2015. <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/115/docs/EB-2015-115-R-23.pdf>

IFAD. 2015. *“Collaboration of the United Nations Rome-based agencies. Establishing a baseline and charting the way forward”*

MOPAN. 2019. Synthesis Report. *“Country-level collaboration between FAO, IFAD, and WFP”*

OECD-DAC.2019. Better Evaluation Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised evaluation criteria, definitions and principles for use. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

UNEG. 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation

WFP. 2016. *Update on Collaboration Among Rome-based Agencies: A WFP perspective 2015-2016*

Annex 2 – Individuals interviewed

FAO

Laurent Thomas, Deputy Director-General, Operations

Angelica Jacome, Director, Office for Small Island Developing States, Least Developed Countries and Land-locked Developing Countries

Matthew Keil, Attache de Cabinet, Office of the Director-General

Patrick Jacqueson, Strategic Programme 5

Shukri Ahmed, Strategic Programme 5

Mohamed Manssouri, Director, Investment Centre

Wafaa El Khoury, Deputy Director, Investment Centre

Bruno Minjauw, Global Coordinator, Food Security Cluster

Coumba Sow, Sub-regional Resilience Coordinator: West Africa and the Sahel, FAO

Cyril Ferrand, Sub-regional Resilience Coordinator, East Africa (Kenya)

Alexis Bonte, Sub-regional Resilience Coordinator, Jordan Country Office.

Florence Rolle, FAO Country Representative, Morocco

IFAD

Donal Brown, Associate Vice President, Programme Management Department

Paul Winters, Associate Vice President, Strategy and Knowledge Department

Ron Hartmann, Director, Global Engagement

Margarita Astralaga, Director Environment, Climate and Gender

Khalida Bouzar, Director of Near East and North Africa

Shantanu Mathur, RBA Collaboration Focal Point

Jordana Blankman, RBA Collaboration Support

Luis Jiménez, IFAD Secretary

Edward Heinemann, Lead Technical and Policy Advisor to the Associate Vice President, Programme Management Department

Marie Haga, Associate Vice President, External Relations and Governance Department

Guoqi Wu, Associate Vice President, Corporate Services Department

Lisandro Martin (written response), Director of West and Central Africa

WFP

Ute Klamert, Assistant Executive Director, Partnerships and Governance

Frederick Ranitzsch, Special Advisor to the Assistant Director, Partnerships and Governance

Stephanie Hochstetter, Director, Rome-based Agencies and CFS

Harriet Spanos, Director, Executive Board Secretariat

Neal Pronesti, External Partnerships Officer

Jacqueline de Groot, Head of Programme, Jordan

Erick Kenefick, Deputy Country Director, India

Annex 3 – Timeline

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Timing</i>
Preparatory	Development of ToRs	March – May 2020
	Draft ToRs revised with consolidated comments from ESC/ EMG	End May 2020
	Draft ToRs cleared by ESC and submitted to Management Advisory Group for review/ IFAD meeting with Management	Jun – 2020
	Revised draft ToRs sent to evaluation firms to request proposals	Early June 2020
	Final ToR shared with ESC for final clearance	End June 2020
	Preparation of ToRs for submission to governing bodies	Jun – Jul 2020
	Contracting of Evaluation firm	Jul - Aug 2020
	Submit TORs to IFAD Office of the Secretary (SEC)	15 July 2020
Inception	Evaluation Team desk review and preparation prior to EMG briefing	Aug – Sep 2020
	Remote briefing to the Evaluation Team	September 2020
	RBA Senior Consultative Group Meeting	September 2020
	Remote Inception meeting with selected countries and debriefing to EMG	Sep – Oct 2020
	Discussion of TORs with Member State Representatives at IFAD’s Evaluation Committee	2 September 2020
	Discussion of TORs with Member State Representatives at informal meeting of RBA governing bodies	14 September 2020 (TBC)
	TL submits draft Inception Report to EMG	November 2020
	ESC and Management Advisory group comments on draft Inception Report	Dec 2021 – Jan 2021
Data collection	Final Inception Report is circulated to RBAs stakeholders	February 2021
	Fieldwork, data collection and desk review. Internal briefings after each country visit	Feb – Mar 2021
Reporting	Overall debriefing with EMG, ESC, and RBA stakeholders	March - 2021
	TL submits draft Evaluation Report to EMG (IFAD peer review 1 week)	April 2021
	Stakeholders workshop	May 2021
	ESC and Management Advisory group comments on draft Evaluation Report	Apr – Aug 2021
	TL submits draft Summary Evaluation Report (SER)	June 2021
	TL submits final draft Evaluation Report (with revised SER)	September 2021
	Report submitted to Secretary for editing/translation	3 September 2021
Dissemination & Follow-up	RBA Senior Consultative Group Meeting	September 2021
	Discussion IFAD Evaluation Committee	October 2021
	Discussion with Joint RBA Executive Board	Nov - Dec 2021 (tbc)
	Dissemination of final Evaluation Report, posting on respective websites	January 2022

EMG= Evaluation Management Group, ESC = Evaluation Steering Committee, TL= Team leader

Annex 4 – Communication and Learning Plan

When Evaluation phase with month/year	What Communication product	To whom Target group or individual	What level Purpose of communication	From whom	How Communication means e.g. meeting, interaction, etc.	Why Purpose of communication
Preparation (Jan-Jun 2020) TOR (Jun 2020)	Full ToR ToR summary	EMG, SC, RBA Management Advisory Group	Conceptualization & Strategic. Steering committee final clearance.	EMG	Consultations, meetings and written exchanges	Draft ToR for comments / Final for information
Share TORs for IFAD peer review and comments (Approach Paper) (June 2020 – 1 week process)	Full TORs (Approach paper)	IOE Director/staff	Informative, consultation	IFAD	Meeting, written exchange	Comments, Final for information
TORs (summary + full) finalized and sent SEC for posting on Scriptoria (September 3, 2020)	TORs (summary and full)	SEC (IFAD)	Informative	EMG	Written exchanges	Final for information
Memo to RBA Management Advisory Group to share TORs for comments (June 2020 – 2 weeks process)	Full TORs	IFAD/WFP/FAO	Informative, consultation	EMG	Consultation, written exchanges	Final for information
Presentation at IFAD Evaluation Committee (invitation extended to WFP EB members and FAO Council members – Sept. 22, 2020/ Oct 22, 2020 - tbc)	TORs (summary and full)	EC (IFAD)/WFP EB/FAO Council/ Directors of IOE/OEV/OEDD	Informative	EMG	Presentation	Final for information

When Evaluation phase with month/year	What Communication product	To whom Target group or individual	What level Purpose of communication	From whom	How Communication means e.g. meeting, interaction, etc.	Why Purpose of communication
see earlier comments in the main text (September 2020)	TORs (summary and full)	IFAD Management	Informative, consultation	IOE	Presentation	Final for information
Inception (Aug -Nov 2020)	EMG Briefing + Inception Mission + Validation Workshop + Draft Inception Report	EMG/SC	Operational & Informative	Evaluation Firm/TL	Written exchange	Draft IR for comments
Share inception report with Evaluation Steering Committee and Reference Groups and feedback collection for finalization (Dec 2020 – Jan 2021)	Inception Report	ESC, Reference Groups	Informative	EMG	Written exchanges, meeting	Final for information
Final Inception report shared internally in FAO, IFAD and WFP (February 2021)	Inception Report	ESC, Reference Groups	Informative	EMG	Written exchanges	Final for information
Fieldwork debrief (March 2021)	PPT	EMG/SC	Operational	Evaluation Firm/TL	Meeting / Teleconference	For information and verbal feedback
Reporting (April -Sept 2021)	Draft and Final Evaluation Report (ER), Workshop	EMG/SC IFAD management for peer review.	All	Evaluation Firm/TL	Written exchanges (+ matrix of comments on request) and presentations	Draft ER for written comments / Final ER for information
Learning workshop (May 2021)	PPT	RBA advisory group/Management	Learning	Evaluation Firm/TL/EMG	Workshop	Utilization of the findings and conclusions of the evaluation
Report submitted to Secretary for editing/translation	Evaluation Report	EMG	Informative	EMG	Written Exchanges	Final for information

When Evaluation phase with month/year	What Communication product	To whom Target group or individual	What level Purpose of communication	From whom	How Communication means e.g. meeting, interaction, etc.	Why Purpose of communication
(September 2021)						
Discussion IFAD Evaluation Committee (October 2021)	Evaluation Report	EC (IFAD)/WFP EB/FAO Council/ Directors of IOE/OEV/OEDD	Informative	EMG	Written exchange	Final for information
Presentation of Management Response to governing bodies (November 2021)	Evaluation Report	FAD/FAO/WFP	Informative	EMG	Written exchange	Final for information
Dissemination event (Nov – Dec 2021)	PPT	EMG/RBA advisory group/ Member State Advisory Group	Informative	EM, Director of Evaluation	Event	Dissemination of evaluation findings and conclusions.

Annex 5 – RBA Collaboration Activities by Pillar

This table shows the range of activities that constitute collaboration among the Rome-based Agencies in terms of the four pillars of the collaboration framework. The list is not exhaustive and reflects only those activities that were reported between 2017 and 2019.

Table: RBA collaboration activities (2017-2019)

Pillars	Activities
Pillar 1: Country level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint country strategies (Colombia, Indonesia, Niger) • Joint contribution to Common Country Analysis for the UNSDCF/UNDAF • Joint advice to government • Country level projects (e.g. Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Kyrgyz Republic, Lebanon) – sample to be selected based on criteria.
Pillar 2: Regional level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-Saharan Africa: (RBA Sahel Action Plan, Integrated Approach Pilot on Food Security in 12 countries) • NENA Region (FAO-WFP regional partnership agreement, Regional Initiative for School Meals and Social Protection, Middle East Joint Resilience Programming) • Asia-Pacific Region: Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Platform for Regional Emergencies; Pacific Food Security Cluster
Pillar 3: Global and thematic level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero Hunger • Climate change including Disaster Risk Reduction • Gender • Nutrition (including the School Food & Nutrition Programme, Nutrition-sensitive value chains, Minimum Dietary Diversity Women (MDD-W) indicator, REACH, SUN) • Agro-ecology • Family Farming • Financial Inclusion • Resilience (including Early Warning Early Action, food security in conflict situations, shock-responsive social protection) • State of Food Insecurity in the World (SOFI) • Data and statistics, including Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping • Global Platforms (e.g. CFS, Global Food Security Cluster, Agriculture Marketing Information Systems, Global Forum on Agricultural Research, United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition) • South-South & Triangular Cooperation
Pillar 4: Corporate services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common procurement/joint procurement (work of Common Procurement Team) • Logistics • Harmonization of business processes at country level • Human Resources Management (alignment of HR policies, human resource development) • Oversight functions • Evaluation function • Risk Management (including business continuity/disaster recovery)

Annex 6 – MAP of RBA collaboration by category, level and type

Level/Types	Strategic/Policy	Operations/Programmes	Advocacy/Communications	Joint Corporate Services/ Administrative
Global				
Tripartite	CFS	NA	Food Systems Summit	Common Procurement Team activities concluded in 2017
	SOFI		Climate change: Side events UNFCCC	Collaboration on business continuity/disaster recovery, MOU on Organizational Resilience Management
	Nutrition-Sensitive Value Chains RBA Working Group activities including framework, e-learning module		Annual International Women's Day	Risk management RBA participation in HLCM risk management working group
	Green Climate Fund strategy on agriculture and food security		RBA Excellence Award	Joint tenders (transcription services, gas supply, printer services)
	Joint RBA Roadmap for South-South & Triangular Cooperation		RBA Joint Website - Zero Hunger	Shared IT services and IT security
	Home-Grown School Feeding Meals Resources Framework (in collaboration with NEPAD CAADP of AU)		Joint participation in HLPF	Annual meeting of Offices of Oversight
	Biodiversity strategy with focus on agro-biodiversity		Scaling up Agroecology Initiative	Informal Joint Meetings of FAO Council and IFAD and WFP Executive Boards
	Monitoring food security in countries with conflict situations (UNSC resolution 2417)		Side event UNGA UNSC resolution 2417	EVAL-forward
FAO-WFP	Global Food Security Cluster	NA	Participation in UNSCN	Hosting agreements at headquarters level
			RBA Evaluation Offices ROMEN Drinks	Common commissary services
FAO-IFAD	NA	FAO's Investment Centre (TCI)		Joint tender medical and health insurance
IFAD-WFP	NA	NA		NA

Level/Types	Strategic/Policy	Programmatic /Operations	Advocacy and Communications	Corporate Services
Regional				
Tripartite	Home-Grown School Feeding Meals Resources Framework (in collaboration with NEPAD CAADP of AU)	Lake Chad Operational Framework (Cameroon, Chad, Niger, Nigeria)	Participation in Scaling Up Nutrition	NA
	Regional Pacific Food Security Cluster	Middle East Joint resilience programme		
		G5 Sahel Plan and implementation		
FAO-WFP	ASEAN strengthening member states to develop risk-informed and shock responsive social protection systems	NA	Events/advocacy Arab Forum for Sustainable Development, League of Arab States meetings	NA
	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Platform for Regional Emergencies (VAMPIRE)			
FAO-IFAD	NA	FAO's Investment Centre (TCI)	NA	NA
IFAD-WFP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Country				
Tripartite	Joint Country strategies (Niger, Colombia, Indonesia)	Joint programme Economic Empowerment of Rural Women (with UN Women)	Participation in Scaling Up Nutrition	NA
	Common areas for country strategic plans (various countries)	5-year Resilience Programme (Canada fund) in DRC, Niger and Somalia	RBA Excellence Award (Guatemala, Madagascar, DRC, Mozambique)	
		Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme -Climate Resilient Agricultural Livelihoods Window	MOPAN case studies (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Jordan, Madagascar)	
		Jordan-Lebanon (EU/MADAD)		
FAO-WFP	ASEAN strengthening member states to develop risk-informed and shock responsive social protection systems (with ILO and UNICEF)	Cambodia Food Security and Nutrition-Specific Interagency Social Protection Assessment tool	Philippines advocacy activities	Hosting agreements in the field
	Global Food Security Cluster	Guinea School meals project		
		Afghanistan Food Security and Nutrition Agenda		
FAO-IFAD	Sub-Saharan Africa Integrated Approach (Pilot) on Food Security to foster sustainability and resilience for food security by safeguarding ecosystems in 12 countries	Accelerated Capacity Development Plans and FFS in IFAD-funded projects (Burundi, DRC, Jordan, Laos, Nepal)	NA	Hosting agreements in the field
		FAO's Investment Centre (TCI)		
		Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Program phase 2		
IFAD-WFP	NA	Cambodia Agriculture Services Programme for Innovation, Resilience and Extension (ASPIRE)	NA	Hosting agreements in the field
		Senegal food and income security for vulnerable rural households		
		Laos Agriculture for Nutrition/Strategic Support for food Security & Nutrition		

Annex 7 – Criteria for selection of country case studies

Consideration should be given to the following criteria and descriptions when developing a full list of criteria and approach to selection of countries.

- **Regional representation (6 in line with WFP/FAO/IFAD regions) – at least 6 countries.** It is necessary to select countries from each of the regions (Member countries and regional groupings expect this). It should be borne in mind that each agency has its own regions that do not always coincide. The selection of countries should be checked against the regions of the three agencies to ensure that all regions are covered. The regions themselves are diverse, and it should be made clear upfront that the country selected is not necessarily representative of the region.
- **Country office location:** Using this criterion will narrow the selection as the number of countries where all three are present is limited. This will also help test the assumption that in-country presence is necessary for collaboration. The joint progress reports do not indicate where collaboration is weak so this would have to be determined in the inception phase through interviews or other evaluative evidence – e.g. evaluation reports.
- **Existing Joint programmes or activities:** An initial mapping of RBA collaboration activities has been done based on the joint progress reports and a sample is presented in Annex 6. This mapping will be completed during inception and will be used to identify countries with greater and fewer tripartite and bilateral collaborations for inclusion for country case studies.
- **Longevity of RBA collaboration in country – long and new collaboration represented.** The duration of RBA collaboration can provide insights on results from collaboration initiatives that have been functioning for some time, and insights into how current initiatives are unfolding – both are important for the evaluation. “Long” and “new” will need to be defined for example. “Long” could be an initiative that predates the 2016 Joint Paper and is still in operation and “new” could be a collaboration initiative since the 2016 Joint Paper. This assumes that the RBA collaboration initiatives are documented with clear starting dates.
- **MOPAN case studies (Bangladesh, Jordan, Ethiopia, Madagascar) evidence will be used. Therefore, these countries will not be visited.** While these countries will not be included in country visits, they may be included as a case study. They may also be included in data collection on collaboration in which they participated/participating. For example, Jordan is in the EU/MADAD programme with Lebanon and Madagascar was a recipient of the RBA Excellence Award.

Based on these criteria, a preliminary indicative country mapping is presented below to show potential countries that may be considered for the case studies and field visits. Longevity of RBA collaboration has been taken into consideration for the existing program criteria and *IFAD's ESR on Partnerships* which indicates greater and weaker RBA collaboration based on its sample was used.

Indicative Criteria and Country mapping – May 2020

Criteria / Regions		Asia	Latin and Central America	Eastern Europe/ Central Asia	Middle East/North Africa	West & Central Africa	Southern Africa	East Africa	Thematic
REGIONAL Offices/ Bureaus (in caps)/ Subregional Offices	WFP offices	THAILAND	PANAMA		EGYPT	SENEGAL	SOUTH AFRICA	KENYA	China, Brazil
	IFAD offices	VietNam, India, Indonesia, Bangladesh, China	Panama, Brazil (KM hub), Peru, El Salvador	Turkey (Istanbul)	Egypt	Senegal, Cameroon, Cote D'Ivoire	South Africa (KM hub)	Kenya, Ethiopia, Zambia	China, Brazil, South Africa
	FAO offices	THAILAND, Samoa	CHILE, Panama, Barbados	HUNGARY, Turkey (Ankara)	Tunisia, Lebanon, UAE	GHANA, Gabon, Senegal	Zimbabwe	Ethiopia	South Africa, Kenya, Senegal, Jordan
Shared RBA Country Offices		China (WFP), Pakistan (FAO), Nepal (WFP), India (WFP)	Peru (FAO), Bolivia (FAO)		Egypt (FAO), Yemen (FAO)	Cote d'Ivoire (WFP), Sierra Leone (FAO)	South Africa, Zambia (WFP)	Kenya, Burundi, Madagascar, Rwanda, Mozambique (FAO)	
Pilot Joint Country Strategy Countries		Indonesia	Colombia			Niger			
Existing Country Studies (e.g., MOPAN, RAB evaluations)		Bangladesh			Jordan	Cameroon	Madagascar	Ethiopia	
Country Programmes with RBA Collaborative (Mix of Tripartite, Bilateral, and Duration (new and older))		Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos PDR, Philippines	Guatemala	Kyrgyzstan	Lebanon	Niger		Kenya	
Strong RBA collaboration (1)		Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Pakistan	Brazil		Turkey, Jordan, Yemen,	Mali	Mozambique	Ethiopia	
Weak RBA collaboration (1)		Nepal, VietNam	Ecuador		Moldova, Morocco	Gambia, Nigeria, Senegal, Ghana	Madagascar, Tanzania	Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda	
POTENTIAL COUNTRY CASES		Indonesia, China, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh (2)	Colombia, Panama, Brazil, Peru	Turkey	Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan (2)	Senegal, Niger, Cameroon (2)	South Africa, Mozambique, Madagascar (2)	Kenya, Ethiopia (2)	

Notes:(1) IFAD's Evaluation Synthesis Report on Partnership

(2) MOPAN Study of Collaboration - Case Study countries

Annex 8 – Country and Regional Presence of the Rome - based UN Agencies

Region	Asia & Pacific			Latin American & Caribbean			Europe and Central Asia			Near East & North Africa		
RBA	FAO	WFP	IFAD	FAO	WFP	IFAD	FAO	WFP	IFAD	FAO	WFP	IFAD
Regional Bureau	RAP - Bangkok	RB Bangkok		RLC - Santiago	RB Panama	Panama HUB (sub-regional)	REU - Budapest	In Near East & North Africa	In Near East & North Africa	RNE - Cairo	RB Cairo	Cairo (Sub-regional)
Sub-Regional Office		China Center of Excellence	East Asia (Beijing) and SSTC/KM Hub	SLM Subregional Office for Mesoamerica (Panama City)		Panama HUB	SEC Subregional Office for Central Asia (Ankara)		Central Asia & Eastern Europe HUB (Istanbul)	SNE Subregional Office for the North Africa (Tunis)		North Africa & Middle East (Cairo)
			South Asia (New Delhi)	SLC Subregional Office for the Caribbean - Bridgetown		PERU - Andean and Southern Cone HUB (Peru);				SNB Subregional Office for the Gulf Cooperation Council States and Yemen (Abu Dhabi)		Central Asia & Eastern Europe HUB (Istanbul),
			South East Asia (Jakarta)			Brazil ICO + SSTC +KC (Brasilia)				SNM Subregional Office for Mashreq Countries (Beirut)		Central Asia & Eastern Europe HUB (Istanbul)
		China Center of Excellence	Mekong HUB (Hanoi)			Salvador Operational				Amman Resilience Hub		Sudan Hub
			Dhaka hub									Rome HUB
Country Offices	Afghanistan	Afghanistan	Afghanistan	Barbuda			Albania			Algeria		Algeria
	Bangladesh	Bangladesh	Bangladesh	Argentina			Armenia			Armenia		Armenia
	Bhutan	Bhutan		Bahamas			Azerbaijan			Bahrain		Bahrain
	Cambodia	Cambodia	Cambodia	Barbados			Belarus			Egypt		Egypt
	China		China	Belize			Herzegovina			Iran		Iran
	Cook Islands			Bolivia	Bolivia	Bolivia	Georgia			Iraq		Iraq
				Brazil	Excellence	Brazil ICO + SSTC	Kazakhstan			Jordan		Jordan
	Fiji	Fiji	Fiji	Chile			Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstan		Kyrgyzstan		Kyrgyzstan
	India	India	India	Colombia	Colombia		Moldova			Kuwait		Kuwait
	Indonesia	Indonesia	Indonesia	Costa Rica			Serbia			Lebanon		Lebanon
	Iran			Cuba	Cuba		Tajikistan			Libya		Libya
	Kiribati			Dominica			FYR Macedonia			Mauritania		Mauritania
	Korea DPR	DPR Korea		Dominican Republic	Dominican Rep.		Turkey	Turkey	Turkey (Istanbul) Hub	Morocco	Morocco	Morocco
	Republic of Korea			Ecuador	Ecuador		Turkmenistan			Oman		Oman
	Lao PDR	Lao PDR	Lao PDR	El Salvador	El Salvador	El Salvador	Ukraine	Ukraine		Palestine		Palestine
	Malaysia			Grenada			Uzbekistan			Qatar		Qatar
	Maldives			Guatemala	Guatemala	Guatemala				Saudi Arabia		Saudi Arabia
	Marshall Islands			Guyana						Sudan	Sudan	Sudan Hub
	Micronesia			Haiti	Haiti	Haiti				Syrian Arab Repu	Syria	Syria
	Mongolia			Honduras	Honduras					Tajikistan		Tajikistan
	Myanmar	Myanmar	Myanmar	Jamaica						Tunisia	Tunisia	Tunisia
	Nauru			Mexico						Turkey (RNE)	Turkey	Turkey (Istanbul) Hub
	Niue			Nicaragua	Nicaragua					United Arab Emirates		United Arab Emirates
	Nepal	Nepal	Nepal	Panama		Panama HUB				Yemen	Yemen	Yemen
	Nepal	Nepal	Nepal	Paraguay								
	Pakistan	Pakistan	Pakistan	Peru	Peru	Peru Hub						
	Palau			St Kitts and Nevis								
	Papua New Guinea	Papua New Guinea		St Lucia								
	Philippines	Philippines	Philippines	St Vincent and the Grenadines								
	Samoa			Suriname								
	Solomon Islands			Trinidad and Tobago								
	Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka	Uruguay								
Thailand			Venezuela									
Timor-Leste	Timor-Leste											
Tonga												
Tuvalu												
Vanuatu	Vanuatu											
Viet Nam		Viet Nam										

Note: (1) FAO regional offices have been mapped under the other agencies' geographical divisions. The final mapping will be provided by the evaluation firm during the inception phase.

FAO - REGIONAL OFFICE FOR AFRICA (GHANA)									
Region	West & Central Africa			Southern Africa			East Africa		
RBA	FAO	WFP	IFAD	FAO	WFP	IFAD	FAO	WFP	IFAD
Regional Bureau	<i>Regional Resilience, Emergency and Rehabilitation Office for West Africa/Sahel (REOWA) - Dakar</i>	RB Dakar	<i>West Africa HUB (Dakar) - Subregional hub</i>	<i>Resilience Hub of the Subregional Office for Southern Africa (REOSA) - Johannesburg.</i>	RB Johannesburg	<i>Johannesburg Knowledge Hub</i>	<i>Resilience Team of East Africa (RTEA) - Nairobi.</i>	RB Nairobi	Kenya HUB: Kenya (Subregional)
Sub-Regional Office	<i>SFW Subregional Office for West Africa - Dakar</i>	Dakar (Regional Bureau)	West Africa HUB (Dakar)	SFS Subregional Office for Southern Africa - Harare		Johannesburg - Angola HUB (Johannesburg)	SFE Subregional Office for Eastern Africa - Addis Ababa		Ethiopia HUB: Ethiopia
	SFC Subregional Office for Central Africa - Libreville		CAMEROON, Yaounde - Central Africa HUB (Yaounde')						Kenya HUB: Kenya
			COTE D'IVOIRE - Coastal Africa HUB (Abidjan)						Zambia HUB: Zambia, Eritrea
Country Offices	Angola			Angola	Angola		Angola		
	Benin	Benin		Benin			Benin		
	Botswana			Botswana			Botswana		
	Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso		Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso		
	Burundi			Burundi			Burundi	Burundi	
	Cabo Verde			Cabo Verde			Cabo Verde		
	Cameroon	Cameroon	Cameroon	Cameroon		Cameroon	Cameroon		
	Central African Republic	CAR		Central African Republic			Central African Republic		
	Chad	Chad		Chad			Chad		
	Comoros			Comoros			Comoros		
	Congo		Congo/DRC	Congo	Congo		Congo		
	Congo/DRC			Congo/DRC	DR Congo	Congo/DRC	Congo/DRC		
	Côte d'Ivoire	Cote d'Ivoire	Cote d'Ivoire	Côte d'Ivoire		Cote d'Ivoire	Côte d'Ivoire		
	Democratic Republic of the Congo			Democratic Republic of the Congo			Democratic Republic of the Congo		
	Djibouti			Djibouti			Djibouti	Djibouti	
	Equatorial Guinea			Equatorial Guinea			Equatorial Guinea		
	Eritrea			Eritrea			Eritrea		
	Eswatini			Eswatini	Eswatini		Eswatini		
	Ethiopia			Ethiopia			Ethiopia	Ethiopia	
	Gabon			Gabon			Gabon		
	Gambia	Gambia		Gambia			Gambia		
	Ghana	Ghana	Ghana	Ghana		Ghana	Ghana		
	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea		Guinea	Guinea		
	Guinea-Bissau	Guinea-Bissau		Guinea-Bissau			Guinea-Bissau		
	Kenya			Kenya			Kenya	Kenya	Kenya
	Lesotho			Lesotho	Lesotho		Lesotho		
	Liberia	Liberia		Liberia			Liberia		
	Madagascar			Madagascar	Madagascar		Madagascar		
	Malawi			Malawi	Malawi		Malawi		
	Mali	Mali	Mali	Mali		Mali	Mali		
		Mauritania							
	Mauritius			Mauritius			Mauritius		
	Mozambique			Mozambique	Mozambique		Mozambique		
	Namibia			Namibia	Namibia		Namibia		
Niger	Niger	Niger	Niger		Niger	Niger			
Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria		Nigeria	Nigeria			
Rwanda			Rwanda			Rwanda	Rwanda		
Sao Tome and Principe	S.Tome & Principe		Sao Tome and Principe			Sao Tome and Principe			
Senegal	Senegal	Senegal	Senegal		Senegal	Senegal			
Seychelles			Seychelles			Seychelles			
Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone		Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone			
Somalia			Somalia			Somalia	Somalia		
							<i>South Africa (Regional Bureau)</i>	South Africa	
South Africa			South Africa			South Africa			
South Sudan			South Sudan			South Sudan	South Sudan		
Tanzania			Tanzania	Tanzania		Tanzania			
Togo	Togo						Uganda	Uganda	
				Zambia	Zambia			Zambia	
				Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe				