

# **Evaluation of School Feeding Modalities Applied in Armenia from 2018 - 2023**

Decentralized Evaluation Terms of Reference

WFP Armenia



World Food  
Programme

SAVING  
LIVES  
CHANGING  
LIVES

October 24, 2023

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Background</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2. Context .....	2
<b>2. Reasons for the evaluation</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1. Rationale.....	7
2.2. Objectives .....	8
2.3. Stakeholder Analysis .....	9
<b>3. Subject of the evaluation</b> .....	<b>12</b>
3.1. Subject of the Evaluation .....	12
3.2. Scope of the Evaluation .....	16
<b>4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations</b> .....	<b>18</b>
4.1. Evaluation Questions and Criteria .....	18
4.2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology.....	21
4.3. Evaluability assessment .....	23
4.4. Ethical Considerations.....	23
4.5. Quality Assurance .....	24
5.1. Phases and Deliverables .....	26
5.2. Contracted Evaluation firm/Team Composition.....	26
5.3. Roles and Responsibilities .....	27
5.4. Security Considerations .....	28
5.5. Communication .....	29
5.6. Proposal.....	29
5.7. EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	30
5.8. Deliverables.....	30

# 1. Background

1. These terms of reference (ToR) were prepared by the WFP Armenia Country Office based upon an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders and following a standard template. The purpose of these terms of reference is 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.

## 1.1. INTRODUCTION

2. This ToR is designed for the Decentralized Evaluation (DE) of the School Feeding Programme (SFP) activities in Armenia. This DE is commissioned by the WFP Armenia and will cover the period from 2018 to July 2023.
3. The purpose of the ToR is to provide key information to guide the evaluation team (supplier) and to specify expectations during the various phases of the evaluation.
4. In 2010, thanks to a multi-year contribution of the Russian Federation, WFP relaunched the development of the SFP assuming the approach of “scaling-up and transition to national Programme”. WFP’s role shifted from implementer to enabler, supporting and enabling national ownership of the school meals programme while working with partners to establish a more comprehensive national school feeding programme. Since 2010 WFP Armenia has been implementing the SFP gradually covering all ten provinces of Armenia (except the capital city Yerevan) in primary school (grades 0/1 – 4) level aiming to improve the nutrition status, access to primary education and the learning outcomes of the schoolchildren, as well as providing schoolchildren with a nutrition-sensitive safety net.
5. The WFP Armenia Country Strategic Plan (2019-2025) builds on the successful implementation of the School Feeding Programme thus far, incorporating an additional strategic investment through - the Transformative School Feeding Programme (TSFP), which places schools as centres of learning that will contribute to improved human capital development of Armenia, establish new drivers of growth through investments in food security, carry forward green and digital regional development of the country, and improve the health of the population.
6. The strategic critical areas of the Programme are:
  - ✓ Provision of school meals with a vision of a full handover of the Programme management to the Government of RA by 2022<sup>1</sup>. This activity will improve food security among schoolchildren, enhancing their health and learning outcomes.

---

<sup>1</sup> The handover process took one additional year mainly because of the lockdown. As of July 2023, the SFP initiated and implemented by WFP in 10 provinces of Armenia (all provinces except of the Capital City Yerevan) has been fully handed over to the Government.

- ✓Infrastructure rehabilitation and re-equipment<sup>2</sup> of schools' kitchen, cafeteria and storage facilities to expand the schools' capacity to provide safe, diverse and nutritious meals.
  - ✓Innovative modules for the enhancement and development of school production capacities through establishment of school gardens and greenhouses, food processing units, bakeries, renewable energy and linking farmers and food producers to schools, diversifying school meals and generating new job opportunities.
  - ✓Institutional capacity strengthening at all levels to improve the Counterpart's capacity to manage the nationwide implementation of the Programme.
7. Over the years, the School Feeding Programme has evolved into an essential development platform contributing to building human capital.
  8. The ToR describes the context, rationale, purpose, and scope of the DE, including key evaluation questions, methodology, key audience, communication plan, deliverables, timeline, and dissemination plan. The findings of the SFP evaluation will be globally published and circulated to stakeholders including the government, donors, and CPs to inform the development of WFP Armenia's new CSP.

## 1.2. CONTEXT

9. Armenia is an upper<sup>3</sup> middle-income and landlocked, net food-importer country with a population of around 3 million people. Snap parliamentary elections were held in Armenia on 20 June 2021<sup>4</sup>. Following the election, Pashinyan's Civil Contract party received 54% of the vote and formed a Government proclaiming continuation of wide-ranging reforms meant to normalize relations with neighbouring countries, increase transparency and accountability in public governance, reduce corruption and improve rule of law and human rights.<sup>5</sup> Armenia hopes to promote economic development and gradually expand into a more service-based economy, focusing efforts on modernization and information technology.
10. As one of the most shock-prone countries in the Central Asia and Caucasus region, Armenia is prone to natural disasters such as droughts, hailstorms, floods and landslides. Climate change impacts the frequency and intensity of such shocks and can result in significant losses and decline of agricultural productivity, eventually bringing to food shortages and increased food prices.<sup>6</sup> Situated in one of the most seismically active regions of the world, a recent World Bank study revealed that, on average, Armenia loses 3 percent of its GDP due to earthquakes.

---

<sup>2</sup> List of equipment includes also hand washing facilities/stations for children and kitchen staff.

<sup>3</sup> The World Bank, New World Bank country classifications by income level: 2021-2022

<sup>4</sup> The elections had initially been scheduled for 9 December 2023, but were called earlier due to a political crisis following the escalation of the conflict in and around Nagorno-Karabakh in 2020.

<sup>5</sup> The SDG Implementation Voluntary National Review (VNR) Armenia, July 2018: [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/19586Armenia\\_VNR\\_2018.pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/19586Armenia_VNR_2018.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Fourth National Communication on Climate Change. Yerevan, RA Ministry of Environment, UNDP Armenia, 2020.

11. In 2021, 27 percent of the population in Armenia lived below the poverty line, of which extreme poverty incidence is 1.5 percent.<sup>7</sup> Many Armenians leave the country each year in search of economic opportunities elsewhere, resulting in increased responsibilities for women in managing households and financial dependence on remittances. In 2021, almost one-fifth of Armenians faced multi-dimensional poverty. The measure of multi-dimensional poverty summarizes information on multiple deprivations and describes the complexity, depth, and persistence of poverty.
12. Armenia ranked 81<sup>st</sup> out of 189 on the Human Development Index<sup>8</sup> in 2020 and 114<sup>th</sup> out of 156 according to the Global Gender Gap report (2021)<sup>9</sup>. The latest official rates from 2022 show unemployment at 13 percent overall, which is by 2.5 and 5.2 percent less than in 2021 and 2020 respectively. This is a significant reduction, but 13 percent is still a high indicator in absolute terms. In 2021 the unemployment rate among women and girls was 15.2 percent, compared with 15.6 percent among men and boys. This is a marked improvement compared to 2020, when the unemployment rate among women and girls was 17.1 percent, compared with 19 percent among men and boys<sup>10</sup>. However, employment opportunities are limited and persisting gender-based inequalities further restrict the opportunities for women to access economic resources, ultimately hindering Armenia's socio-economic development.
13. As per UN Women's Armenia Country Gender Equality Brief, in 2019 the nominal pay gap between men and women decreased by 8.3% since 2008. Nonetheless, the gender pay gap stands at 32.5%. Women in Armenia therefore spend 33% of their time in gainful employment compared to 60% of men; spend upwards to 21.7% of their time on unpaid domestic care work in the home, and approximately six times more time on childcare activities than men<sup>11</sup>.
14. In 2020, the total number of children aged 6-17, which corresponds to the official age for 12-year education, was 479,800 individuals. This figure was 29,300 higher than the count in 2010, which stood at 450,500 children. The number of children of primary and lower secondary age increased in all types of settlements, while the number of children of upper secondary age decreased from 2010 to 2020<sup>12</sup>. In terms of gender composition, the proportion of girls in total enrolment remained virtually unchanged at 47.7% in 2010-2020, with the absolute enrolment of girls and boys increasing by 7.2% and 8.1% respectively.
15. In 2020, the number of out of school children in primary and secondary schools was 228 (0,15 percent). As per UNESCO, in 2018 the most common risk factors associated with being out-of-school are disability, extreme poverty, child labour, ethnicity, and refugee status.

---

<sup>7</sup> Social Snapshot and Poverty in Armenia, 2022, Statistical Committee of the RA, Retrieved from: [Poverty 2022 En 2 \(armstat.am\)](#)

<sup>8</sup> UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) in annual Human Development Report 2020.

<sup>9</sup> Global Gender Gap Report 2021.

<sup>10</sup> Labour Market in Armenia, 2022, National Statistical Service. Retrieved from: [https://www.armstat.am/file/article/lab\\_market\\_2022\\_7.pdf](https://www.armstat.am/file/article/lab_market_2022_7.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> UN Women (2019). Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals – The Gender Snapshot 2019. New York, New York: UN Women Headquarters.

<sup>12</sup> [Education Sector Analysis for Armenia.pdf \(unicef.org\)](#)

16. According to the World Bank, Armenia had a literacy rate of around 99.6% in 2021. This high literacy rate indicates that the majority of the population over the age of 15 in Armenia is able to read and write<sup>13</sup>.
17. Armenia has one of the highest rates of youth inactivity in Europe and Central Asia, with 28% of young people not in employment, education, or training (NEET) in 2020<sup>14</sup>. Women experience higher levels of inactivity and unemployment, with only 38% of working-aged women employed, and young women have a NEET rate twice as high as young men<sup>15</sup>. This results in significant economic opportunities being lost, and households headed by women are among the most food insecure<sup>16</sup>.
18. The spread of COVID-19 in 2020, and the escalation of conflict in and around Nagorno Karabakh (NK) created new vulnerabilities. The conflict led to mass casualties (including civilian), damage and destruction of both public and private property as well as mass movements of people from NK to Armenia. Already before the armed conflict, COVID-19 had significant implications on the food and nutrition security situation and poverty in Armenia. The ongoing crisis has affected local and regional food systems with substantial consequences on people's access to food. Specifically related to the conflict in NK, almost a year after the tripartite ceasefire agreement, the estimated number of displaced remaining on the Armenian territory due to loss of land, properties and jobs is more than 20,000 people. The people continue to require support for subsistence living as well as potentially more longer-term support. The influx of people into Armenia was initially spurred by the ongoing Ukrainian crisis, which engendered volatility in the costs of commodities and services. This, in turn, adversely affected the purchasing power of susceptible demographics, compounding the challenges faced by this segment of the population.
19. Since late 2020, WFP Armenia conducted five nation-wide Food Security and Vulnerability Assessments (FSVA) to assess the needs of the population of Armenia. Based on the latest FSVA5 it was found that amongst Armenian households, 30 percent were severely or moderately food insecure, compared to 23 percent in summer 2022 (FSVA4). About 40 percent of households are worried about running out of food or not having enough food to eat, and approximately half of the households recorded that they eat less variety of food due to of lack of money or resources. Additionally, the assessments found that the application of crisis and emergency coping strategies is still high, reaching to 44 percent among respondents. In particular, it was found that i) households with disabled child, ii) households of people displaced from Nagorno-Karabakh, and iii) households consisting of only

---

<sup>13</sup> [Literacy rate, adult total \(% of people ages 15 and above\) - Armenia | Data \(worldbank.org\)](https://data.worldbank.org/indicators/SH.UV.SRVS.CV?locations=AS)

<sup>14</sup> World Bank. World Development Indicators. Washington, D.C World Bank. <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>

<sup>15</sup> World Bank, 2022. Armenia Human Capital Review:

[https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099082001272340595/pdf/P1735300d500e80b20840902a6e742162a6.pdf?cid=eca\\_fb\\_armenia\\_am\\_ext](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099082001272340595/pdf/P1735300d500e80b20840902a6e742162a6.pdf?cid=eca_fb_armenia_am_ext)

<sup>16</sup> WFP September 2022; Fourth Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment report:

[https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000142417/download/?\\_ga=2.44532260.1422123314.1672726504-1744875093.1622788255](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000142417/download/?_ga=2.44532260.1422123314.1672726504-1744875093.1622788255)

single pensioners were the most vulnerable of those interviewed<sup>17</sup>. Food insecurity is primarily an issue of access to nutritious food, particularly lack of financial means, non-agricultural incomes of the population, inequality, limited opportunities in the labour market, limited economic access to healthy diets, and low awareness and education on nutrition.

20. Malnutrition is also an issue in Armenia, manifesting in a double burden of stunting and overweight particularly among children under five years of age<sup>18</sup>. The more recent Childhood Obesity Surveillance Study (COSI) confirmed that 27.7% of children between 7-10 years are overweight and around 13% obese. Armenia ranks last among 29 countries in the COSI for breakfast consumption, with only 44% of 6-9-year-olds eating breakfast daily<sup>19</sup>.
21. Obesity and overweight are prevalent in all social strata of the population and is confirming an alarming trend towards increased malnutrition levels in adulthood. Already now 48% of the adult population are overweight and 22% are leaving the labour market prematurely due to non-communicable diseases (hyper tensions, diabetes, heart diseases).
22. Around 6 percent of households were found to have unacceptable food consumption during the above-mentioned FSVA5 in Armenia carried out by WFP in December-January 2023. The analysis shows that during seven days prior to the assessment, 1 percent of households had poor food consumption, and 5 percent of households had borderline food consumption score. The poor and borderline food consumption levels together are considered as a proxy for the share of food insecure households in the country and for December – January 2023 it constituted 6 percent.
23. Addressing food insecurity, malnutrition, and decline in income sources, WFP Armenia has been implementing a four-pillar approach, which combines (1) the provision of nutritious hot meals to children in schools under (2) the transformative school feeding framework, (3) contribution to the community development, and (4) assistance to the national capacity strengthening.
24. Since 2010 WFP Armenia's flagship programme has been School Feeding. WFP has worked with the Government and partners to develop a comprehensive model of school feeding, and the handover of school feeding activities to the Government began in 2014. Under the current (revised) country strategic plan for 2019 to 2025, WFP will not only continue to support the Government to finalize smooth handover of school feeding, it will also work to develop a more sustainable and school based transformative agriculture model that is more nutritious and benefits vulnerable communities. It will also introduce wholegrain flour production and baking covering the entire value chain, from the farm to final consumers, including schoolchildren.
25. As in previous years, the development of transformative school feeding was a major pillar of WFP's operation in Armenia in 2022, with a focus on strengthening access to

---

<sup>17</sup> Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment in Armenia. January 2023, WFP Armenia. <https://www.wfp.org/publications/food-security-and-vulnerability-assessment-armenia>

<sup>18</sup> National Strategic Review of Food Security and Nutrition in Armenia. January 2018.

<sup>19</sup> WHO European Childhood Obesity Surveillance Initiative (COSI), 2022; Report on the fifth round of data collection, 2018-2020: <https://www.who.int/europe/publications/i/item/WHO-EURO-2022-6594-46360-67071>

nutritious foods year-round with Social and Behavioural Change activities. Efforts were made to enhance national capacities to finalize the handover of the School Feeding Programme to the Government, which was achieved by the end of 2022 in accordance with the Country Strategic Plan (CSP 2019-2025)<sup>20</sup>. WFP expanded its school-based agriculture activities, integrated circular economy models, improved children's eating habits and contributed to the development of the National School Feeding Strategy.

26. Accordingly, this country strategic plan for School Feeding programme contains two strategic outcomes:
27. Strategic outcome 1: Vulnerable populations in Armenia, including schoolchildren, have access to adequate and nutritious food year-round.
  - Strategic outcome 2: National policies, programmes and systems are strengthened so that they improve food security and nutrition among targeted groups by 2025.
28. These strategic outcomes contribute directly to WFP new Strategic outcomes 1 and 2 as well as Sustainable Development Goals 2 on improving access to food, 17 on strengthening the capacity of governments and partnerships for sustainable development, and 4 on ensuring quality education. WFP will support the Government to ensure inclusive and equitable education in Armenia, improved livelihoods for the vulnerable, including smallholders and better nutrition information and evidence, fostering equitable opportunities and equal access to resources for all people. The country strategic plan is in line with the priorities identified through the 2018 national strategic review and the focus on human capital development and the improvement of social protection set out in the Armenia Development Strategy 2014–2025.
29. As part of WFP's efforts to establish a more sustainable, gender-transformative and nutrition-sensitive approach to school feeding, WFP has piloted the use of greenhouses and gardens, together with purchasing from local producers through cash-based transfers (CBTs). The detailed information about the models will be provided during the inception stage. The results of these initiatives have been exceptional: all of them supported the provision of a more nutritious and diverse school meal for girls and boys at school, they created employment for men and women in the community, and they encouraged local economic development by purchasing most foods from local producers. A review of the CBT pilot in Tavush province, conducted in mid-2017, found that CBTs were important in simplifying the handover process. Greenhouses were founded to provide a crop surplus that created revenue for the schools and was used to fund the additional costs of school meals, the salaries of workers and additional classroom rehabilitation needs<sup>21</sup>.
30. The Government of the Republic of Armenia with the support provided by WFP has made efforts for the formulation of the National School Feeding Strategy to institutionalize the programme in the country engaging stakeholders in a consultative

---

<sup>21</sup> WFP Armenia Country Office, Annual Country report, 2022 [docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000147927/download/?\\_ga=2.153142648.1925100389.1690897006-1744875093.1622788255](https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000147927/download/?_ga=2.153142648.1925100389.1690897006-1744875093.1622788255)



process. In 2022, the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports (MoESCS) established and led a working group to support the Government with writing the Strategy. Additionally, the School Feeding and Child Welfare Agency (SFCW) deployed expertise to enhance its operational capacity of supporting the Government to establish proper regulatory and governing frameworks for the development of the Strategy. The SF Strategy will be then integrated into the broader National Education Strategy which was revised by the Government in 2020 and is expected to be finalized in 2023.

31. Gender and age were systematically integrated into the implementation of all activities linked to school feeding, as proved by WFP's Gender and Age Marker code 4. During the planning and implementation of the School Feeding Programme, WFP ensured that boys and girls were provided with equal access to school meals, and delivered special support to women working in food production that contributes to school feeding.

## **2. Reasons for the evaluation**

### **2.1. RATIONALE**

32. The evaluation is being commissioned for the following reasons: Whilst SFP is one of the oldest (implemented since 2010) WFP programmes in Armenia, it has not been comprehensively reviewed or evaluated. It also needs to be stressed that as of July 2023 the SFP initiated and implemented by WFP in 10 provinces of Armenia (all provinces except of the Capital City Yerevan) has been fully handed over to the Government. There are several opportunities and challenges for the SFP which have not been explored and interrogated to inform strategic programming. As a result, there is a need for more evidence to inform the development of a new transformative school feeding strategy for the country office, as well as development of the new CSP.
33. Since the beginning of the current CSP in 2019 the SFP has changed a lot, especially in terms of adding new transformative school agriculture component, food value chain pilot projects complementing the SFP and green energy solutions. Evaluation of these piloted components will allow to replicate the successful models in other communities, whilst making improvements wherever deemed necessary.
34. The evaluation results will, first and foremost, be used by WFP Armenia as potential evidence to see the impact and effectiveness of the SFP and communicate these to current and future donors. The results will also inform efforts to strategically secure continuous sustainability for the handed-over program. This entails informing for secure planning of the program by government counterparts in alignment with the agreed School Feeding Strategy.
35. The findings and lessons learnt from the evaluations will inform and benefit all relevant government and other partners that implement and contribute towards the SFP. In particular, the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports (MoESCS), the School Feeding and Child Welfare Agency (the Agency), the Ministry of Economy, as

well as the Social and Industrial Foodservice Institute (SIFI), as long-standing cooperating partner of WFP Armenia for SFP.

36. Internally within WFP, the evaluation results will be used by the Country Office, Regional Bureau in Cairo, and key HQ divisions (School Feeding Division, the Office of Evaluation, Research, Assessment and Monitoring (RAM) departments among others) for evidence synthesis and learning.
37. WFP Armenia will utilise the evaluation results for the following: (1) adapt the next programme and CSP design and implementation plan based on the lessons learned; (2) utilise the generated evidence to advocate for further cooperation with the government and other partners; (3) showcase the impact and effectiveness of the SFP to current and future donors.

## 2.2. OBJECTIVES

38. The DE of SF serves the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning. and evidence for adaptative programming purposes as SFP has not been comprehensively reviewed or evaluated during the ICSP period. The DE findings and recommendations will be used to inform new SFP strategies and implementation approaches.
39. The evaluation has dual and mutually reinforcing objectives as follows:
  - **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the School Feeding Modalities Applied in Armenia.
  - **Learning** – The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain results occurred or did not occur to draw lessons, derive good practices and provide pointers for learning. It will also provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. Findings will be actively disseminated, and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson-sharing systems.
40. The specific objectives of the DE include:
  - **Gender:** Examine the impact of the School Feeding Modalities on gender equality and identify any potential gender-based disparities in access to and benefits from the feeding programs.
  - **Human rights:** Assess whether the School Feeding Modalities adhere to human rights principles, such as the right to food, the right to education, and the right to non-discrimination. Ensure that the feeding programs respect the dignity and autonomy of the beneficiaries and do not perpetuate any form of discrimination.
  - **Inclusiveness and accessibility:** Analyse the extent to which the SF is accessible to vulnerable and marginalized groups, including children with disabilities, and those from poor households.
41. The evaluation might serve as a basis for advocacy of the self-financing model from the viewpoint of WFP. Effectiveness of the transformative pilot SF in the overall programme.

42. The primary users of this DE are stakeholders directly involved in carrying out the evaluation. In addition to the evaluation team (ET) itself, these include WFP Armenia and its main implementing partner, the (MoESCS); SFCW Agency, SIFI and other partners and stakeholders. The DE is also of direct interest to the participants in the Internal Evaluation Committee (IEC) and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). A full stakeholder analysis will be provided.

### 2.3. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

43. The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a broad range of WFP internal and external stakeholders. A number of stakeholders will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process in light of 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.

44. Accountability to affected populations (AAP), is tied to WFP commitments to include 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
<b>Internal (WFP) stakeholders</b>	
<b>WFP Office management</b>	<b>Commissioner of the decentralized evaluation</b> - Following the provisions of the WFP Evaluation Policy, the WFP Country Director is considered to be the commissioner of the evaluation with a responsibility for the proper conduct of the evaluation according to relevant UN norms of evaluation such as independence, impartiality, credibility and utility.
<b>WFP country office (CO) in Armenia</b>	<b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - 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 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 Country Strategic Plan, programme and partnerships.
<b>WFP field offices in Lori and Kapan</b>	<b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - Responsible for day-to-day programme implementation. The field offices liaise with stakeholders at decentralized levels and has direct beneficiary contact. It will be affected by the outcome of the evaluation.
<b>Regional bureau (RB) Cairo</b>	<b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - 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 bureau will be involved in the planning of the next programme, thus it is expected to use the evaluation findings to provide strategic guidance, programme support, and oversight. The regional evaluation

	officers support country office/regional bureau management to ensure quality, credible and useful decentralized evaluations.
<b>WFP divisions HQ</b>	<b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - WFP headquarters divisions 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.
<b>WFP Office of Evaluation (OE)</b>	<b>Primary stakeholder</b> - The Office of Evaluation - supported by the Regional Evaluation Unit in the Regional Bureau in Cairo - is responsible for 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.
<b>WFP Executive Board (EB)</b>	<b>Primary stakeholder</b> - 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.
<b>External stakeholders</b>	
<b>Beneficiaries</b> [women, men, boys and girls in the provinces of Armenia, smallholder farmers assisted, small businesses]	<b>Key informants and primary/secondary stakeholders</b> - As the ultimate recipients of SFP assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP assessing whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the participation of women, men, boys, and girls from different groups in the evaluation will be essential, and their respective perspectives will be sought.
<b>Government</b> [the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports (MoESCS), the Ministry of Health (MoH), the Ministry of Economy (MoE), The Ministry of Environment, the School Feeding and Child Welfare Agency (the Agency), Community and school authorities, school teachers.	<b>Key informants and primary stakeholder</b> - The Government has a direct interest in knowing whether WFP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonized with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. Issues related to capacity development, handover and sustainability will be of particular interest. Issues related to capacity development, handover and sustainability are of particular interest.  The MoESCS jointly with the SFCW Agency (supporting the Government to manage national SF programme) are the principal counterparts in the SFP implementation and have an interest in learning from an external perspective on the SFP implementation, especially around national ownership, capacity, inter-sectoral coordination and sustainability.  The MoH will also be interested in the SFP evaluation findings as the main partner of healthy curriculum implementation and healthy eating habits social behavior change campaign.

	<p>The MoE is currently the main policy making body for Agricultural sector and the CO is successfully cooperating with the MoE in the framework of school-based agriculture and FVC projects.</p> <p>The CO is cooperating with the Ministry of Environment mainly within the green energy activities (solar stations installation at schools).</p> <p>Heads of communities, school authorities and teachers are key actors in the management and implementation of School Feeding Programme at school level. They will be involved in evaluation as key informants.</p>
<p><b>United Nations country team (UNCT)</b> [UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, UNDP]</p>	<p><b>Secondary stakeholder</b> - The harmonized action of the UNCT should contribute to the realization of the government developmental objectives. It has therefore an interest in ensuring that WFP programmes are effective in contributing to the United Nations concerted efforts under the UN Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDCF) for Armenia. Various agencies are also direct partners of WFP at policy and activity level. UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA and other school-based programme actors have interest with the achievements, lessons-learnt, challenges, and gaps of WFP's SFP.</p>
<p><b>Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</b> [the Social and Industrial Foodservice Institute (SIFI)]</p>	<p><b>Key informants and primary stakeholder</b> - NGOs are WFP partners for the implementation of some activities while at the same time having their own interventions. The results of the evaluation might affect future implementation modalities, strategic orientations and partnerships. They will be involved in using evaluation findings for programme implementation.</p>
<p><b>Donors</b> [the Russian Federation, Germany, Republic of Armenia]</p>	<p><b>Primary/secondary stakeholders</b> -- WFP interventions are voluntarily funded by a number of donors. They have an interest in knowing whether their funds have been spent efficiently and if WFP work has been effective and contributed to their own strategies and programmes. This will provide evidence for stakeholders to make informed decisions regarding investments in future expansion of school feeding.</p>

## 3. Subject of the evaluation

### 3.1. SUBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

45. The decision to conduct the DE of the SFP was endorsed by the WFP Country Office management in March 2023. The evaluation inception phase is planned to start in mid-November 2023 the earliest and the dissemination of the evaluation report is scheduled to have been completed by the end of May 2024. In 2024, the CO will commission an evaluation of the current CSP, thus this DE is intended to be completed by then and inform also the CSP evaluation, as it covers the biggest component of it.
46. The evaluation should analyse how gender, equity and wider inclusion objectives and GEWE mainstreaming principles were included in the intervention design, and whether the evaluation subject has been guided by WFP and system-wide objectives on GEWE. The gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions should be integrated into all evaluation criteria as appropriate.
47. WFP CSP for Armenia was approved by the Executive Board for an initial duration of 5 years (July 2019 – July 2024). The CSP was subsequently extended until November 2025 to align with Armenia’s current UNSDCF 2020 – 2025 and WFP’s new Corporate Strategy and the Results Framework for 2020 - 2025.
48. School Feeding has been WFP’s flagship activity in Armenia since 2010. WFP has worked with the Government and partners to develop a comprehensive model of school feeding, and the handover of school feeding activities to the Government began in 2014. Under the current CSP, WFP Armenia not only continues to support the Government to ensure a smooth handover of school feeding, it also works to develop a more sustainable and transformative school feeding models (innovative home-grown model that is more nutritious and contributes to the development of vulnerable communities).
49. SF is implemented by WFP in close cooperation with MoESCS, SFCWA and SIFI. The following actors will be key to the implementation and engagement of the intervention:
  - **International level:** SIFI; WFP; UN agencies.
  - **National level:** MoESCS; Ministry of Finance; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Economy; Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure; Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; Ministry of Emergency Situations; SFCWA; Armenian National Agrarian University (ANAU); NGOs.
  - **Regional Level:** Yerevan Municipality; Governors Offices in 10 provinces (Marzpetarans).
  - **Local Communities:** schools (headmasters, cooks, teachers), parents, schoolchildren; farmers and cooperatives, community authorities, NGOs and Social Enterprises, Small & Medium Enterprises along the food value chain.

50. As part of the nationalization of the school feeding programme, WFP supported the Government to improve school kitchen infrastructure. The rehabilitation of school facilities not only provided potable water for school children and staff, but the renovations and rehabilitation of kitchens, cafeterias and storage facilities to be more accessible for boys and girls with disabilities.
51. Changes in planned implementation happened mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent school closures during March 2020 and November 2021, the planned SF activities were only implemented intermittently, and on-site school meals were repurposed to Take-home Rations, which were provided to 53,874 primary schoolchildren and 6,575 kitchen helpers with their family members from vulnerable families.
52. At the request of the Government and in cooperation with partners and the Rome-based agencies, WFP has expanded technical support to the Government to include important areas identified in the national strategic review, including emergency preparedness, social protection, food security strategy and social behaviour change.
53. By the end of 2022, the implementation and governance of School Feeding Programme had been successfully handed over to the Armenian Government with WFP and its partners providing continued technical assistance. SIFI played a crucial role in providing operational support and technical advice, leading several research projects to inform programme design and interventions. Due to its outstanding performance, the School Feeding Programme in Armenia has been selected as one of ten most exceptional programmes initiated by WFP globally.
54. Accordingly, this country strategic plan initially contained two strategic outcomes:
- **Strategic outcome 1:** Vulnerable populations in Armenia, including schoolchildren, have access to adequate and nutritious food year-round.
  - **Strategic outcome 2:** National policies, programmes and systems are strengthened to improve food security and nutrition among targeted groups by 2025.
55. These strategic outcomes contribute directly to WFP Strategic Outcomes 2 and 4 as well as SDGs 2 on improving access to food, 17 on strengthening the capacity of governments and partnerships, and 4 on ensuring quality education of 2019-2025 CSP. WFP will support the Government to ensure inclusive and equitable education in Armenia, improved livelihoods for the vulnerable and better nutrition information and evidence, fostering equitable opportunities and equal access to resources for all people. The country strategic plan is in line with the priorities identified through the 2018 national strategic review and the focus on human capital development and the improvement of social protection.

**Table 2: SFP under the WFP Armenia’s CSP (2019-2025)**

<p><b>SO 1:</b> Vulnerable populations in Armenia, including schoolchildren, have access to adequate and nutritious food year round</p>	<p><b>Activity 1:</b> Strengthen and complement the national school feeding programme to facilitate handover to the Government</p>	<p>1.1. Schoolchildren in the targeted areas receive a nutritious, hot, diversified meal every day they attend school to meet their basic food and nutrition needs</p> <p>1.2. Communities benefit from an enhanced national school feeding programme, including nutrition education, enabling them to meet their basic food and nutrition needs</p> <p>1.3. Schoolchildren benefit from rehabilitated school facilities and equipment, including kitchens, that improve delivery of school meals</p> <p>1.4. Communities, including smallholders, benefit from joint efforts to link local production with procurement of school meals to improve their incomes</p>
<p><b>SO 2:</b> National policies, programmes and systems are strengthened to improve food security and nutrition among targeted groups by 2025</p>	<p><b>Activity 2:</b> Provide technical support to national institutions to generate an evidence-base and inform policies, strategies and systems to address food insecurity and malnutrition in Armenia</p>	<p>2.2 National institutions have strengthened capacities to implement a comprehensive nutrition-sensitive national school feeding programme.</p> <p>2.3 Communities benefit from enhanced national frameworks and policies on food systems in order to improve the availability of nutritious food.</p> <p>2.4 Communities have enhanced awareness of access to and consumption of healthy, nutritious and diverse diets.</p>

56. Outputs and outcomes for SFP indicators are aligned to the current Corporate Result Framework (CRF) 2020 – 2025. The Line of Sight (LOS) and the CSP logframe initially based on the previous CSP have been retrofitted to the current CRF 2020 – 2025 (See Annexes 8 and 9). These indicators are tracked and reported on an annual basis through the Annual Country Report (ACR). WFP Armenia has a restructured Theory of Change (ToC) but there is no separate ToC for the SFP, and will therefore, need to be reconstructed during the inception phase of the evaluation.

57. During the current CSP the SFP supported 474 schools with the highest number of schoolchildren. In 2021, SFP reached 53,874 school children (46 percent girls and 54 percent boys), which reduced to 26,165 (47 percent girls and 53 percent boys) in 2022. The total number of planned and actual beneficiaries under the SFP from 2018 to



2023 are presented in Table 3. Additional outputs will be provided at the inception phase.

**Table 3: planned and actual beneficiaries under the SFP from 2018 to 2023**

PLANNED										
	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022	
	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
5-18 years	32,400	27,600							1,359	1,019
24-59 month			2,400	1,800	2,000	1,500	1,400	1,050	16,646	14,946
5-11 years			29,400	26,400	24,500	22,000	17,150	15,400	1,500	1,330
Total	<b>60,000</b>		<b>60,000</b>		<b>50,000</b>		<b>35,000</b>		<b>36,800</b>	
ACTUAL										
	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022	
	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
5-18 years	32,351	27,559								
24-59 month							2,155	1,616	1,080	806
5-11 years			29,493	25,123	44,054	36,438	26,398	23,705	12,793	11,480
Total	<b>59,910</b>		<b>54,616</b>		<b>80,492</b>		<b>53,874</b>		<b>26,159</b>	

Source: WFP COMET system

58. The development of transformative school feeding was a major pillar of WFP's operation in Armenia in 2022, with a focus on strengthening access to nutritious foods year-round with Social and Behavioural Change activities. Efforts were made to enhance national capacities to finalize the handover of the School Feeding Programme to the Government, which was achieved by the end of 2022 in accordance with the Country Strategic Plan (CSP 2019-2025).

59. WFP expanded its school-based agriculture activities, integrated circular economy models, improved children's eating habits and contributed to the development of the National School Feeding Strategy. In parallel, WFP advanced food value chain activities that strengthen school feeding and create opportunities for local communities and food producers.

**Table 4: SFP planned and actual beneficiaries of capacity building under the SFP from 2018 to 2023**

Output	Output Indicator	Detailed Indicator	Target Value	Actual Follow-up Values
Communities, including smallholders, benefit from joint efforts to link local production with procurement of school meals to improve their incomes	Number of smallholder farmers supported/trained	Number of smallholder farmers supported by WFP	603	1,076
Communities benefit from an enhanced national school feeding programme, including nutrition education, enabling them to meet their basic food and nutrition needs	Number of people engaged in capacity strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance national food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities (new)	Number of government/national partner staff receiving technical assistance and training	2,717	7,348
Communities, including smallholders, benefit from joint efforts to link local production with procurement of school meals to improve their incomes	Number of people provided with direct access to energy products or services	Total number of people provided with direct access to energy products or services (Productive uses)	56,496	62,421

60. Details of the resources allocated to each of the outputs it will be provided for the inception phase of the DE.

### 3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

61. It is proposed that the evaluation focuses on four main provinces which are covered by the current CSP, i.e., Gegharkunik, Kotayk, Lori and Armavir. Partially activities were still implemented in two provinces where the handover was done earlier than the CSP, but additional core activities have been implemented in Vayots Dzor and Syunik (renovation and enabling environment). For Transformative School Feeding/FVC is it crucial to cover Tavush province as several important pilot FVC projects, including the Wholegrain and Berd projects, have been initiated in Tavush. The evaluation team is tasked to propose a robust sampling frame and the scope of the targeting.
62. The evaluation will consider all the activities outlined in the CSP for SFP, as well as Transformative School Feeding and FVC pilot projects, which were not initially planned in the CSP, but are fully covered in separate project documents. The time period of the evaluation is from 2018 until mid-2023.
63. The main purpose of the evaluation of School Feeding Modalities Applied in Armenia from 2018 – 2023:
- To understand the main results – direct and indirect, intended and unintended - of the SF programme so far – taking into account the differences in the target population the WFP programme was expected to service. This analysis will support WFP’s obligations to account for how its resources are spent and with what effects and help WFP decision makers, learn lessons from what has been implemented so far.
  - The level and strength (sustainability) of the programme nationalization.

- How will the evaluation be used? Which decisions about the intervention could be informed by this evaluation? When are those decisions being made? Advising the stakeholders (Government and WFP).

64. The evaluation target groups will include:

- Government bodies, including relevant Ministries, SFCW Agency
- Local, foreign and international partners
- Schools listed provinces that received assistance from WFP, including the schools that have been handed over to the Government, will be included in the evaluation sampling frame.
- Schoolchildren benefited from SF Programme within the current CSP.

65. Key findings of different assessments, monitoring and case study reports on SF Programme are summarized below:

- Thanks to multi-year funding enabling continuation of school feeding operations and long-term planning, WFP and development partners started working more closely with various Armenian ministries including MoESCS, Ministry of Labour and Social Services, and Ministry of Agriculture among others to ensure sustainability. Various joint Plans, Concepts and Strategies were drafted together, and the first inter-ministerial School Feeding coordination committees were formed to lay our aims to build up and transition a sustainable school feeding system enabling provision of healthy food to all primary school students in state-run general education schools in Armenia.
- The formation of the School Feeding and Child Welfare Agency, during the beginning of COVID-19 was one of the most important steps of institutionalisation of the NSFP.
- The engagement of parents and the Parents' Council was crucial in supporting the program through contributions and decision-making.
- Armenia is well on track to build a sustainable and resilient National School Feeding Programme with strong commitment and engagement from the Government and involvement from the local provinces.

66. The evaluation design should be theory-based using the OECD-DAC international evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact as a framework for exploring the overall results of the school modalities interventions, the impact pathways that led to or impeded the achieving the expected results as well as the appropriateness of the underlying assumptions in the design of the interventions. Table 6, presented below outlines the proposed key questions under each of these criteria that the evaluation should seek to answer.

# 4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations

## 4.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA

67. The evaluation should address the following key questions, which should be further developed and tailored by the evaluation team in a detailed evaluation matrix during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim at highlighting the key lessons and performance of the School Feeding Modalities Applied in Armenia from 2018 - 2023, with a view to informing future strategic and operational decisions.
68. In addition, the evaluation should analyse how gender, equity and wider inclusion objectives and GEWE mainstreaming principles were included in the intervention design or not, and whether the evaluation subject has been guided by WFP and system-wide objectives on GEWE. The gender, equity and wider inclusion dimensions should be integrated into all evaluation criteria as appropriate.
69. Refining the OECD-DAC criteria in the context of the evaluation of the School Feeding Modalities in Armenia will help ensure that the assessment is comprehensive, relevant, and purposeful. The OECD-DAC criteria consist of six key dimensions (presented below), which can be tailored to fit the specific purpose of the evaluation.
70. **Relevance:** the extent to which the intervention objectives and design align with the needs and priorities of RA Government, beneficiaries (students, parents, and communities), and partners (NGOs, donors, and other stakeholders).
71. **Coherence:** The coherence of the SF with other interventions in Armenia, within the education sector or relevant institutions, is an essential aspect to consider during the evaluation. Assessing compatibility involves understanding how the SF modalities fit into the broader context of existing initiatives and strategies.
72. **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the SF Modalities achieved its objectives and results, including any differential results across groups.
73. **Efficiency:** the extent to which the SF Modalities delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way including funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.
74. **Impact:** the extent to which the School Feeding Modalities intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects, including ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of SF.
75. **Sustainability:** the extent to which the benefits of SF will continue, or are likely to continue, including the examination of the financial, economic, social, environmental, and institutional capacities needed to sustain net benefits over time.

**Table 6: Proposed evaluation questions and criteria (to be confirmed during inception)**

Evaluation questions		Evaluation Criteria
EQ1	To what extent was the School Feeding Programme relevant to the needs <sup>22</sup> of the schools, beneficiaries, the Government and the communities it served?	Relevance
1.1	As designed how relevant was and is the programme to address the nutritional/educational needs of children in the target communities? Why?	
1.2	What are the key factors that have contributed to the programme's relevance or lack thereof?	
1.3	Which of the approaches of School Feeding Programme (e.g., in-kind, cash transfers, take-home rations, transformative agriculture) were the most appropriate and relevant to the local context? Why?	
EQ2	How coherent is the School Feeding Programme to the Government strategy related to education and nutrition?	Coherence
2.1	Did WFP's School Feeding Programme complement or duplicate other interventions by Government or other development partners in the same geographic area or among the same target population?	
2.2	Are there any school based complementary models/interventions and programmes that could be implemented alongside the School Feeding Programme to enhance its impact?	
2.3	How well does the SF handover strategy to the Government fit into the broader national plans and is integrated into the country's education and nutrition strategies? (is it timely? complementary?) Is it coherent with the Government's capacity?	
2.4	What steps can be taken to ensure better coordination and coherence between the programme and other development interventions by Government or development partners?	
EQ3	To what extent has the School Feeding Programme achieved its objectives for Handover strategy? To what extent did the School Feeding Programme achieve its objectives in terms of improving school attendance <sup>23</sup> , nutrition, and learning outcomes?	Effectiveness
3.1	How effective was WFP in terms of contributing to creating enabling environment at schools, including the infrastructure, capacity building and innovative models for enhanced self-resilience?	

<sup>22</sup> Food security, nutrition, health and education needs and in some cases community development needs.

<sup>23</sup> It has to be stressed that school attendance rate has traditionally been very high in Armenia and the incremental year to year improvements in attendance rates has been marginal. As at the end of 2022 the overall attendance rate was 99.98 percent.

3.2	How effective were the different modalities used in the School Feeding Programme (e.g., in-kind, cash transfers, take-home rations, transformative agriculture, community-based models) in achieving the programme's objectives?
3.3	Were there any unintended positive and negative impacts or effects of the School Feeding Programme?
3.4	How effective has the programme been in supporting the development of new policies, systems, procedures to enable full handover of the programme to the government?
3.5	To what extent have the national policies, programmes and systems been strengthened to improve food security and nutrition among targeted groups by 2025?
3.6	How successful have the initiatives to introduce wholegrain flour production and baking been in covering the entire value chain, from farm to final consumers, including schoolchildren? Has the wholegrain value chain brought behavior change at the consumer level in terms of consumption of more wholegrain bread?
3.7	What has been the main success of involving private entities (the mill and wholegrain bakery/training center, other bakeries) in the pilot project, which could not be achieved without WFP's co-investment/contribution?
3.8	How successful have the pilot projects of using greenhouses, intensive gardens and orchards, together with purchasing from local producers been in creating a more nutritious and diverse school meals for girls and boys at school, ensuring additional income (circular economy, revolving models) for schools, creating employment for men and women in the communities, and encouraging local economic development?
3.9	What are the main challenges and opportunities for the School Feeding programme in Armenia, and how they can be addressed in the future?
EQ4	How efficient was the School Feeding Programme in terms of the resources used (e.g., time, money, personnel)?
	Efficiency
4.1	Were the resources allocated to support the implementation of the programme utilized efficiently?
4.2	How efficiently were financial resources allocated and utilized in the implementation of the School Feeding Programme?
4.3	Did the intervention achieve its intended outcomes within the planned timeframe and resource allocation?
4.4	Were there any operational challenges, cost overruns or inefficiencies in the budget allocation for the feeding programs that could be addressed to improve the programme's performance on time and at cost?
4.5	How well were human resources managed in the implementation of the feeding programs? Were there any capacity gaps or staffing issues that affected efficiency?
4.6	Were there any streamlined processes or innovative approaches adopted to improve the efficiency of the School Feeding Programme?

4.5	Were the modalities (in-kind, cash, self-financing, THRs) used in the SF programme cost-effective compared to other possible interventions?	
4.6	How well and promptly was the SF programme able to adapt to the changing context and needs in Armenia (COVID-19, NK conflict escalation) since the CSP start in 2019?	
4.7	How well and promptly was the SF programme able to adapt to the changing priorities, programmes and policies of the Government.	
EQ5	To what extent is the School Feeding Programme sustainable in the long term?	Sustainability <sup>24</sup>
5.1	Are there any risks/factors to the program's sustainability, and how can they be mitigated?	
5.2	To which extent the handover strategy is sustainable for the continuous implementation of National School Feeding by the Government? Why? What needs to be done within the Government, and for the programme to ensure the sustainability of the Nation School Feeding?	
5.3	What support might schools and communities need to ensure the sustainability of the programme?	
EQ6	What has been the impact of the School Feeding Programme to date?  How well have the schools prepared for the transition and handover?  What were the overall impacts of the School Feeding Programme on the schools, communities and beneficiaries?	Impact
6.1	To what extent has the SF programme influenced national policies (education, healthy and nutritious food) and programmes?	
6.2	How has the impact varied by modality (e.g., in-kind, cash transfers, take-home rations, transformative agriculture)?	
6.3	Were there any differential impacts on different subgroups (e.g., boys vs. girls, urban vs. rural)?	
6.4	Are there any other expected or unexpected impact on systems, structures and individuals?	

76. The evaluation will apply the international evaluation criteria of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, and Impact as shown in Table 6.

#### **4.2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

77. The evaluations will use a theory-based, participatory, and gender-responsive evaluation approach. A theory-based evaluation is appropriate since the programme should be based on WFP Armenia's SFP theory of change to be drafted during the

<sup>24</sup> Sustainability must be clearly defined jointly with the evaluators.

inception phase, to explain how the interventions are expected to produce its results. A theory-based approach will therefore enable the evaluation analysis to determine whether the theory of change holds true.

78. The evaluation team (supplier) will need to expand on the methodology presented in this ToR and develop a detailed evaluation matrix in the inception report. The evaluation matrix should validate and/or propose additional evaluation sub-questions to answer the evaluation questions backed up by a clear methodology including proposed tools to generate and analyse data to answer the evaluation questions. This detailed methodology designed at the inception stage should build on top of and complement any existing evidence on the subject, including other recent evaluations commissioned by the CO on its School Feeding Programme.
79. The evaluation should follow a mixed methods approach of data generation and analysis, which should maximize the strengths of existing secondary quantitative and qualitative data methods and propose complementary primary qualitative and quantitative data collection tools to gain a holistic, in-depth understanding of programme performance against the evaluation framework presented previously.
80. Quantitative data of all project indicators should be collected, whenever secondary data is missing and/or is not sufficient. For quantitative data collection, random sampling should be utilised for each of the provinces <sup>25</sup>, based on the number of participating schools in each province.
81. A survey needs to be conducted among schoolchildren benefited/benefiting from SF in selected schools. The sampling should be representative with 95 percent of confidence interval and 5 percent of margin of error. The sampling strategy can be suggested by the evaluator (supplier) in the inception phase such as systematic random selection from the lists of schoolchildren in selected schools. The data collection/survey can be outsourced to a research company. During the interviews with children all ethical considerations and child protection safeguarding principles should be considered. The total number of schoolchildren will be provided by WFP.
82. Out of the total 474 schools that received project intervention during the CSP, a representative sample of schools from each province will be randomly selected, based on the weight of each province.
83. A wealth of qualitative data will be collected using Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews from a multitude of stakeholders: school headmaster, teachers, parents, cooks, smallholders, community heads and village leaders and range of government stakeholders at the national, province and community levels. Qualitative data will be crucial to answer numerous important evaluation questions, that seek to explore the reasons behind the numbers, such as the factors that affected the performance of the results. Qualitative data will also be triangulated with quantitative data to validate and contextualize findings.

---

<sup>25</sup> Marzes are the provinces of Armenia. There are 10 marzes in Armenia, which cover the entire territory of the country, except for the capital city Yerevan.



84. Key risks include interview fatigue of key informants, especially external stakeholders, who undergo numerous interviews from various organisations each year. Mitigation measures include coordination of evaluations within the Country Office, ensuring complementary evaluation designs and utilising existing evidence during desk reviews. Another risk can be the security situation in the country.
85. The evaluation methods should include document review in particular to collect information around the efficiency and effectiveness questions stated in table 6. Document review can include WFP reports, partner reports, payment lists, etc.
86. Collected qualitative and quantitative data will be triangulated to increase the credibility, validity, and reliability of the findings by cross-verifying information from different sources or through different methods. It helps to reduce the impact of potential biases and enhances the overall robustness of the analysis.
87. The evaluation design will be sensitive in terms of GEWE, 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. The methodology should ensure that primary data collected is disaggregated by sex and age; an explanation should be provided if this is not possible.
88. The evaluation should also include SABER<sup>26</sup> index to define and analyse Armenia's education system by identifying and assessing the education policies that matter most in helping countries achieve education results and learning.
89. During the data collection phase, the evaluation team (supplier) is expected to travel to Armenia to conduct qualitative data collection among partners and beneficiaries, make field visits to selected provinces and prepare the outsourced company to conduct the survey among schoolchildren.

### **4.3. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT**

90. During the inception phase, the evaluation team (supplier) will be expected to perform an in-depth evaluability assessment and critically assess data availability, quality and gaps. This assessment will inform the data collection and the choice of evaluation methods. The evaluation team (supplier) 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.
91. During the inception phase the evaluation team (supplier) is expected to travel to Armenia to collect necessary information for the preparation of the inception report.

### **4.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

92. The evaluation must conform to [UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation](#). Accordingly, the selected evaluation firm is responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all

---

<sup>26</sup> The Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) is a World Bank led initiative, of which WFP is a partner, to collect and disseminate comparative data and knowledge on education policies, to help countries systematically evaluate and strengthen their education systems.

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.

93. 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.
94. The evaluation firm and involved individuals will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the WFP SFP 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 firm 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**

95. 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.
96. 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.
97. The WFP evaluation manager (WFP staff) 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.
98. 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.
99. The evaluation manager (WFP staff) will share the assessment and recommendations from the quality support service with the team leader (supplier), 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](#),<sup>[1]</sup> a rationale should be provided for comments that the team does not take into account when finalizing the report.

100. The evaluation firm will be required to ensure the quality of data (reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the data collection, synthesis, analysis and reporting phases.
101. The evaluation firm 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.
102. WFP expects that all deliverables from the supplier 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.
103. 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.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> [UNEG](#) Norm #7 states “that transparency is an essential element that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability”.

# 5. Organization of the evaluation

## 5.1. PHASES AND DELIVERABLES

104. Table 7 presents the structure of the main phases of the evaluation, along with the deliverables and deadlines for each phase.

Table 7: Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones			
Main phases	Indicative timeline	Tasks and deliverables	Responsible
1. Preparation	<b>1 March – 12 July 2023</b> <b>End of October 2023</b>	Preparation of ToR Selection of the evaluation team & contracting	Evaluation manager (WFP)
2. Inception	<b>End of November 2023</b> <b>End of December 2023</b>	Desk/document review Inception mission  Inception report	Contracted evaluation firm/Team
3. Data collection	<b>End of February 2024</b>	Fieldwork Exit debriefing	Contracted evaluation firm/Team
4. Reporting	<b>End of March 2024</b> <b>Mid-April 2024</b>	Data analysis and report drafting Comments process Evaluation report	Contracted evaluation firm/Team
5. Workshop	<b>End of April 2024</b>	Present the findings of the evaluation	Contracted evaluation firm/Team
6. Dissemination and follow-up	<b>Early May 2024</b> <b>Mid-May 2024</b>	Management response Dissemination of the evaluation report	Evaluation manager (WFP)

## 5.2. CONTRACTED EVALUATION FIRM/TEAM COMPOSITION

105. The evaluation team (supplier) is expected to include 3-4 members, including the team leader and with a mix of national and international evaluators will be required. To the extent possible, the evaluation will be conducted by a gender-balanced and geographically and culturally diverse team with appropriate skills to assess gender dimensions of the subject as specified in the scope, approach and methodology sections of the ToR. At least one team member should have experience of WFP SFP evaluation.

106. The team (supplier) will be multi-disciplinary and include members who, together, include an appropriate balance of technical expertise and practical knowledge in the following areas:

- Experience in leading and managing evaluation/review teams.

- Prior experience in the education sectors.
- Experience in WFP's School Feeding programmes, including the home-grown and food systems approaches.
- Experience in reviewing/evaluating school feeding policies, strategies, and economic programmes.
- Experience in data collection, analysis, and reporting.
- Good knowledge of nutrition, gender, equity and wider inclusion issues.
- All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills, evaluation experience with a track record of written work on similar assignments, and familiarity with Armenia and the South Caucasus region.

107. The team leader will have expertise in one of the key competencies listed above as well as demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations, including designing methodology and data collection tools. She/he will also have leadership, analytical and communication skills, including a track record of excellent English writing, synthesis and presentation skills. 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.

108. 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).

109. 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**

110. The **WFP Armenia's management (Director or Deputy 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 (supplier) 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.
111. The **evaluation manager** manages the evaluation process through all phases including: drafting this ToR; 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 and providing any materials as required; and conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products. The evaluation manager will be the main interlocutor between the team, represented by the firm's focal point, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process.
  112. An internal **evaluation committee (within WFP Armenia Country Office)** is formed to help ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation.
  113. **An evaluation reference group (ERG)** is formed as an advisory body with representation from internal, RBC, Armenia government and cooperating partner representatives. The evaluation reference group members will review and comment on the draft evaluation products and act as key informants in order to contribute to the relevance, impartiality and credibility of the evaluation by offering a range of viewpoints and ensuring a transparent process.
  114. **The Office of Evaluation (OEV).** 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](mailto:wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org)) in case of potential impartiality breaches or non-adherence to UNEG ethical guidelines.

#### **5.4. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS**

115. **Security clearance** where required is to be obtained from UNDSS Armenia.
  - Consultants hired by WFP are covered by the United Nations Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS) system for United Nations personnel, which covers WFP staff and consultants contracted directly by WFP. Independent consultants must obtain UNDSS security clearance for travelling from the designated duty station and complete the United Nations basic and advance security trainings (BSAFE & SSAFE) in advance, print out their certificates and take them with them.
  - As an "independent supplier" of evaluation services to WFP, the contracted firm will be responsible for ensuring the security of the evaluation team, and adequate

arrangements for evacuation for medical or situational reasons. However, to avoid any security incidents, the evaluation manager will ensure that the WFP country office 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. The evaluation team must observe applicable United Nations Department of Safety and Security rules and regulations including taking security training (BSAFE & SSAFE), curfews (when applicable) and attending in-country briefings.

## 5.5. COMMUNICATION

116. 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 between the Evaluation Manager, who will be responsible for coordinating implementation of a communication and knowledge management plan (Annex 5), the Communications unit and the evaluation team. This plan will be refined by the evaluation manager in consultation with the Communications unit and the evaluation team during the inception phase.
117. Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation firm will make arrangements and include the cost in the budget proposal.
118. Based on the stakeholder analysis, the communication and knowledge management plan identify the users of the evaluation to involve in the process and to whom the report should be disseminated. The 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.
119. 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. The summary evaluation report along with other products will be presented to the WFP SFP stakeholders through a learning workshop and other channels to be defined during the inception phase. The final evaluation report will be posted on the public WFP website and OEV will ensure dissemination of lessons through the annual evaluation report.

## 5.6. PROPOSAL

120. The Proposal should be provided by filling in and sending the signed and stamped form in the **Annex II: Template for Technical and financial offer**. The excel file with Budget and Timeline table should also be provided.
121. The offer will include a technical proposal. Technical proposal should include a) the proposed methodology, data quality measures, ethical considerations and timeline of the evaluation, which can be slightly revised after the inception visit; b) Company qualifications and recent project history of experience including quantitative and

qualitative data collections and analysis, preferably of School feeding/School meals, c) CVs of the key evaluation team members.

122. The offer should include a detailed budget for the evaluation. The budget should include consultant fees: team leader (approximately 40 days), evaluator (32 days), senior researcher (18 days), National consultant (10 days), data analyst (25 days) and interpreter (10 days) to deliver inception report, data collection, analysis and reporting). It should also include costs for international and local travel, outsourcing the survey (data collection), organization of a workshop and other costs (interpreters, etc.).
123. Following the technical (75%) and financial assessment (25%), an improved offer may be requested by WFP from the preferred bidder(s) to better respond to the TOR requirements. WFP may conduct reference checks and interviews with selected team members.

### **5.7. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

124. The technical proposals will be evaluated by the following criteria: a) Completeness and clarity, b) Quality, design and ethics, c) Proposed evaluation team, d) Firm capacity.
125. Budget proposals will be evaluated by the following criteria: a) Total number of working days allocated are reasonable and realistic in relation to the work required by evaluation phase, b) Back-office support (i.e. survey administration, data synthesis, formatting, editing, security arrangements, etc.).

### **5.8. DELIVERABLES**

The following deliverables are expected to be provided by the contracted company:

1. Prepare and submit the inception report with the detailed methodology, tools and clear roles of the evaluation team members: end of December 2023
2. Provide the clean database and the summaries of qualitative data: end of March 2024
3. Prepare and deliver the workshop with the presentation of the main findings and recommendations of the evaluation: end of April 2024.