

Terms of Reference: Evaluation of the Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas Activities in Indonesia from 2017 to 2024



21 March 2024

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
1. Background	3
1.1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.2. Context	4
2. Reasons for the evaluation	6
2.1. Rationale.....	6
2.2. Objectives	7
2.3. Stakeholder Analysis	7
3. Subject of the evaluation	9
3.1. Subject of the Evaluation	9
3.2. Scope of the Evaluation	14
4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations	15
4.1. Evaluation Questions and Criteria	15
4.2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology.....	18
Outcome Harvesting	19
WIDER IMPACTS: Qualitative Case Studies	20
FORMATIVE Component	20
4.3. Evaluability assessment	21
4.4. Ethical Considerations.....	22
4.5. Quality Assurance.....	22
5. Organization of the evaluation	24
5.1. Phases and Deliverables	24
5.2. Evaluation Team Composition	25
Summary of evaluation team and areas of skills required	25
5.3. Roles and Responsibilities	26
5.4. Security Considerations	28
5.5. Communication	28
5.6. Proposal.....	28
Annex 1: Map	29
Annex 2: Tentative Timeline	29
Annex 3: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Committee	32
Ec composition.....	32
Annex 4: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Reference Group	33
ERG Composition	34
Annex 5: Communication and Knowledge Management Plan	35

Internal knowledge management and communication plan.....	35
external knowledge management and communication plan	35
Annex 6: Bibliography	36



1. Background

1.1. INTRODUCTION

1. These terms of reference (ToR) were prepared by WFP Indonesia Country Office (WFP Indonesia CO) for the Decentralised Evaluation of WFP contribution to the Government of Indonesia to develop the Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas (FSVA) to inform government programme planning and targeting of food security interventions. This ToR aims to provide key information to stakeholders about the evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and to specify expectations during the various phases of the evaluation.
2. This activity evaluation is commissioned by WFP Indonesia and will cover the period from 2017 to 2023, taking into consideration the evolution and development of the FSVA in years prior. The evaluation is planned to take place from **May 2024 to January 2025**.
3. The evaluation process within WFP will be managed by an evaluation manager (WFP - EM) appointed by the WFP Indonesia CO who will be the main focal point for day-to-day contact during the evaluation period. In its role as a key user and stakeholder in the development of the FSVA, the Government will be consulted regularly throughout the evaluation process. An outside firm will be contracted to carry out the actual evaluation and will appoint their own evaluation manager.
4. The evaluation's purpose is to support strategic planning, learning, and accountability.

This evaluation will inform strategic planning by WFP, Government, and other stakeholders on what is yet to be done to support the development, enhancement, and utilisation of the FSVA in Indonesia.

This evaluation's learning objectives are: i) to gather knowledge and evidence of Government, WFP and other stakeholders' technical and resource investments to develop enhance, and utilise the FSVA to target food security and nutrition interventions within the National Food Agency and other Government stakeholders and estimate their impacts on relevant interventions, programmes, services, and the populations they serve; and ii) to draw lessons and highlight technical assistance, policy engagement, and partnership good practices that have improved the coherence and effectiveness of the FSVA within national and subnational contexts

This evaluation's accountability objective is to assess and document the performance and results of WFP policy engagement and technical assistance to the government and other stakeholders at the national and sub-national level within the period of 2017 to 2024 to develop, enhance, and ensure utilisation of the FSVA.

1.2. CONTEXT

5. Indonesia is classified as an upper middle-income country with a Gross National Income of USD 4,580.¹ As of March 2023, the poverty rate stands at 9.36 percent.² Indonesia continues to face serious challenges in food security and nutrition with around 21.6 percent of children under 5 years of age stunted³ and a rapidly growing threat of the triple burden of malnutrition (undernutrition, micronutrient deficiencies, and overweight/obesity). The prevalence of undernourishment increased from 7.63 percent in 2019 to 10.21 percent in 2022.⁴ The Basic Health Research (RISKESDAS) in 2018 showed that among school-aged children, the stunting and wasting rates are 23.6 percent and 9.2 percent, respectively.⁵ Evidence also confirms that micronutrient deficiencies are widespread, with pregnant women and adolescent girls being at higher risk to suffer from it due to their higher micronutrient needs; 49 percent of all pregnant women regardless of age group and 26 percent of children aged 5-14 years were anaemic.
6. Lack of access to nutritious food, lack of knowledge among parents and caregivers, lack of access to sanitation and clean water, limited access to health facilities and gender inequality are among the factors influencing child stunting⁶ and wasting.⁷ The percentage of the population that is overweight and obese, with obesity affecting women more than men, is an emerging concern and is associated with high levels of consumption of processed food and limited physical activity. In 2018, the rate of overweight and obese adults was already significant, at 35.4 percent, with obesity alone at 21.8 percent.⁸ Additionally, one in five primary school-aged children and 16 percent of adolescents aged 13-15 years were overweight or obese. The proportion of children over 5 who consume fewer than the WHO-recommended five portions of vegetables and fruits per day is 95.5 percent.
7. WFP has supported the Government in promoting healthy diets through social and behavioural change communications (SBCC) and nutrition education in initiatives. For example, the Ministry of Health scaled up a digital SBCC campaign jointly developed with WFP in 2022. The campaign aimed to promote healthy lifestyles among urban adolescents and reached over 2.5 million people.
8. Indonesia faces challenges in food security and nutrition for some foods and a low-quality diet among the middle-lower-income population. In remote areas, food insecurity is further exacerbated by poor economic access, logistical barriers and food production failures caused by a lack of resilience to shocks and a lack of integrated and fragmented policies on food security, nutrition, and poverty, including in terms of gender-responsiveness.
9. Despite their key role in food systems, women still experience unequal access to and control over resources and are disproportionately affected by crises. Gender inequality remains a significant factor in limiting opportunities for advancement in poverty reduction and sustainable development. In 2023, women made up nearly 39 percent of the labour force but made up over 80 percent of the workers in the informal sector.⁹ This is notwithstanding that rates of school enrolment for girls are higher than those for boys, particularly in urban areas.¹⁰ Women have a higher life expectancy at birth, yet high maternal mortality rates persist, as does gender-based violence, including child and forced marriage.¹¹
10. In 2023, Indonesia continues to recover from the impacts of the exacerbated poverty and unemployment in the country during the COVID-19 pandemic and ripple effects of shocks beginning in 2022. During the pandemic, poverty increased—from 9.8 percent in March 2020 to 10.1 percent in March 2021, with higher incidences in rural areas.¹² In urban areas, poverty continued to increase from 7.4 to 7.9 percent between February 2020 to February 2021. Of the total working-age population of 206.7 million people, 21.3 million (10.3 percent) were affected by COVID-19.¹³ Among them, 17.4 million had shorter working hours, 1.8 million were unemployed, 1.4 million stopped working temporarily, and 0.7 million stayed out of work.
11. Global evidence indicates that COVID-19 has affected men and women differently, disproportionately impacting women. Lockdowns and restrictions have put more burden on women, resulting in income losses for the many women engaged in the informal sector, and increased unpaid domestic workload and caretaker responsibilities for those attending to the elderly and children during school closures. It

also resulted in increased pressure on households, contributing to the vulnerability experienced by women to domestic violence.

12. COVID-19 has also exacerbated vulnerabilities in the context of food security and nutrition. A study conducted in selected low-income areas of Jakarta showed how the quality of the diets of mothers worsened during the pandemic.¹⁴ Dietary diversity and consumption of nutritious foods of women decreased in 2020 compared to 2018. This along with the decrease in purchasing power due to COVID-19, especially for poor households.
13. Responding to the pandemic, the Government rolled out substantial fiscal stimulus packages through the National Economic Recovery Programme.¹⁵ This resulted in increased coverage and benefits of existing social protection programmes, and the introduction of new social protection measures to reach the most vulnerable. Per February 2021, the Government's COVID-19 stimulus for social protection reached USD 10.9 billion. Newly launched social protection measures included the Village Cash Transfer Programme, targeting 11 million households in rural areas who were not covered by any other social protection programme. In poor urban areas, food assistance and cash-based transfers delivered through the Family Hope Programme and Staple Food Programme, increased their coverage to a higher number of households.
14. WFP has supported Government in strengthening linkages between food security and social protection programmes. For example, WFP and the Ministry of National Development Planning initiated the implementation of the workplan for Joint Activities on Rice Fortification 2022-2024 in 2022, which aimed to support the Government to scale up the availability and affordability of fortified rice, including through social protection channels.
15. In 2021 the Government continued working towards making the country's social protection system more adaptive and responsive to social and economic risks related to climate change and natural hazards. The Government also continued delivering assistance in response to disasters. Through mid-December 2021 and in addition to the COVID-19 pandemic, Indonesia experienced 2,853 disasters, including earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, as well as climate-related hazards such as floods, droughts, and storms.¹⁶ The number of affected people increased from 6.7 million in 2020 to 8.1 million in 2021. In 2022, hydrometeorological disasters made up 99 percent of all disaster events, some of which were attributable to climate anomalies.¹⁷ The country experienced several climate anomalies from 2021-2023, such as the triple-dip La Niña phenomenon, extreme drought in East Nusa Tenggara, floods in South Kalimantan and an earthquake in West Sulawesi, with repercussions on lives, assets and livelihoods.¹⁸
16. WFP has supported the Government in strengthening institutional capacity for disaster risk management and response, as well as with the emerging field of Anticipatory Action (AA). WFP has engaged in policy dialogue and provided technical assistance to the Government in building towards a common understanding on AA and associated framework. Through a scoping study spanning five provinces, WFP generated data on the state of AA at the subnational level and subsequently informed AA models and their piloting. Enhancing institutional capacity for disaster risk management and response, WFP catalysed the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the National Disaster Management Agency and the Chamber of Commerce in 2022. This strengthened the regulatory framework for public-private partnerships for disaster preparedness and response.
17. From May to August 2022, nearly all low- and middle-income countries recorded high food inflation (above 5%). In Indonesia, this figure reached a peak of 10.3 percent year-on-year in July 2022.²⁰ This affected the prices of food commodities including chilli, bird's eye chilli, shallot, and chicken egg. In September 2022, Statistics Indonesia reported the general annual inflation rate at 5.95 percent, a seven-year high.²¹ This rise in inflation was mainly triggered by a 30 percent price hike on subsidised fuel. In response to food price shocks, the Government launched a series of social assistance programmes in response from April to September 2022. These included low-price packaged vegetable oil (*Minyakita*) and unconditional cash transfers for cooking oil targeting 20.5 million beneficiary families and 2.5 million small street vendors; and unconditional cash transfers for fuel targeting over 20.6 million beneficiary families. In late March 2023, the Government initiated a rice assistance programme for 21.3 million beneficiary families, with each family receiving 10 kg of rice over three months.²²
18. The domestic price of wheat flour in Indonesia recorded an increase since the start of the conflict in Ukraine in 2022.²³ In 2022, the price of domestic wheat flour recorded up to a 12 percent weekly increase.

Despite this, knock-on effects of the conflict in Indonesia have been minimal to date as Indonesia managed to substitute wheat imports from Ukraine. In June 2022, Indonesia doubled its imports from Australia and also started importing wheat from other countries such including Argentina, Thailand, Pakistan, and Myanmar. Imports of wheat are used for wheat flour industry, instant noodles, bread, and cattle feed.

19. In 2023, Indonesia braced for the impact of El Niño. A 2023 study forecasted reduced global rice yields from impacts of El Niño on key rice producing countries, including Indonesia.²⁴ In July 2023, the Government announced the continuation of rice assistance for 21.3 million beneficiary families from until December 2023.²⁵ This assistance is expected to help mitigate the impact of El Niño on the food security of vulnerable groups. In anticipation of potential El Niño-induced food inflation, the Government also continues to organize affordable food markets with key staples at subsidised prices.
20. WFP has maintained longstanding support for the Government in producing and utilising data and analysis for evidence-based food security policies and programming. This is chiefly done through the Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas (FSVA). Since WFP continued its partnership with the Food Security Agency of the Ministry of Agriculture to produce Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas (FSVA). The FSVA have been referred to in several country-wide programmes, including the Sustainable Food Yard, Family Farming, Farming Corporation Development and Community Food Barn. They have also been utilized by the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration for targeting support. Local governments have utilized the more granular data provided to inform village-level stunting reduction interventions.
21. Policy dialogue and technical assistance remain relevant for the establishment and fine-tuning of legislative frameworks and the use of innovative approaches, technologies and methodologies in food security and nutrition data generation and analysis, early warning systems, adaptive strategies and efforts to address malnutrition in all its forms. North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation remain important, as do partnerships with the private sector and civil society.
22. WFP in Indonesia strives for gender equality through its activities, including in its alignment with the Long-Term National Development Plan 2005-2025 and the Medium-Term National Development Plan 2020-2024, into which the Indonesia gender policy framework is embedded. This policy framework commits the Government to ensuring fair and equitable development for women, men, girls, and boys.

2. Reasons for the evaluation

2.1. RATIONALE

23. The rationale for this evaluation is to fill a gap in knowledge and documentation on what WFP has achieved with its contribution to the FSVA and its use as follows:
 - For WFP Indonesia to learn lessons and share them internationally on its experience of building a longstanding government partnership, leading to institutionalisation of a key food security information system.
 - For WFP to understand achievements and challenges of supporting FSVA at the subnational level.
 - For WFP to document achievements arising from the utilisation of FSVA to inform policies and programmes and have detailed recommendations on strategies for greater utilisation.
24. The timing of this evaluation from **May 2024 to January 2025** is key in its utility. The lessons learned and documentation on achievements and challenges of the FSVA activities will inform the CO's future approach to the FSVA in the next WFP Indonesia CO Country Strategic Plan 2026-2030. They may also be used by the Government to inform the next Medium-Term National Development Plan (2025-2029) and Long-Term National Development Plan (2026-2045). All the documents above will be formulated or finalized at the tail end of or shortly after the evaluation.

2.2. OBJECTIVES

25. This evaluation serves the mutually reinforcing objectives of strategic planning, accountability, and learning. Given the fact that the FSVA collaborations have not previously been assessed from a performance/result/outcomes perspective, equal weight is placed on accountability and learning. The evaluation will serve the objective of strategic planning by informing the design of FSVA activities in the upcoming strategic plan documents for both WFP Indonesia CO and the Government of Indonesia.

Strategic Planning – This evaluation will inform the CO’s approach to FSVA activities in the next WFP Indonesia CO Country Strategic Plan 2026-2030. Government stakeholders engaged may also use the evaluation findings to inform inputs for the next Medium-Term National Development Plan (2025-2029) and Long-Term National Development Plan (2026-2045). This will include approaches to gender equality and inclusion.

Accountability – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the WFP policy engagement and technical assistance to the government and other national and sub-national stakeholders in the FSVA partnership within the period of 2017 to 2024. Target populations of food security policies and programmes are considered indirect stakeholders in the context of this objective. This will include assessments of the consideration of and contributions to gender equality and inclusion throughout and as a result of FSVA activities.

Learning–The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain activities led to certain results or not, to draw lessons, derive good practices and pointers for further learning. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making about future programming and design of WFPs FSVA support. Findings will be actively disseminated, and lessons will be incorporated into relevant knowledge management systems. This will include lessons learned on what can be improved and good practices on integrating gender equality and inclusion into FSVA activities and their contributions to results.

26. The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the performance of the FSVA activities, paying attention to its results measured against its objectives as well as any unintended (positive or negative) results. As such, the evaluation will determine the extent to which the programme has increased legitimacy, credibility and influence of the FSVA system. This will include determining outcomes at the household and community levels which derive from the use of FSVA information and analysis to inform changes in interventions, programming, service delivery etc.

There are three aspects of the learning focus, which are:

- **Performance and Results:** To document and assess the contribution of WFP since 2017 to the FSVA at national and subnational levels.
- **Utilisation and Wider Impacts:** To evaluate the extent of the utilisation of the FSVA outputs by the Government at the national and subnational level and estimate the benefits derived by populations from the use of those outputs to improve interventions, programme and services.
- **Diagnosis:** To provide a current situational analysis of the FSVA to identify challenges and provide options for the pathway forward for WFP programming.

2.3. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

27. The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a broad range of WFP internal and external stakeholders. Stakeholders will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process based on their expected interest in the results of the evaluation and relative power to influence the results of the programme being evaluated. Table 1 provides a preliminary stakeholder analysis, which should be deepened by the evaluation team as part of the inception phase.

28. Accountability to affected populations is tied to WFP commitments to include indirect beneficiaries as key stakeholders in WFP work. WFP is committed to ensuring gender equality, equity and inclusion in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups (including persons with disabilities, the elderly and persons with other diversities such as ethnic and linguistic).

Table 1: Preliminary stakeholder analysis

Stakeholders	Interest and involvement in the evaluation
WFP stakeholders	
WFP country office (CO) in Indonesia	Key informant and primary stakeholder. Responsible for the planning and implementation of WFP interventions at country level. The country office has an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries and partners for the performance and results of its programmes. The country office will be involved in using evaluation findings for programme implementation and/or in deciding on the next programme and partnerships.
WFP Field Office in Kupang	Key informant and primary stakeholder. Responsible for day-to-day programme implementation. The field offices liaise with stakeholders at decentralized levels. It will be affected by the outcome of the evaluation.
Regional Bureau Bangkok (RBB) (including RAM and CCS technical units)	Key informant and primary stakeholder. Responsible for both oversight of country offices and technical guidance and support, the regional bureau management has an interest in an independent/impartial account of operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings to apply this learning to other country offices. The regional evaluation unit supports country office/regional bureau management to ensure quality, credible and useful decentralized evaluations.
HQ Technical Units (including RAM and CCS technical units)	Key informant and primary stakeholder. WFP headquarters technical units are responsible for issuing and overseeing the rollout of normative guidance on corporate programme themes, activities and modalities, as well as of overarching corporate policies and strategies. They also have an interest in the lessons that emerge from evaluations, as many may have relevance beyond the geographical area of focus. Relevant headquarters units should be consulted from the planning phase to ensure that key policy, strategic and programmatic considerations are understood from the onset of the evaluation. They may use the evaluation for wider organizational learning and accountability.
WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV)	Primary Stakeholder. The Office of Evaluation has a stake in ensuring that decentralized evaluations deliver quality, credible and useful evaluations respecting provisions for impartiality as well as roles and accountabilities of various decentralized evaluation stakeholders as identified in the evaluation policy. It may use the evaluation findings, as appropriate, to feed into centralized evaluations, evaluation syntheses or other learning products.
WFP Executive Board (EB)	Primary Stakeholder. The Executive Board provides final oversight of WFP programmes and guidance to programmes. The WFP governing body has an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of WFP programmes. This evaluation will not be presented to the Executive Board, but its findings may feed into thematic and/or regional syntheses and corporate learning processes.
Government stakeholders	
National Government (including the National Food	Key informant and primary stakeholder. Responsible for the planning and implementation of policy and programmes the national government will use evaluation findings as recommendations that can inform budget allocation, policymaking, iterations, programme design and implementation and/or deciding

Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, and other stakeholders under the FSVA technical working group)	on prioritizing future programmes, establishing and/or strengthening partnerships where applicable.
Sub-National Government (District office counterparts)	Key informant and primary stakeholder. Responsible for the planning and implementation of policy and programmes the sub-national government will use evaluation findings as recommendations that can inform budget allocation, policymaking, programme implementation and/or deciding on prioritizing future programmes, establishing and/or strengthening partnerships where applicable.
Other Stakeholders	
UN Country Team (UNCT)	Primary stakeholder. The harmonized action of the UNCT should contribute to the realization of the government developmental objectives. It has an interest in ensuring that WFP programmes are effective in contributing to the United Nations' concerted efforts.
Donors	Primary stakeholder. WFP interventions are voluntarily funded by donors. They have an interest in knowing whether their funds have been spent efficiently and if WFP has been effective and contributed to their own strategies and programmes as well as the Government's priorities under the Medium-Term and Long-Term National Development Plans.
Affected Populations	Indirect stakeholder. Target populations of food security policies and programmes that WFP aims to enhance through capacity strengthening and technical assistance are indirect beneficiaries and stakeholders of these activities.

The primary users of this evaluation will be:

- The WFP Indonesia country office and its partners in decision-making, notably related to programme implementation and/or design, Country Strategy and partnerships, scaling up of activities.
- Given the core functions of the Regional Bureau (RB), the RB is expected to use the evaluation findings to provide strategic guidance, programme support, learning, and oversight.
- WFP HQ technical units may use evaluations for wider organizational learning and accountability.
- OEV may use the evaluation findings, as appropriate, to feed into evaluation syntheses as well as for annual reporting to the Executive Board.
- The National Food Agency and other national stakeholders will use the evaluation findings to inform decision making where applicable.

3. Subject of the evaluation

3.1. SUBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

29. This is an activity evaluation of FSVA that is part of Strategic Outcome 1 in the WFP Indonesia CSP 2021-2025.²⁶ The CSP is the vehicle through which WFP operationalizes its approach to capacity strengthening i.e., working with and through national systems to sustain positive food security and nutrition (FSN) outcomes.

30. In the CSP 2017-2020, FSVA activities fall under Strategic Outcome 1: “Reduce severe food insecurity by 1 percent per year prioritizing the most vulnerable people and regions using an evidence-based approach.” FSVA activities fall under the Strategic Outcome 1 Output 1.1 of “Enhanced national and subnational food security and nutrition data collection and analysis systems”. This output aimed to improve the Government’s food security system, which will enable policymakers to base their decisions on up-to-date evidence. This output further aimed to enhance Government prioritization of vulnerable groups and districts for food security interventions and ensuring that no one is left behind.
31. The CSP 2017-2020, which guided the FSVA activities throughout the same period, was informed by a strategic review of food security and nutrition commissioned by WFP and the Office of the President of the Republic of Indonesia in 2014. The strategic review recommended that WFP focus on policy advice, capacity development and knowledge-sharing to support the Government’s investments in food security, nutrition and emergency preparedness. The strategic review highlighted supporting the prioritization of food-insecure districts as a comparative advantage of WFP, detailing that WFP should “support the development and implementation of work plans in priority districts, and adapt them to local conditions”.
32. The CSP 2017-2020 further mandates that its activities and outputs will incorporate gender, protection, nutrition and disaster risk factors.
33. The CSP 2017-2020 was also informed by an Indonesia country portfolio evaluation (2009-2013). The country portfolio evaluation largely echoes the findings of the strategic review.
34. Based on the strategic review, consultations with government and other partners and lessons learned from the country portfolio evaluation, WFP would no longer provide direct food distribution under the CSP 2017-2020 unless an emergency leads to a request from the Government. Instead, WFP would focus on policy advice, capacity development and knowledge-sharing—all within government policies and programmes to achieve sustainable outcomes.
35. In the CSP 2021-2025, FSVA activities fall under Strategic Outcome 1: “By 2025 the Government and other partners have enhanced capacity to generate and apply high quality evidence as a basis for the reduction of food insecurity and malnutrition”. The FSVA is specified as a channel through which WFP would provide technical assistance and capacity strengthening to enhance Government capacity to capture and communicate food security conditions, which would support government planning and targeting for the implementation of food security programmes. WFP would also support the Government with innovative ways of collecting and analysing food security and nutrition data, disaggregated by age, sex, gender, disability and other relevant characteristics, to identify the most vulnerable people and regions for evidence-based policy dialogue aimed at leaving no one behind. This CSP also includes capacity strengthening on small-area estimation (SAE) for subpopulations or geographic areas when primary data collection is challenging.
36. The CSP 2021-2025, which is guiding FSVA activities throughout the same period, was informed by an evaluation of the CSP 2017-2020. This CSP evaluation had several recommendations: I) Increase policy-level engagement, II) Build on successful activities from the CSP 2017-2020 (explicitly mentioning the FSVA), and III) Conduct a systematic and in-depth analysis and review of government partnerships.
37. The CSP 2021-2025 was also informed by the United Nations Common Country Analysis (CCA) for Indonesia, which underpinned the development of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF). The CCA identified women and girls, older people, people with disabilities, people living in remote areas and children as the groups most at risk. The CSP 2021-2025 includes a social safeguard component that seeks to ensure the equal participation of women, men, girls and boys in all social, economic and political areas throughout the country. This was envisioned to be done through promoting a human-rights-based approach and the promotion and advocacy of social inclusion in government-administered programmes. WFP also committed to screen activities for their impact on gender relations and support advocacy for the prevention of gender-based violence and sexual exploitation and abuse.
38. To develop the CSP and corresponding capacity strengthening activities, WFP engages with national stakeholders to design and deliver validated and demand-driven capacity strengthening interventions guided by the five policy pathways and domains of WFPs CCS Framework (detailed in the next section) and the 2022 Policy Update.

39. The subject of the evaluation falls within WFPs Country Capacity Strengthening (CCS) modality. WFP has defined a Corporate Approach to CCS: a conceptual framework with:²⁷
- **Three domains:** enabling environment domain (i.e., supportive laws, policies, strategies, and procedures), organizational domain (i.e., well-functioning organizations), and individual domain (i.e., educated, skilled people) and;
 - **Five critical pathways:** 1) policies and legislation; 2) institutional accountability; 3) strategic planning and financing; 4) stakeholder programme design and delivery; and 5) engagement and participation of civil society and private sector.
40. The implications of a CCS focused CSP needs to be well understood focusing on, among others, staff profiles and capacities, flexible funding, alignment with Government priorities and systems and the arrangement of agreements to maximize the potential of this type of approach. It follows therefore that; the sustainability of WFP support largely depends on Government ownership and commitment.
41. Through CCS activities, WFP aims to indirectly reach beneficiaries through their contribution to Government policies and programmes. These beneficiaries are classified as Tier 3 beneficiaries. The classification of the beneficiaries of FSVA activities throughout the CSPs are as follows:

CSP	Tier 3 Beneficiaries
2017-2020	9 million severely food insecure people
2021-2025	4.5 million, all adults and all children

42. The evaluation focuses on the annual national and subnational activities/outputs attained under the project “Supporting the Government of Indonesia to Collect and Analyse Data on Food Security and Nutrition to Optimize Policies and Programmes”, a joint intervention between WFP and the Food Security Agency under the Ministry of Agriculture between 2017 and 2021; as well as the activities/outputs on the FSVA conducted with the National Food Agency from 2021 to 2023.
43. Leveraging the Government of Indonesia and WFPs long-term partnership on enhancing monitoring and analysis of food insecurity vulnerability since the first national FSVA was jointly prepared and launched in 2005, between 2017 and 2021 WFP provided technical support to the achievements below, in cooperation with the Food Security Agency:
- Establish a unified national food security and nutrition information system built upon existing platforms (e.g., The Food and Nutrition Surveillance System)
 - Improve the FSVA methodology refinement and coordination for collaboration with Statistics Indonesia. WFP and the Government of Indonesia have had a long-term partnership to enhance monitoring and analysis of food insecurity vulnerability since the first national FSVA was jointly prepared and launched in 2005.
44. The joint project aimed to decrease the number of severely food insecure households nationally by one percent per year by strengthening institutional capacity to reduce food insecurity.
45. Beginning in 2017, WFP provided training to the Food Security Agency on utilising data to prioritize the most vulnerable districts. These capacity development sessions included a national level workshop on data and methodology for the production of FSVA reports.
46. From 2018, the Food Security Agency independently produced the national FSVA with WFP’s role redefined as a member of the national FSVA technical working group. In this role, WFP continued to support the Government in collecting and analysing data on food security and nutrition for optimum policies and programmes.
47. In 2018, WFP began to conduct training sessions at the sub-national level for the Food Security Offices in the provinces of East Nusa Tenggara, Papua and West Java, which were among the provinces most vulnerable to food insecurity. Through these training sessions, WFP stressed the importance of evidence-

based targeting to address Indonesia's food security challenges and shared examples of the utilization of the FSVA at the central, provincial and district levels for enhanced targeting.

48. Through the joint project, WFP also provided technical support to the Food Security Agency to foster knowledge sharing between different ministries and provincial governments to generate ideas on the most effective ways to allocate provincial and district budgets to address food insecurity challenges.
49. At the national level, the FSVA is a recognized reference for the government's Food Security and Nutrition Action Plans, which are multi-sectorial and multi-year investment plans to prioritize, target and implement interventions. In October 2019, the Ministry of Agriculture authorized "The Cooperation Agreement on Synergizing Support for the Eradication of Food-Vulnerable and -Insecure Regions Programme". This strategic document was signed by eight ministries across sectors, all agreeing to the FSVA as a tool to target programmes. The FSVA has informed the geographic targeting of country-wide programmes, including the Sustainable Food Yard (P2L) and Family Farming (PK) programmes under the Ministry of Agriculture. The Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration has also used the FSVA for geographic targeting. There are also some examples of certain local governments that use the FSVA to inform their cross-sectoral planning and targeting of food security-related interventions and village-level stunting reduction interventions.
50. In 2019, the Food Security Agency launched a mandate to produce sub-national level (provincial and district) FSVAs. The Food Security Agency identified a lack of resources at the national level to support some provinces in Eastern Indonesia to produce subnational FSVAs. In response, WFP has since provided technical assistance and capacity strengthening on FSVA production directly to the Food Security Offices in five provinces in Eastern Indonesia.
51. Through the joint project, WFP also provided capacity strengthening and technical assistance through a workshop series to enhance food security and vulnerability evidence through the implementation of the small-area estimation (SAE) methodology. WFP convened the Food Security Agency, Statistics Indonesia, and Statistics Polytechnic for these efforts. WFP further provided the datasets needed to produce the small area estimations. The implementation of the SAE methodology aimed to support the Food Security Agency to produce data for the Provincial FSVAs with disaggregation of food security conditions at sub-district levels. This resulted in the availability of sub-district data for 34 provinces' FSVAs for 2020. The SAE training sessions further strengthened the capacity of officials from the Food Security Agency to generate and analyse sub-national food security data.
52. In parallel, WFP also provided technical assistance to sub-national (provincial and district) governments in producing sub-national FSVAs. WFP assisted the Provincial Food Security Office in East Nusa Tenggara Province in finalizing its provincial FSVA 2018 by embedding a staff member, filling a gap on the data analysis and mapping required.
53. In 2019, WFP began an initiative to incorporate gender disaggregation in some aspects of the SAE methodology. With support from WFP, the Government began to use this methodology to generate data on not only food security and vulnerability, but also on how these experiences differ for women and girls.
54. In 2019, WFP further supported the Papua Province in preparing the FSVA.
55. In 2020, WFP continued to strive to incorporate a gender equality perspective in the FSVA. With technical support from WFP, the Government incorporated a gender-sensitive indicator - the number of schooling years for girls - as one of the nine indicators used to calculate the food security composite index for producing the Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas. This aimed to provide insight into the linkages between maternal education and food utilization, as part of the analysis of the driving factors influencing food security and thus inform government interventions.
56. In 2020, WFP also collaborated with the Food Security Agency, Statistics Indonesia and the Statistics Polytechnic to scale up the utilization of the small-area estimation (SAE) methodology, which resulted in food security data availability at the sub-district level across all 34 Indonesian provinces. This aimed to enhance local level targeting of interventions. The SAE has been a dynamic aspect of WFP technical assistance for the FSVA in the face of diverse guidelines and global evidence.
57. In 2020, WFP also provided technical assistance to the Food Security Offices in five the most food insecure provinces (East Nusa Tenggara, Maluku, North Maluku, West Papua and Papua) on the production of Provincial and District FSVAs. Analysis included sub-district-level and village-level food security data.

58. The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia in March 2020 affected the implementation of the project. Initially planned for 2017-2020, the project was extended to March 2021 to accommodate the changes necessitated by the pandemic. Implementation of capacity strengthening activities – including workshops and trainings – shifted to a virtual modality.
59. The total project budget was estimated at **USD 1,204,163** for the period of November 2017 to December 2020. Funding was planned to be secured through joint National Food Security Agency (BKP) and WFP resource mobilization. As of the project end date (31 March 2021), the total funds raised and allocated was **USD 124,184**, 10 % of the initial proposed budget.
60. In late 2021, the tasks and functions of the Food Security Agency were integrated into the National Food Agency based on Regulation of the President of the Republic of Indonesia No. 66/2021. The National Food Agency was founded in July 2021 as the agency responsible for food sovereignty, security, and self-sufficiency in Indonesia.
61. Since this integration, WFP and the National Food Security Agency have not developed a project document to plan for work on the FSVA and other activities. WFP has continued to provide technical assistance to produce sub-national FSVAs in five Eastern Indonesian provinces, including through data and analysis support. WFP has also continued to participate in the national FSVA technical working group and providing support to the national FSVA's development on an ad hoc basis.
62. In 2021, WFP secured funding from the WFP Emerging Donors Matching Fund (EDMF) to continue its partnership with the Government for producing the FSVA for planning and targeting food security and nutrition interventions. The EDMF allocation matched a fund allocation by the Government of Indonesia towards the production of FSVAs in 2021. This funding was expected to cover two years of activities, from 2021 to 2023.
63. In 2021, WFP began to support the utilisation of FSVA products and data at the sub-national level through the development of factsheets for dissemination among stakeholders.
64. In 2021, WFP also conducted a study to review the Government's Nutrition Surveillance System (SKPG) and the FSVA as decision-making tools to improve food security and nutrition, including during prolonged crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The study found a correlation between the average length of schooling of women or girls over 15 years and household food security. This informed the recommendation for FSVA to continue to use the average length of schooling for girls over 15 as one of the nine indicators to assess food security, as proposed in 2020.
65. WFP Emerging Donor Matching Fund's resources strengthened national government partnerships by complementing budget allocations from the National Food Agency to enhance the FSVA methodology.
66. In 2022, WFP provided technical assistance to produce the National and Provincial FSVA through the delivery of two training sessions in Papua and Maluku.
67. WFP conducted a case study in East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) to identify barriers and bottlenecks related to understanding, disseminating, and utilizing the provincial and district FSVA. The main impediments identified included a lack of awareness and a supporting legal framework. With WFP's advocacy, the Kupang Regent of East Nusa Tenggara issued a decree to utilize FSVA for food security policies and programmes. The decree further calls for the formation of a technical working group to support FSVA utilization. The Government of East Nusa Tenggara, with WFP technical assistance, began to develop an online provincial FSVA dashboard to support cross-sectoral collaboration, as mandated by the decree.
68. In 2022, WFP also facilitated an independent review of the SAE analysis and provided recommendations to improve the methodology, to enhance the analysis and accuracy of results. In parallel, WFP continued supporting the National Food Agency, Statistics Indonesia, and Statistics Polytechnic to produce SAE datasets for the 2023 sub-national FSVAs in 34 provinces.
69. In 2023, WFP supported the development of a project document with the National Food Agency, which is still in progress.

Table 2: Key Events and Achievements of WFP collaboration with the Government of Indonesia on FSVA activities

Key Events and Achievements	Year
Shift from co-financing of FSVA production between WFP and the government to full government financing of FSVA production.	2019
Geographical focus of WFP technical assistance for FSVA production changed to include and focus more on the sub-national level.	2019
Technical assistance on Small Area Estimation began for the production of sub-national FSVA's.	2019
FSVA formally referenced by a national, cross-ministerial cooperation agreement to support food insecurity alleviation programmes.	2019
The number of schooling years for girls officially added as one of the nine indicators used to calculate the food security composite index for producing the FSVA.	2020
Food Security Agency integrated into the National Food Agency. WFP and Food Security Agency project "Supporting the Government of Indonesia to Collect and Analyse Data on Food Security and Nutrition to Optimize Policies and Programmes" ends.	2021
Review conducted on the Government's Nutrition Surveillance System (SKPG) and the FSVA.	2021
FSVA utilisation case study conducted in Kupang District, East Nusa Tenggara. The case study informed advocacy for cross-sectoral, district-level regulation on FSVA utilisation.	2022
Kupang Regent's Decree on FSVA cross-sectoral, district-level utilisation launched. This included a mandate for the formation of a district-level FSVA technical working group.	2022

3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

70. **Temporal coverage:** Although the FSVA programme originated 2006 and joint production of FSVA reports began in 2012, the temporal scope of the evaluation has been set **as the period 2017 to the present**. This is the period in which the government assumed full responsibility for the FSVA, with WFP advisory support only and in which WFP commenced its work at the subnational level. Furthermore, Since the evaluation will rely considerably on Key Informant Interviews, it is considered unviable to trace individuals and use memory to reconstruct processes further back than 2017.
71. **Component:** The activities that will be evaluated will include technical assistance and capacity strengthening by WFP to the Government of Indonesia on the development and utilisation of data and analyses to inform food security intervention targeting and programming and policy formulation. This will include the activities under the 2017-2021 joint intervention with Food Security Agency; and activities planned and conducted with the National Food Agency beyond the intervention through early 2024. The activities will also be evaluated for their alignment and contribution to gender equality as outlined in the CSP 2017-2020 and CSP 2021-2025 and to inclusion per the CSP 2021-2025.
72. **Geographic scope:** This evaluation will look at both the national and sub-national levels. At the national level, the evaluation will focus on WFP technical assistance and capacity strengthening on the production of data and analyses for the FSVA, including through activities on the SAE and including through WFP's role as part of the FSVA technical working group. The evaluation will also review the utilisation of the FSVA at the national level. At the subnational level, the evaluation will assess WFP technical assistance and capacity strengthening on the production of data and analyses for the subnational FSVA's as well as for the utilisation of the FSVA at the subnational level. The regions that will be included at the subnational level case studies will be determined during the inception phase. The following is an initial list of criteria to be considered in choosing the regions: past or current engagement between WFP and the provincial government on the FSVA, accessibility and budgetary considerations.

73. In terms of the evolution and expansion of the FSVA, the evaluation will trace systematically the changes at the national and subnational levels. For the detailed assessment of any outcomes from “optimised policies and programmes” criteria will be developed for the selection of two sub-national locations where WFP has previously conducted FSVA activities. This will be determined by detailed planning of what is possible within the available budget.

4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations

4.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA

74. **Evaluation Criteria.** The evaluation will apply the international evaluation criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, and Coherence. The evaluation should analyse how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) objectives and mainstreaming principles were included in government policy, cross-sector coordination, and partnerships and WFP’s FSVA design and activities. The GEWE dimensions and wider inclusions and human rights issues should be integrated into all evaluation criteria as appropriate.

75. **Evaluation Questions.** Allied to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation will address the following key questions, which will be further developed, refined and tailored by the evaluation team in a detailed evaluation matrix during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim at highlighting good practices and key lessons from cross-sector policy coordination and partnerships in FSVA with a view to informing future strategic and operational decisions.

Table 3: Criteria and evaluation questions

Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	<p>How relevant have the activities implemented and support provided towards enhancing the FSVA been to the needs, priorities, and policies of the government of Indonesia and other food security stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How relevant does the government perceive FSVA activities? How have any reservations been addressed and/or resolved? • To what extent is the design of WFP capacity strengthening and technical assistance for the production and utilisation of the FSVA and expected results relevant to the achievement of the outcomes? • What effect did WFP’s decision to move its focus to the sub-national level have on the relevance of its work on the FSVA? • To what extent has the FSVA and its methodology been able to adapt and be responsive to emerging needs and changing contexts, including unexpected shocks (e.g., COVID-19 pandemic, global economic crisis, etc)?
Coherence	<p>How well-aligned has the FSVA been with the policies, legislation, programmes, and mandates of the government of Indonesia, WFP, and other food security stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the FSVA activities aligned with national and sub-national policies and regulations? To what extent have contradictions with policies and regulations that have constrained the implementation of FSVA activities and achievement of results? How has this risk been mitigated and/or overcome? • How coherent are the partnerships surrounding the FSVA externally (re: external stakeholders) and internally (within CO)?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does WFP’s work at both the national and sub-national levels on the FSVA impact its coherence, if at all? • To which extent has the CO applied CCS principles in line with the WFP corporate CCS framework—including retroactively—in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation of the CCS activities related to the FSVA? • To what extent has the institutional handover of the FSVA enhanced the coherence of the workstream? • To what extent are FSVA activities coordinated with the broader food security and nutrition frameworks and efforts in Indonesia? Is there complementarity between the FSVA and the actions of different actors? • To what extent has the comparative advantage of WFP to continue with interventions on the FSVA been recognised and accepted by the government of Indonesia and other food security stakeholders?
Efficiency	<p>To what extent has WFP made effective use of the financial and human resources available for FSVA work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were WFP FSVA capacity strengthening activities implemented in a timely manner per project plans? To what extent were these plans coherent with government planning timelines? • To what extent were capacity strengthening outputs stemming from the activities recorded consistently to inform the attainment of milestones? How was the knowledge generated through the course of the project managed? • What internal and external factors enabled and constrained the achievement of intended results from the WFP FSVA capacity strengthening activities? • How consistent have the partnerships surrounding the FSVA been throughout the years (coordination meetings, technical meetings, prioritization, resource allocation, etc)? • To what extent are gender sensitive and inclusive considerations (e.g., disability) included in the FSVA tools and methodologies? • How timely has the production of the FSVA been at the sub-national level? • What constraints have the national and sub-national governments faced in utilising the FSVA? To what extent have the FSVA activities delivered Value for Money?
Effectiveness	<p>What has been the quality and utility of WFP’s contribution to the FSVA over the evaluation period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the FSVA activities achieved the planned outputs and have these led to or likely to lead to the achievement of the expected outcomes? • What combination of formal and informal mechanisms did WFP use to sustain the partnership with the government on the FSVA? • What is the quality of the FSVA reporting at the national and sub-national levels and what has been WFP’s contribution in ensuring effective quality assurance mechanisms in place for the FSVA, for credible and reliable data? • To which extent the recommendations from methodology reviews and studies conducted to enhance the FSVA methodology and enhance use and uptake have achieved (or not achieved) the desired outcomes been achieved?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the FSVA development process, analysis, its products (e.g., reports) and dissemination strategies sensitive and integrated gender and inclusion issues? • How useful have the FSVA products been to potential users? • To what extent does the utilisation focus at the national and sub-national level vary? Why? • To what extent has the utilisation and application of the FSVA been monitored? To what extent has this been done systematically? • What are the unique features of the government in Indonesia and how effectively did WFP navigate these systems? • How has the financial and human resources for the development and utilisation of the FSVA evolved throughout the years at the national and sub-national level? To what extent has this impacted the effectiveness of FSVA development and utilisation? •
Impact	<p>How has WFP contributed to the intended and unintended impacts of the FSVA?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which pathways of the WFP CCS approach have led to the greatest impact within the context of FSVA activities? • What do the FSVA utilisation case studies show in terms of tangible changes (intended and unintended) at the household and community level from improved programming and targeting? • What degree of evidence exists on impacts of the FSVA in relation to gender equality and inclusion? • How WFP's capacity strengthening efforts may have contributed to ensuring robust planning and monitoring processes and systems for the FSVA and how this support can be prioritised moving forward. • What factors affected the strategic planning process for WFP capacity strengthening activities that would have impacted negatively or positively on the achievement of the expected outcomes?
Sustainability	<p>What strategies should be used to maintain and enhance the sustainability of the FSVA at the national and sub-national level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the Government FSVA-related capacity been strengthened and institutionalised both at the national and sub-national levels? • What are the gaps in capacity that remain at the national level for which WFP technical assistance is still required? • What degree of evidence exists on the increased legitimacy, credibility, and influence of the FSVA following WFP capacity strengthening at the national and sub-national levels? • To what extent has the FSVA influenced emergency and developmental policy and programming? • To what extent has the overall funding situation of WFP Indonesia affected its credibility as the government partner in the FSVA program? • What have been the challenges, if any, of raising donor resources for FSVA activities? What does this tell us about the sustainability of CCS-focussed WFP operations in general?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the financial/human resource contributions of WFP and the Government to FSVA activities have been below those expected/planned, what have been the consequences of this? • Which CCS pathways have reached the level of self-sufficiency? And which ones have remained at lower levels of sustainability?
--	---

4.2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

76. The detailed methodology will be developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and coherence.
- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources. The selection of sub-national governments for this evaluation (i.e., province-level) will also need to demonstrate impartiality while still ensuring that the selected sub-national governments will be able to reflect regional disparities.
- Apply an evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints
- Ensure a gender balance among key interview and focus group discussion participants.

77. The methodology chosen should demonstrate attention to impartiality and reduction of bias by relying on mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative, participatory etc.) and different primary and secondary data sources that are systematically triangulated (documents from different sources; a range of stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries; direct observation in different locations; across evaluators; across methods etc.). It will take into account any challenges to data availability, validity or reliability, as well as any budget and timing constraints. The evaluation questions, lines of inquiry, indicators, data sources and data collection methods will be brought together in an evaluation matrix, which will form the basis of the sampling approach and data collection and analysis instruments (desk review, interview and observation guides, survey questionnaires etc.).

78. The methodology should be sensitive in terms of gender equality and women's empowerment, equity and inclusion, indicating how the perspectives and voices of diverse groups (men and women, boys, girls, the elderly, people living with disabilities and other marginalized groups) will be sought and taken into account in the framework of CCS activities. The methodology should ensure that primary data collected is disaggregated by sex and age, where it makes sense, and an explanation will be provided if this is not possible.

79. Looking for explicit consideration of gender in the data after fieldwork is too late; the evaluation team must have a clear and detailed plan for collecting data from women and men in gender-sensitive ways before fieldwork begins.

80. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations must reflect gender and inclusion analyses, and the report should provide lessons/ challenges/ recommendations for conducting gender responsive and inclusive (e.g., disability) evaluation in the future.

81. To ensure independence and impartiality, the following mechanisms will be employed:

- Establishment of an Evaluation Committee (EC) composed of internal stakeholders.
- Establishment of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) composed of internal and external stakeholders.
- Consult with the RBB Evaluation Unit to determine additional measures required to ensure impartiality and independence through all stages of the evaluation.

82. The following potential risks to the methodology have been identified:

- There will be holidays in April 2024 and June 2024 corresponding to Ramadan, Eid al-Fitr and Eid al-Adha, respectively, that might cause some delays. Data collection and ERG engagement should be planned with these dates in mind.
 - Final data collection and Evaluation Reference Group timelines will be communicated and agreed upon with the Government far ahead of time to ensure their availability.
83. The evaluation team will need to expand on the methodology presented in the ToR and develop a detailed evaluation matrix in the inception report.
84. In addition to the mixed methodology proposed above, it is proposed that each of specific evaluation learning focus will be met with a tailored qualitative methodology and approach:
- **Performance and Results:** To document and assess the contribution of WFP since 2017 to the FSVA at national and subnational levels. **Proposed Methodology and Approach:** Outcome Harvesting.
 - **Wider Impacts:** To estimate the extent of benefits derived by populations from the use of the FSVA to improve interventions, programme, and services. **Proposed Methodology and Approach:** Case Studies.
 - **Diagnosis:** To provide a current situational analysis of the FSVA to identify challenges and provide options for the pathway forward for WFP programming. **Proposed Methodology and Approach:** Forward Looking, Formative Approach

Outcome Harvesting

In late 2022 the WFP HQ Country Capacity Strengthening Unit & Office of Evaluation launched pilot project “Applying the Outcome Harvesting Methodology & Conducting an Evaluability Analysis for WFP Country Capacity Strengthening (CCS) Programmes”. This was because WFP corporate and decentralized evaluations have identified systemic challenges in measuring results and generating evidence on WFP’s contributions to capacity strengthening.

The 2021 synthesis on CCS in decentralized evaluations¹ reported that: *(...) WFP is unevenly monitoring and underreporting CCS achievements. There is an unrealized potential for WFP to better monitor and therefore identify and showcase results and strengthen its own learning regarding what works well in CCS and what can be improved if a mix of quantitative and qualitative reporting is utilized.*

In response to these considerations and challenges, the outcome harvesting evaluation methodology is considered potentially the most relevant and promising for this DE. The outcome harvesting methodology is appropriate for complex programming contexts, where change is not linear, cause and effect relationships are not fully understood, and there is interest in understanding the process of change ([USAID Outcome Harvesting Methodology, p. 3](#)). It does not limit measurement of progress towards *predetermined* results, but rather collects evidence on what has been achieved, and works backward to determine whether and how the project or intervention has contributed to the change.

This WFP Indonesia FSVA evaluation can be part of the process of testing and utilising the outcome harvesting methodology. Any lessons available from other outcome harvesting exercises in WFP, within the timeframe of this evaluation preparatory phase, can be incorporated to strengthen the methodology of this DE as appropriate.

Following from the outcome data harvested, the further analysis applying other tool and frameworks can be considered during the inception phase, including:

- **Reconstruction of Theory of Change.** This is a method to compensate for the fact that the FSVA workstream did not include a logical framework or specific targets. This will therefore entail an illustration/diagram, or a narrative built up from the testimony of stakeholders on what they were expecting to achieve through FSVA together with the assumptions made about

¹ <https://www.wfp.org/publications/synthesis-evidence-and-lessons-country-capacity-strengthening-evaluations>

why this could be achieved. This is then compared with what has been achieved and any under or over performance provides basis for analysis in the evaluation.

- **Reconstruction of the policy and technical assistance timeline with key events and milestones using the WFP CCS framework.** This is a retrospective framing, this time within the 3 domains and 5 pathways of the WFP CCS framework, it can provide a baseline for capacity strengthening work going forward allowing for the establishment of clear targets and milestones.

WIDER IMPACTS: Qualitative Case Studies

Identifying level of utilisation of the FSVA products and the extent of concrete benefits of FSVA to affected populations: Since the Outcome Harvesting will be directed mainly as outcomes in institutional capacities, the evaluation will use a case study approach to identify cases where the evidence provided by the FSVA has been used to improve policy implementation, programmes and services for food insecure and vulnerable communities. This component of the evaluation will also look at the utilisation or under-utilisation of FSVA outputs using a SWOT analysis with national and subnational FSVA stakeholders. Since this is the stated objective of the FSVA then it follows that the evaluation should identify and assess the extent of translation of the use of FSVA into concrete benefits and go further to attempt to identify those benefits at a disaggregated level according to gender, age and different types of vulnerability. Below are specifications of the case studies:

- Provisionally, two case studies are expected to be conducted in Nusa Tenggara Timur (East Nusa Tenggara) and West Kalimantan derived from a national action plan (on climate or food security or nutrition).
- Qualitative purposive sampling is proposed to be used to constitute Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews to identify outcomes/impacts of FSVA for these “Tier 3” beneficiaries (link to Tier 3 definition)
- Rigorous qualitative research approaches and methods will be applied to establish credible evaluation findings.
- The anonymous coded data derived from transcripts will be shared with WFP for further use.

FORMATIVE Component

The evaluation is expected to use a formative, forward looking approach for situational analysis and future pathways for WFP's FSVA work.

For WFP Indonesia, adoption of a formative component to the evaluation reflects the COs desire to improve and support future decision-making in the face of a complex, uncertain and rapidly changing development context for FSVA work. The idea will be for WFP to be able to feed the findings and lessons emerging from the evaluation into various imminent WFP and external strategic review and design processes in 2024 and 2025. The WFP processes are the CSP Evaluation and new CSP formulation. External processes include UNSDCF Evaluation, UNSDCF formulation, and Government Planning processes. **This gains importance given the stated intention of the Government of Indonesia, communicated to the WFP Strategic Outcome 1 team, to embark upon a review and reform of the FSVA itself in 2024.**

With regard to the review and reform of the FSVA in 2024 the implications are that the evaluation team will be engaged to participate with the timetable of the process, where appropriate and feasible, and be able to provide flexible support to WFP with preliminary findings and evaluative insights from the evaluation to shape the FSVA reform process. Whilst this will not be a developmental evaluation where evaluation team members are embedded in the WFP operations and directly participate in the FSVA reform itself, the approach may require more of a continuous engagement than in the conventional evaluation data gathering and report writing stages in line with the WFP rules and guidance.

4.3. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

85. The Indonesia Country Office has commissioned an Evaluability Assessment, which has been conducted by an external consultant in the preparatory phase of the evaluation.
86. It is expected that evaluability assessment will ascertain the readiness of, and inform the approach for, an evaluation of the FSVA. The evaluability assessment should also gauge the usability of the evaluation, considering the timeliness of the evaluation and demand for the evaluation within the context of targeted decision-making processes.
87. The evaluability assessment analysed the following components of the planned Decentralized Evaluation on the FSVA:
 - **Detailed explanation of the technical details of the FSVA itself, including the indicators and how they are collected.** The evaluability assessment reviewed the composition and functioning of the current FSVA vis-à-vis other food security and nutrition surveillance systems in Indonesia and considering practices in vulnerability assessment and analysis (VAA) from other countries. This indicates a factual exposition of the similarities and differences between the Indonesian approach and systems in wide use in other countries globally.
 - **Information on the design of the capacity strengthening and technical assistance** on the production of the FSVA and the existing avenues and pathways for the utilization of the FSVA data and findings to inform programmes and shorter-term interventions. Focus on any major changes in the focus of WFP support to FSVA since 2017 and the reasons for the change.
 - **Availability and measurability of data** to sufficiently answer key evaluation questions. This considers the breadth and depth of data collected, the systems that are in place, and the capacity that was in place to monitor WFP's FSVA activities during the period under evaluation. The emphasis is on comprehensive document search, and an explanation the content of the available documents, for the evaluation team to have a clear starting point for the further primary data collection required for a credible evaluation.
 - **Assessment of the suitability and feasibility** of the methods and indicators proposed in the draft terms of reference of the Decentralized Evaluation
 - **Assessment of the scope of the evaluation** including the period to be covered, reviewing the preliminary selection of 2017 to date, and extent of coverage of national and subnational FSVA activities.
 - **Context and environment** for the implementation of the evaluation. This will consider political, financial, and other contexts that determine the timeliness and usability of the evaluation.
88. The evaluability assessment was conducted using both primary and secondary data. Methods employed include a desk review and interviews with WFP staff. Methods can also include snowball sampling where key informants identify other potential key informants that WFP may not currently be aware of or be engaged with.
89. The evaluability assessment identified gaps in data that would be required to produce a credible and useful evaluation. The assessment could then lay out ways forward for primary data gathering in areas where existing data sources are limited and specify any limitations that cannot be mitigated and that will necessarily affect the scope of the evaluation.
90. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will be expected to perform an in-depth analysis of evaluability based on the existing evaluability assessment. This analysis will inform the data collection and the choice of evaluation methods proposed above. The evaluation team will need to systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data during the reporting phase.

4.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

91. The evaluation must conform to [UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation](#). Accordingly, the selected evaluation firm is responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation process. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of respondents, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of respondents, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results do no harm to respondents or their communities.
92. The evaluation firm will be responsible for managing any potential ethical risks and issues and must put in place, in consultation with the evaluation manager, processes and systems to identify, report and resolve any ethical issues that might arise during the implementation of the evaluation. Ethical approvals and reviews by relevant national and institutional review boards must be sought where required.
93. The team and evaluation manager will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of WFP's contribution to the FSVA nor have any other potential or perceived conflicts of interest. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the [2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#), including the Pledge of Ethical Conduct as well as the WFP technical note on gender. The evaluation team will also commit to signing confidentiality, Internet and Data Security Statement. The evaluation team and individuals who participate directly in the evaluation at the time of issuance of the purchase order are expected to sign a confidentiality agreement and a commitment to ethical conduct. These templates will be provided by the country office when signing the contract.

4.5. QUALITY ASSURANCE

94. The WFP evaluation quality assurance system sets out processes with steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products based on a set of [Quality Assurance Checklists](#). The quality assurance will be systematically applied during this evaluation and relevant documents will be provided to the evaluation team. This includes checklists for feedback on quality for each of the evaluation products. The relevant checklist will be applied at each stage, to ensure the quality of the evaluation process and outputs.
95. The WFP Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (DEQAS) is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community and aims to ensure that the evaluation process and products conform to best practice. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views or independence of the evaluation team but ensures that the report provides credible evidence and analysis in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.
96. The WFP evaluation manager will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation progresses as per the [DEQAS Process Guide](#) and for conducting a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their finalization.
97. To enhance the quality and credibility of decentralized evaluations, an outsourced quality support (QS) service directly managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation reviews the draft ToR, the draft inception and the evaluation reports, and provides a systematic assessment of their quality from an evaluation perspective, along with recommendations.
98. The evaluation manager will share the assessment and recommendations from the quality support service with the team leader, who will address the recommendations when finalizing the inception and evaluation reports. To ensure transparency and credibility of the process in line with the [UNEG norms and standards](#),^[1] A rationale should be provided for comments that the team does not take into account when finalizing the report.
99. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the data collection, synthesis, analysis and reporting phases.

^[1] [UNEG Norm #7](#) states "that transparency is an essential element that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability."

100. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the directive on disclosure of information. This is available in the [WFP Directive CP2010/001](#) on information disclosure.
101. WFP expects that all deliverables from the evaluation team are subject to a thorough quality assurance review by the evaluation firm in line with the WFP evaluation quality assurance system prior to submission of the deliverables to WFP.
102. All final evaluation reports will be subject to a post hoc quality assessment (PHQA) by an independent entity through a process that is managed by the Office of Evaluation. The overall PHQA results will be published on the WFP website alongside the evaluation report.

5. Organization of the evaluation

5.1. PHASES AND DELIVERABLES

An indicative time frame, including milestones/deadlines and deliverables for each stage. See Annex 2 for further details.

Table 4 presents the structure of the main phases of the evaluation, along with the deliverables and deadlines for each phase. Annex 2 presents a more detailed timeline.

Table 4: Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones.

Main phases, tasks and deliverables	Q1 2024	Q2 2024	Q3 2024	Q4 2024	Q1 2025	Responsible
1. Preparation Preparation of TOR Selection of the evaluation team & contracting Logistics preparation						Evaluation manager
2. Inception Inception mission in Jakarta Inception report						Evaluation team
3. Data collection Fieldwork Exit debriefing						Evaluation team
4. Reporting Data analysis and report drafting Comments process Learning workshop Evaluation report						Evaluation team and Evaluation manager
5. Dissemination and follow-up Management response Dissemination of the evaluation report						Evaluation manager

5.2. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

This Decentralized Evaluation will be conducted by a team of three independent consultants with relevant evaluation expertise, put together by an Indonesia-based and registered evaluation service provider. The selected evaluation firm [service provider] providing the evaluation team is responsible for proposing a mix of evaluators with multi-lingual language skills (English and Bahasa Indonesia) who can effectively cover the areas of evaluation. The evaluation team will have strong methodological competencies in designing feasible data capture, and analysis plan for this evaluation. Outcome harvesting experience is preferred.

For this assignment, at least one evaluation consultant who has national and international experience with and in-depth knowledge of collaborations between WFP, the UN, multilateral and partner governments (i.e., bilateral), ideally on food security and vulnerability mapping, assessment and analysis, should be included in the team.

The team will provide a combination of the expertise and skills required to conduct the evaluation as a research analyst as detailed below. The team will preferably consist of a combination of international, regional and/or national consultants with gender balance.

All team members must be fluent in English, with evaluation competencies in designing and conducting data collection, analysis, synthesis and reporting skills; evaluation experience in humanitarian and development contexts. Knowledge of the WFP food and technical assistance modalities is desirable.

Local language skills will be required for focus group discussions with due attention to gender balance, ensuring both a female/male local language speaker for interviews with government and other stakeholders.

The team leader (TL) will have the additional responsibility for overall design, implementation, reporting and timely delivery of all evaluation products. The team leader should have excellent synthesis and evaluation reporting writing skills in English. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i) defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team; and iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception report, the end of field work (i.e., exit) debriefing presentation and evaluation report in line with DEQAS.

Summary of evaluation team and areas of skills required

Table 5: Evaluation Team Requirements

Team	Experience, knowledge and skills required
Team Leader and Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis Evaluation Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team leadership, coordination, planning and management including the ability to resolve problems. • Understanding and experience of Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) or equivalent system at a regional or global level, to place the Indonesia FSVA in a comparative perspective. Knowledge and experience of WFP VAM outreach to governments across different countries and continents highly desirable. • Proven track record in designing and implementing complex evaluations. • Strong experience in evaluating implementation of strategic plans and to evaluating capacity strengthening activities and its contribution, with deep understanding and of experience of national information systems for e.g., poverty reduction, food security, early warning, nutrition. Extensive UN evaluation track record preferred. • Native level English writing skills.

Indonesia Government Systems Evaluation Specialist (National)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with evaluating technical assistance to strengthen resilience of vulnerable populations in Indonesia via government-owned platforms, operational partnerships with other UN agencies, international financial institutions and/or private sector. • Experience with evaluating institutional capacity strengthening, training and technical assistance to national and sub-national governments and other development and humanitarian partners to improve vulnerable people's livelihood. • Familiarity with food security assessments, VAM, M&E processes and products. • Capacity to assess efficiency, timelines and cost-effectiveness of WFP technical assistance/capacity development modalities. Evaluate WFP's technical assistance to the FSVA.
Qualitative Gender and Inclusion and Evaluation QA Specialist (National)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with qualitative research, data searches and storages, data cleaning, analysis, documentation, formatting, proofreading, taking notes for the record, arranging/facilitating conference calls in support of the team's work and evaluation products. • Relevant understanding of evaluation and research, fieldwork experience in providing research support to evaluation teams, data analyses, formatting, proofreading, writing and presentation skills. • Experience in gender and inclusion in research and evaluation. • Experience of working within UN evaluation/research systems and regulations is an asset. • Capacity to ensure high quality of analysis and integration of the three evaluation components, as well as timely production of deliverables.

Team members will: i) contribute to the methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; and iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s) v) disseminate the findings and recommendations of the DE.

The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and in close communication with the WFP evaluation manager. The team will be hired following agreement with WFP on its composition.

5.3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

This evaluation is managed by the WFP Indonesia Country Office. Mutia Assyifa, the Indonesia CO Reports and Information Management Officer, has been appointed as Evaluation Manager (EM). The EM has not worked on issues associated with the subject of evaluation. The EM will manage the evaluation process through all phases including:

- Drafting the ToR (with inputs from relevant Units at RBB and HQs);
- Identifying the evaluation team;
- Preparing and managing the budget;
- Setting up the evaluation committee and evaluation reference group;
- Ensuring quality assurance mechanisms are operational and effectively used;
- Consolidating and sharing comments on draft inception and evaluation reports with the evaluation team;
- Ensuring that the team has access to all documentation and information necessary to the evaluation;
- Facilitating the team's contacts with local stakeholders;

- Supporting the preparation of the field mission by setting up meetings and field visits;
- Providing logistic support during the fieldwork and arranging for interpretation, if required;
- Organizing security briefings for the evaluation team
- Providing any materials as required;
- Conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products.

The EM will be the main interlocutor between the team represented by the team leader and government agencies as the other commissioners of the evaluation, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process. An evaluation officer from WFP RBB and/or HQ and an Evaluation Officer from the Government agency (as the other commissioner to this evaluation) will provide second level quality assurance.

The WFP Indonesia Country Director will take responsibility to:

- Assign an evaluation manager for the evaluation;
- Compose the internal evaluation committee and the evaluation reference group (see below);
- Approve the final ToR, inception and evaluation reports;
- Approve the evaluation team selection;
- Ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation at all stages, including establishment of an evaluation committee and a reference group;
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and the evaluation subject, its performance and results with the evaluation manager and the evaluation team;
- Organize and participate in two separate debriefings, one internal and one with external stakeholders;
- Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes, including the preparation of a management response to the evaluation recommendations.

An internal evaluation committee (EC) is formed to help ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. See Annex 3 for the complete list of committee members. The committee will be responsible for the evaluation process, making key decisions and reviewing evaluation products.

An evaluation reference group (ERG) will be formed as an advisory body with representation from internal stakeholders of WFP and the National Food Agency. See Annex 4 for the complete list of the ERG members. ERG members will review and comment on the draft evaluation products and act as key informants to contribute to the relevance, impartiality and credibility of the evaluation by offering a range of viewpoints and ensuring a transparent process.

The regional bureau will take responsibility to:

- Advise the evaluation manager and provide support to the evaluation process where appropriate;
- Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the evaluation subject as required;
- Provide comments on the draft ToR, inception and evaluation reports;
- Support the preparation of a management response to the evaluation and track the implementation of the recommendations.

While the regional evaluation officers, Stuart Coupe and Mari Honjo, will perform most of the above responsibilities, other regional bureau-relevant technical staff may participate in the evaluation reference group and/or comment on evaluation products as needed.

The Office of Evaluation (OEV) is responsible for overseeing WFP decentralized evaluation function, defining evaluation norms and standards, managing the outsourced quality support service, publishing as well submitting the final evaluation report to the PHQA. OEV also ensures a help desk function and advises the Regional Evaluation Officer, the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation teams when required. Internal and external stakeholders and/or the evaluators are encouraged to reach out to the regional evaluation officer and the Office of Evaluation helpdesk (wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org) in case of potential impartiality breaches or non-adherence to UNEG ethical guidelines.

5.4. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

Security clearance where required is to be obtained from the Indonesia CO. As an independent service provider of evaluation services to WFP, the evaluation company is responsible for ensuring the security of all persons contracted, including adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. The consultants [sub-contractor] contracted by the service provider do not fall under the UN Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for UN personnel.

However, to avoid any security incidents, the Evaluation Manager is requested to ensure that:

- The WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground as necessary.
- The team members observe applicable UN security rules and regulations – e.g., curfews etc.

5.5. COMMUNICATION

To ensure a smooth and efficient process and enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders. These will be achieved by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders.

All evaluation products will be produced in English and Bahasa Indonesia. Should translators be required at any stage of the evaluation, the evaluation firm will plan accordingly and include the cost in the budget proposal.

Based on the stakeholder analysis, the communication and knowledge management plan (in Annex 5) identifies the users of the evaluation to involve in the process and to whom the report should be disseminated. The communication and knowledge management plan indicates how findings including gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be disseminated and how stakeholders interested in, or affected by, gender, equity and wider inclusion issues will be engaged.

As part of the international standards for evaluation, WFP requires that all evaluations are made publicly available. It is important that evaluation reports are accessible to a wide audience, thereby contributing to the credibility of WFP – through transparent reporting – and the use of evaluation.

5.6. PROPOSAL

The evaluation will be sourced by the funds allocated by the CO for a decentralised evaluation, as well as through other WFP internal sources, where applicable.

The service provider will outline their budget in a financial proposal to WFP as part of their response to the Request for Proposals (RFP) (Annex 2: Evaluation Schedule indicated number of days which help evaluation team to estimate the budget). For this evaluation the service provider will:

- Include budget for travel and accommodations for all relevant in-country data collection, including costs related to obtaining visas [as applicable]
- Include budget needed for key informant interviews and focus group discussions (e.g., venue, refreshments, moderator, etc)
- Include budget needed for desk review, such as costs related to acquiring data (e.g., from Statistics Indonesia and other entities)
- The final budget and handling will be determined by the option of contracting that will be used and the rates that will apply at the time of contracting.

WFP may conduct reference checks and interviews with selected team members.

Annexes

Annex 1: Map



Annex 2: Evaluation Schedule

Phases, deliverables and timeline		Key dates
Phase 1 - Preparation		
EC Chair	EC Chair approves ToR	20 March 2024
EM	TOR circulated to national firms for Proposals	22 March 2024
EM	Proposal Deadline based on the Draft TOR	19 April
EM	Assess evaluation proposals and recommends team selection	22 April – 16 May
EC Chair	Approve evaluation team selection and recruitment of evaluation team	17 May 2024
EM	Evaluation team recruited/contracted	24 May 2024
Phase 2 - Inception		
EM/TL	Brief core team	27 May 2024
ET	Desk review of key documents	28 May – 11 June 2024
ET	Inception mission	3 – 4 June 2024
ET	Draft inception report (IR)	26 June 2024
EM	Quality assurance of draft IR by EM and REO using QC, share draft IR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS	27 June – 11 July 2024
EM	Share IR with ERG	11 July 2024
ERG	Review and comment on draft IR	11 – 23 July 2024
EM	Consolidate comments	24 July 2024
ET	Review draft IR based on feedback received from DEQS, EM, ERG, and REO and submit final revised IR	25 July – 1 August
EM	Review final IR and submit to the evaluation committee for approval	2 – 7 August
EC Chair	Approve final IR and share with ERG for information	16 August
Phase 3 – Data collection		
EC Chair/EM	Brief the evaluation team	19 August 2024
ET	Data collection and initial analysis	20 August – 1 October 2024
ET	Debriefing	4 October 2024
Phase 4 - Reporting		
ET	Draft evaluation report	1 November 2024

EM	Quality assurance of draft ER by EM and REO using the QC, share draft ER with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQAS	4 – 15 November 2024
EM	Circulate draft ER for review and comments to ERG, RB and other stakeholders	15 November 2024
ERG	Review and comment on draft ER	18 – 29 November
ET	Validation Workshop	3 December 2024
EM	Consolidate comments received	4 – 5 December 2024
ET	Review draft ER based on feedback received from DEQAS, EM, ERG, and REO and submit final revised ER	6 – 20 December 2024
EM	Dissemination and Learning Workshop	6 January 2025
EM	Review final revised ER and submit to the evaluation committee	7 – 14 January 2025
EC Chair	Approve final evaluation report and share with key stakeholders for information	29 January 2025
Phase 5 - Dissemination and follow-up		Up to 4 weeks
EC Chair	Prepare management response	30 January – 20 February 2025
EM	Share final evaluation report and management response with the REO and OEV for publication and participate in end-of-evaluation lessons learned call	24 – 28 February 2025

Annex 3: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Committee

Purpose and role: The purpose of the evaluation committee (EC) is to ensure a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation in accordance with WFP evaluation policy. It will achieve this by supporting the evaluation manager in making decisions, reviewing draft deliverables (ToR, inception report and evaluation report) and submitting them for approval by the Country Director/Deputy Country Director (CD/DCD) who will be the chair of the committee.

EC COMPOSITION

WFP Indonesia Country Office	
Position	Name
Country Director	Jennifer Rosenzweig
Evaluation Manager/Reports and Information Management Officer	Mutia Assyifa
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting Head of Unit	Lukman Hakim
Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Activity Manager	Katarina Kohutova
Food Security and Nutrition Officer	Rahmitha
Nutrition Analyst	Unun Bafani
Procurement Officer	Yenny
Regional Bureau Bangkok	
Regional Evaluation Officer	Mari Honjo
Regional M&E Consultant	Stuart Coupe

Annex 4: Role and Composition of the Evaluation Reference Group

Purpose and role: The evaluation reference group (ERG) is an advisory group providing advice and feedback to the evaluation manager and the evaluation team at key moments during the evaluation process. It is established during the preparatory stage of the evaluation and is mandatory for all decentralized evaluations.

The overall purpose of the evaluation reference group is to contribute to the credibility, utility and impartiality of the evaluation. For this purpose, its composition and role are guided by the following principles:

- **Transparency:** Keeping relevant stakeholders engaged and informed during key steps ensures transparency throughout the evaluation process
- **Ownership and Use:** Stakeholders' participation enhances ownership of the evaluation process and products, which in turn may impact on its use
- **Accuracy:** Feedback from stakeholders at key steps of the preparatory, data collection and reporting phases contributes to accuracy of the facts and figures reported in the evaluation and of its analysis.

Members are expected to review and comment on draft evaluation deliverables and share relevant insights at key consultation points of the evaluation process.

The main roles of the evaluation reference group are as follows:

- Review and comment on the draft ToR
- Suggest key references and data sources in their area of expertise
- Participate in face-to-face or virtual briefings to the evaluation team during the inception phase and/or evaluation phase
- Review and comment on the draft inception report
- Participate in field debriefings (optional)
- Review and comment on the draft evaluation report and related annexes, with a particular focus on a) factual errors and/or omissions that could invalidate the findings or change the conclusions; b) issues of political sensitivity that need to be refined in the way they are addressed or in the language used; c) recommendations
- Participate in learning workshops to validate findings and discuss recommendations
- Provide guidance on suggested communications products to disseminate learning from the evaluation.

ERG COMPOSITION

WFP Indonesia Country Office	
Position	Name
Country Director	Jennifer Rosenzweig
Evaluation Manager/Reports and Information Management Officer	Mutia Assyifa
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting Head of Unit	Lukman Hakim
Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Activity Manager	Katarina Kohutova
Food Security and Nutrition Officer	Rahmitha
Nutrition Analyst	Unun Bafani
Strategy and Policy Officer	Patricia Norimarna
Partnership Officer	Rein Suadamara
Head of Kupang Sub-Office	Nunuk Supratinah
Regional Bureau Bangkok	
Regional Evaluation Officer	Mari Honjo
Regional M&E Consultant	Stuart Coupe
Regional Capacity Strengthening Advisor	Belinda Chanda
Head of RAM	Andrea Berardo
VAM Officer	Susana Moreno
VAM Officer	Aysenur Ozcan
Senior VAM Programme Assistant	Ruangdech Pongprom
National Food Agency	
Director, Food Security Control Directorate	Rachmad Firdaus
Deputy, Food Security Control Directorate	Tono

Annex 5: Communication and Knowledge Management Plan

INTERNAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PLAN

When (Evaluation Phase)	What	To Whom	From Whom	How	When
Preparation	Final TOR	ERG, EC	CO	Email	Mar 2024
Inception	Draft IR Final IR	ERG ERG, EC	CO	Email Email	Jun 2024 Aug 2024
Data Collection	In-Country Briefing	ERG	CO	In-person / hybrid workshop	Oct 2024
Reporting	Draft Report Revised Draft Report	ERG ERG, EC	CO	Email Email	Nov 2024 Nov 2024

EXTERNAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION PLAN

When (Evaluation Phase)	What	To Whom	From Whom	How	When
Reporting	Final Report	Public	CO and RBB	Website	Jan 2025
Dissemination and Follow Up	2-page Evaluation Brief	Public	CO and RBB	Website	Jan 2025
Dissemination and Follow Up	Dissemination and Learning Workshop	Public	CO	In-person / hybrid workshop	Jan 2025

Annex 6: Bibliography

- [1] World Bank. July 2023. World Bank Country and Lending Groups. <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups>
- [2] Statistics Indonesia. July 2023. March 2023 Poverty Profile in Indonesia. <https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2023/07/17/2016/profil-kemiskinan-di-indonesia-maret-2023.html>
- [3] Ministry of Health. 2022. Indonesia Nutritional Status Survey Results Pocketbook. <https://kesmas.kemkes.go.id/assets/uploads/contents/attachments/09fb5b8ccfd088080f2521ff0b4374f.pdf>
- [4] Statistics Indonesia. 2022. Prevalence of Undernourishment, 2020-2022. <https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/23/1473/1/prevalensi-ketidacukupan-konsumsi-pangan.html>
- [5] Ministry of Health. 2018. *Basic Health Research*. https://kesmas.kemkes.go.id/assets/upload/dir_519d41d8cd98f00/files/Hasil-risikesdas-2018_1274.pdf
- [6] Beal, T., Tumilowicz, A., Sutrisna, A., Izwardy, D., & Neufeld, L. M. 2018. *A review of child stunting determinants in Indonesia*. *Maternal & child nutrition*, 14(4), e12617.
- [7] United Nations Children’s Fund, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, World Food Programme and the World Health Organization. *Global Action Plan on Child Wasting: a framework for action to accelerate progress in preventing and managing child wasting and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals*. New York, 2021.
- [8] Ministry of Health. 2018. *Basic Health Research*. https://kesmas.kemkes.go.id/assets/upload/dir_519d41d8cd98f00/files/Hasil-risikesdas-2018_1274.pdf
- [9] World Economic Forum. July 2023. *Global Gender Gap Report 2023*. https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2023.pdf
- [10] Statistics Indonesia. 2022. *Education Completion Rates According to Educational Level and Gender*. https://www.bps.go.id/indikator/indikator/view_data/0000/data/1982/sdgs_4/1
- [11] Statistics Indonesia. 2022. *Life Expectancy According to Province and Gender, 2020-2022*. <https://www.bps.go.id/indikator/40/501/1/angka-harapan-hidup-ahh-menurut-provinsi-dan-jenis-kelamin.html>
- [12] Statistics Indonesia. July 2021. *The percentage of people in poverty fell to 10.14 percent in March 2021*. <https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2021/07/15/1843/persentase-penduduk-miskin-maret-2021-turun-menjadi-10-14-persen.html>
- [13] Statistics Indonesia. November 2021. Official Statistics News No. 84/11/Th. XXIV, 05 November 2021.
- [14] United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Children’s Fund, World Food Programme, World Health Organization. 2021. *Food security and nutrition in urban Indonesia: Evidence from a remote COVID-19 survey*.
- [15] World Food Programme. 2021. SDFU Report.
- [16] National Disaster Management Agency. Accessed in December 2021. Indonesian Disaster Information Data. <https://dibi.bnppb.go.id/>
- [17] National Disaster Management Agency. Accessed in December 2022. Indonesian Disaster Information Data. <https://dibi.bnppb.go.id/>
- [18] World Food Programme. May 2023. WFP Indonesia Seasonal Monitoring Bulletin: January-March (Q1) 2023. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000149390/download/?_ga=2.243921221.1551968560.1698026433-529354186.1651037242
- [19] World Food Programme. October 2022. WFP Indonesia - Economic and Food Price Bulletin - October 2022. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000144111/download/?_ga=2.243324229.1551968560.1698026433-529354186.1651037242
- [20] World Bank. 11 August 2022. Food Security Update. <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/b5de315c82b1a3bb32bf30057aad9b74-0320012022/original/Food-Security-Update-LXVIII-Aug-11-2022.pdf>

[21] World Food Programme. October 2022. WFP Indonesia - Economic and Food Price Bulletin - October 2022. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000144111/download/?_ga=2.243324229.1551968560.1698026433-529354186.1651037242

[22] Logistics Affairs Agency. 8 June 2023. National Food Agency: 21.3 Million Have Received 433 Thousand Tonnes of Social Assistance Rice. <https://www.bulog.co.id/2023/06/08/bapanas-213-juta-sudah-terima-bansos-beras-433-ribu-ton/>

[23] World Food Programme. October 2022. WFP Indonesia - Economic and Food Price Bulletin - October 2022. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000144111/download/?_ga=2.243324229.1551968560.1698026433-529354186.1651037242

[24] Cao, J., Zhang, Z., Tao, F., Chen, Y., Luo, X., Xie, J. 2023. Forecasting global crop yields based on El Nino Southern Oscillation early signals. *Agricultural Systems*, Volume 205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2022.103564>.

[25] Logistics Affairs Agency. 26 July 2023. Government Extends Rice Food Assistance Until End of 2023. <https://www.bulog.co.id/2023/07/26/pemerintah-perpanjang-bantuan-pangan-beras-hingga-akhir-2023/>

[26] World Food Programme. 2020. Indonesia country strategic plan (2021-2025). https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000119410/download/?_ga=2.214620503.1551968560.1698026433-529354186.1651037242

[27] World Food Programme. 3 October 2022. Country Capacity Strengthening Policy Update – 2022. <https://www.wfp.org/publications/country-capacity-strengthening-policy-update-2022>

Annex 7: Acronyms

CCA	Common Country Analysis
CCS	Country Capacity Strengthening
CD	Country Director
CO	Country Office
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
DCD	Deputy Country Director
DEQAS	Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System
EC	Evaluation Committee
EM	Evaluation Manager
ER	Evaluation Report
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
ET	Evaluation Team
FSVA	Food Security and Vulnerability Atlas
IR	Inception Report
OEV	Office of Evaluation
RAM	Research, Assessment, Monitoring
RBB	Regional Bureau Bangkok
REO	Regional Evaluation Officer
SAE	Small Area Estimation
WFP	World Food Programme
VAA	Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis