

Summary of evaluation evidence

Guidance

SAVING LIVES CHANGING LIVES

Contents

			OUTPUT			
FRAMING NOTE & EVALUATION UNIVERSE	SEE LEAD SELECTED	ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK & FIELDS	MID-TERM CONSULTATION PPT	SEE REPORT	SEE BRIEF	INTERACTIVE EVIDENCE SHARING SESSION
			KEY ACTIONS			
 Form a user group Brief user group on SEE purpose and features Prepare the Framing Note Define the universe of evaluations Share draft Framing Note with users for comments 	 Select SEE lead Brief SEE lead on the SEE subject matter Hold meeting with users to discuss SEE expectations 	 Prepare the analytical framework, including the analytical fields Validate the analytical framework 	 Extract evidence from the evaluation reports Populate the analytical framework Hold mid-point consultation 	 Conduct data analysis Develop SEE narrative Review SEE narrative against quality standards 	 Circulate SEE report for comments to commissioner and users' group, and address comments May share SEE report for peerreview and final validation Prepare SEE brief Circulate brief for comments Share brief for approval 	 Share final SEE report and brief for publication on WFP sites Disseminate SEE products
			TOOLS			
Technical Notes SEE Framing Note SEE Guidance - Annex SEE & Synthesis: key differences	N.A.	Templates Analytical framework	Templates Mid-point consultation	Technical Notes SEE CE Report SEE DE Report SEE Guidance – Annex SEE Report: contents & quality	Templates SEE CE Brief SEE DE Brief	N.A.

Introduction

The WFP Strategic Plan 2022-2025 states that 'Evidence will underpin WFP's focus on achieving positive results'.¹ The Evaluation Policy 2022 also emphasizes the need for evaluation evidence to inform WFP policy, strategic and programming decisions.²

WFP produces a range of evaluation products to support learning, accountability and decision making. This Guidance focuses specifically on the summarising of independent evaluative evidence.

Summaries of Evaluation Evidence (SEEs)

represent distinctive evidence products that bring together evidence from WFPs independent evaluations. This guide clarifies the distinctive features and processes associated with SEEs, for the benefit of WFP staff commissioning or preparing SEEs, or external evaluation experts involved in preparing SEEs.

SEE elements

Definition and principles

For WFP, a Summary of Evaluation Evidence (SEE) is defined as a document that presents, concisely and clearly, an overview of evidence from a defined set of evaluations on a particular topic. SEEs are an example of a 'utilisation-focused'³ evaluation product, which aim to make independent evaluative evidence both accessible and useful. SEEs have **six defining principles**:

- 1. **Demand-driven**: a SEE derives its purpose from the evidence needs as identified by potential? users. As such, a SEE should have a clear intended use from the start.
- **2. Bound by available evidence**: a SEE brings evidence together in summary form. It does not generate new evidence or create recommendations.
- **3. Reliant on credible sources**: a SEE needs a sound evidence base, meaning that it draws from evaluations whose quality was externally rated as at least "satisfactory".
- **4. Transparent**: a SEE records the source of its findings, with clear and systematic referencing to the evidence cited.
- **5. Accessible**: a SEE presents existing evidence in a concise and easily readable form.
- **6. Swiftly produced**: a SEE is produced within a short time, following a lean process.

SEEs are sometimes confused with Evaluation Synthesis. However, these are distinct items. Table 1 below presents the key differences between the two exercises (for more details, see Annex 1).

Table 1: Key differences between a Summary of Evaluation Evidence and an Evaluation Synthesis

Features	Summary of Evaluation Evidence	Evaluation Synthesis
Focus/intent	Learning	Learning and accountability
Approach	Desk based Can be undertaken internally or externally	Desk based plus limited number of additional interviews and review of other relevant secondary data Always undertaken externally
Timeframe	Usually, a maximum of four months	Can take up to one year
Contents and presentation	Do not include recommendations; are not presented to the Executive Board	Include recommendations; are presented to the Executive Board



Key features of a SEE

Purpose

SEEs primarily aim to foster internal **learning** on a given topic by leveraging existing relevant evaluation evidence. As such all SEEs are commissioned based on an explicit need or request.

SEEs may be commissioned by a Country Office, Regional Office, HQ division, and by the Office of Evaluation, to inform programme or policy decisions, internal reflection on positioning or approaches, or dialogue with partners.

Objectives

Depending on the intended use, SEE objectives may include:

- Consolidating evidence on a specific theme, programmatic area or Country Strategic Plan (CSP) issue.
- Identifying consistent areas of good performance, underperformance and explanations/reasons for this in a theme, programmatic area, country or region.
- Learning what evidence is available in specific areas, and what gaps exist – so that more work can be done to address these.

Box 1: Examples of SEE objectives

- The Summary of Evaluation Evidence on School Feeding and Home-Grown School Feeding in Western Africa (2023) aimed to inform ongoing and future School Health and Nutrition programmes and to support knowledge sharing among WFP Country Offices beyond single evaluations.
- The Summary of Evaluation Evidence on WFP Community Engagement in Western Africa (2023) aimed to fill a knowledge gap in how WFP operations in West Africa make progress towards the standards set by WFP and the international humanitarian community regarding community engagement.
- The Regional Bureau Dakar (RBD) 2020
 Summary of Evidence from Decentralised
 Evaluations aimed to enhance the learning and knowledge base arising from WFP interventions in the region, and identify findings useful for to inform the implementation of Country Strategic Plans (CSPs).

Content

A SEE brings together evidence from a defined set of evaluations (the 'evaluation universe'). The universe is brought together before the SEE begins and comprises at minimum 5 evaluations. These should be primarily WFP-commissioned independent evaluations but may also include evidence from non-WFP independent evaluations, so long as rated of satisfactory quality by an independent Quality Assurance system. See Box 5 on Why only evaluations for further details.

The content of a SEE is reliant on the evidence from completed evaluation reports and does not intend to generate new evidence. As such, the collection of new data is not foreseen.

Timing

Common timing for SEEs in WFP is:

- Ahead of a moment of reflection on a programmatic activity or thematic area.
- When management seeks evidence to inform decision-making e.g. on policy, strategy or programming.
- When a Country Office or Regional Bureau is developing its Annual Performance Plan.
- When regional or global policies or strategies, or Country Strategic Plans are being formulated, particularly if no other evaluation exercise will be made available in time, or when the scope of an evaluation would not adequately cover the required evidence needs.

SEEs are sometimes confused with Evaluation Synthesis. However, these are distinct items. Table 1 below presents the key differences between the two exercises (for more details, see Annex 1).

Box 2: Country-focused SEEs and Country Strategic Plan Evaluations

A **country-focused SEE** is often requested by COs to feed evidence into the design of a new CSP. This rationale is similar to that of a Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (CSPE). However, a SEE **cannot replace a CSPE**, since it only brings together existing evidence, while full evaluations generate new evidence and analysis. In deciding to conduct a Country-focused SEE, managers should be clear therefore on how it adds value to, or complements, full evaluation exercises.

Duration

The time for conducting a SEE is approximately four months from the initial preparation of the framing note to the dissemination of the SEE report. The figure below illustrates the duration of each phase. To note that the duration and level of effort required will depend on the summary focus (complexity) and number of evaluations in the universe.

Figure 1: SEE phases

Pha	se	Average time
1	Form user group and prepare framing note	2 weeks
2	Select and brief SEE lead	1-2 weeks
3	Prepare analytical framework	1 week
4	Populate analytical framework	Up to 2 weeks
5	Analysis and SEE report drafting	2 weeks
6	Report commenting and finalization, and brief drafting	1 week
7	Publish and disseminate final product	1 week
Tota	l	12 weeks (4 months)



Roles and responsibilities

This section describes the roles and responsibilities of all possible stakeholders involved in a summary of evaluation evidence. These include: SEE manager; SEE lead; SEE users; and SEE quality assurer, as well as members of the WFP Office of Evaluation.

Terms noted below such as framing note, analytical framework, SEE report, SEE brief and interactive session for SEE evidence-sharing are explained in later sections of this guidance.

SEE manager

oversees SEE planning,

framing and process and, when the SEE is conducted externally, provides guidance to SEE lead throughout. Managers are from the evaluation function and are nominated at the time when the SEE is decided, by the DoE, for SEEs conducted at OEV level (centralized), and by REOs for SEEs conducted at RO level (decentralized). Their role is as follows:

1

Planning and framing

- Informs Use Unit in the Office of Evaluation of SEE plans.
- Prepares SEE framing note and evaluation universe, and shares with users for inputs
 - Supports identification of the SEE lead if outsourced to an external provider, leads selection and contracting.
- Shares all necessary documentation with SEE lead.
 - Organise and support initial information exchange meetings.

Extracting, analyzing, and validating

- Backstops SEE lead with guidance and feedback on analytical framework.
- Participates in mid-point consultation for guidance.

Reporting and disseminating

- Comments on draft SEE report and brief in line with quality standards set out in the SEE Report – contents & quality parameters, in Annex 3.
- Shares draft report with users and organizes meetings as appropriate
- Submits final SEE report for validation, through SEE quality assurance peerreview.
- If the SEE is managed by OEV, submits final SEE brief to Director of Evaluation for review and approval.
- Disseminates the SEE report and brief widely and requests that OEV publish them on WFP websites.

Generally, OEV staff will manage SEEs of global scope and Regional Evaluation Unit staff will manage SEEs of regional and country-level cope.

the person (or team) responsible for preparing the SEE. This role can be by an internal WFP staff member or outsourced to an external provider. Their role is as follows:

1

Planning and framing

- Meets with users and commissioners to understand SEE purpose and objectives.
- Leads fine-tuning of SEE questions if necessary.
- Ensures familiarity with framing note and evaluation universe.
- Undertakes a preliminary review of the universe.
- Develops the analytical framework.

Extracting, analyzing, and validating

- Conducts data extraction from the universe of evaluations and presents evidence basis to users and commissioners for any adjustment of framing.
- Performs analysis to generate the SEE report draft, in line with quality standards established (see SEE Report – contents & quality parameters, in Annex 3).
- Submits the SEE report to the SEE commissioner by the agreed deadline.

Reporting and disseminating

- Reviews and addresses the comments of SEE quality assurer and users' group.
- Submits a revised and final SEE report
- Prepares SEE brief.
 - Leads interactive session for evaluation evidence-sharing (I-SEE), as required.

SEE users (group)

are the main recipient

of a SEE. Their roles are to:

Planning and framing

Offer insights on envisaged utility of the SEE, specifically advising on what it should cover, and thus commenting on the lines of enquiry identified in the framing note.

Inform the SEE commissioner of relevant evaluation evidence sources.

Share relevant background on the subject matter to the SEE commissioner.

Extracting, analyzing, and validating

- Share views at mid-point consultation.

Reporting and disseminating

Comment on draft SEE report.

Take part in meetings and the interactive session for SEE evidence-sharing, as appropriate.

SEE quality assurer

of SEE deliverables with quality standards:

Reporting and disseminating

Peer-reviews SEE report ahead of their publication and ahead of the final approval of the SEE Brief's by Director of Evaluation, (Director of Evaluation only approves briefs of SEEs managed by OEV).

In case of SEEs managed at the Regional Evaluation Teams level, the Regional Evaluation Officer acting as Quality Assurer will bear the responsibility of clearing the final products.

Until SEE practice is well owned within the evaluation function, the **OEV Use Unit** will be **available to support Quality Assurance** and support SEE managers at each step of the SEE preparation process, shadowing them in providing guidance and advice to SEE leads, as appropriate.

Figure 2: Roles complementarities and possible overlaps

Some of the above mentioned roles may be combined depending on context. For instance:

- SEE manager and lead may be undertaken by the same individual, such as when the SEE is conducted internally.
- SEE manager and quality assurer may be performed within the same office or person, such as when the SEE is outsourced.

Note: The roles of SEE lead and SEE quality assurer cannot by any circumpstance be performed by the same person, to ensure necessary checks and

halances

QUALITY ASSURER

external/internal

LEAD

MANAGER

Director of Evaluation

reviews and

approves the final OEV commissioned SEE brief.

Communications Unit, Office of Evaluation

coordinates with

commissioners, supporting formatting, graphic layout, and publication of final SEE report on WFP evaluation websites. And provides advice on dissemination modalities, if required.

Table 2: Illustration of roles under different scenarios (whether SEE undertaken at HQ or RO level):

No level).				
SCENARIO 1 SEE outsourced externally				
SEE lead SEE manager SEE QA				
Externalized (to firm under LTA)	Staff in evaluation function	Head of Unit in evaluation function		
	Can be the same person			
SEE	SCENARIO 2 conducted inte	rnally		
SEE lead	SEE manager	SEE QA		
	SEE manager	SEE QA		
Externalized (to firm under LTA)	Staff in evaluation function	Head of Unit in evaluation function		

Resources and skills required

Resources

Based on experience, when outsourced, a SEE can be budgeted at approximately USD 25,000 on average. However, budgets can vary depending on the number of evaluations in the universe, the complexity of the SEE subject matter; and the fees of the SEE lead.

The commissioning unit (HQ Division/ CO/ RO) is responsible for ensuring available funding for planned SEEs. The Evaluation Function, will consider the possibility of funding SEEs (budget permitting), should the HQ Division (beyond OEV)/ CO/ RO not be able to secure funds.

Skills and experience

SEE credibility is strongly linked to the expertise and experience of the SEE lead. The following are important considerations:

The relevant skills and capabilities should be listed in the framing note (discussed in section 3.1 below), so that the requirements and justification for selecting the SEE lead are clear. Support is available from the Use Unit in OEV to facilitate the outsourcing of expertise dedicated to SEEs, with firms that have established LTAs, or with single experts.

Table 3: Key skills required to lead a SEE

Skills/capability	Essential/desirable
Qualitative research skills	Essential
Strong analytical skills	Essential
Sound writing skills and ability to express key messages concisely	Essential
Languages as appropriate for the languages of the universe of evaluations	Essential
Thematic expertise	Desirable
Quantitative research skills	Possible (if used)
Evaluation knowledge	Highly Desirable
Knowledge of WFP	Desirable
Data visualization, communication & presentation skills	Desirable



Preparing a SEE may be sequenced in **six main phases**. Their applicability will vary according to the conditions of the exercise, and depending on whether the SEE is conducted by an internal WFP staff member or outsourced to an external provider. The following phases therefore offer a broad guide which can be adapted as appropriate.

FORM A USER GROUP & PREPARE FRAMING NOTE

Phase 1 is aimed at understanding the demand and clarifying the evidence need that will determine the SEE purpose and scope, in consultation with key stakeholders. This typically takes approximately two weeks, but can be longer, depending on the time to obtain inputs from the user group on the framing note.

Form and brief user group

Identifying potential users of the SEE and involving them from the start is critical to ensure relevance, ownership and thus utility, and to clarify and manage expectations from the start. Engagement with users is 'light' and not time intensive.

The **users**, usually a group of internal stakeholders, are those whose work the SEE may touch upon, or for whom the SEE may have direct implications. They will be the SEE main recipients. Their involvement will ensure the SEE is framed in full consideration of the appropriate evidence needs and eventual upcoming events it may feed into. Users may also advise on relevant evidence sources at this early stage.

The **SEE manager** identifies and engages the user group, who may include any knowledgeable colleagues from a relevant programmatic or functional area related to the SEE subject, whatever their level of responsibility. The SEE manager should brief users on the general purpose and features of a SEE and inform them of their role in the process.

Table 4: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Form and brief user's group	Prepare framing note	Review and comment on draft framing note
SEE manager	L	L	P
SEE users group	P	Р	L
SEE lead			(P)
SEE QA			L
DoE			
OEV Comms			

Key: L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: Participate actively in step; (...): optional

& FRAMING NOTE

Prepare framing note

The framing note is a **short document**, which sets out the main purpose, focus and expected process of the SEE. It is developed iteratively, in consultation with users, who may review and comment on it. Core to the framing note are the main **lines of inquiry** against which evidence will be extracted and summarized and a list of **evaluations to be reviewed** (the 'evaluation universe'). It also indicates the expected **timeline** for its preparation, skills expected from the SEE lead, how the SEE findings will be disseminated, and outlines the user group's role and practical arrangements. See the **template** for the framing note.

The **SEE manager** takes the lead in preparing the framing note, based on inputs received from **users**, which entails:

- Clarifying the purpose and intended use of the SEE.
- Defining the lines of inquiry, which are drawn from the main evidence needs that the SEE is meant to address, and will determine the evidence that will be collected from evaluation reports. Lines of inquiry are few in number (usually 3-5), focused, and analytical in nature, rather than calling for purely factual or descriptive responses. They may be adapted in course, depending on evidence availability.
- Defining the universe of evaluations that will be reviewed to prepare the summary, which will determine the availability of evaluative evidence. The evaluation universe may include all types of evaluations, and can only include evaluations that conform to minimal quality standards.

The selection of evaluation reports to form the SEE universe will usually be done based on considerations of: i) relevance to the country/regional/thematic/programmatic focus of the SEE; ii) time period: depending on the SEE, there may be need to focus on more recently completed reports, or to include longer time spans. Insofar as evidence extraction is done manually, it it is advised to keep the universe to a manageable number of reported, i.e., not to exceed 35. A higher number of evaluation makes for a very difficult analytical phase and extends the SEE production phase substantially.

Box 3: Example of lines of enquiry

- Summary of evaluation evidence from WFP nutrition activities in Eastern and Southern Africa.
- According to the set of evaluations, how relevant were WFP's nutrition activities to needs in the Eastern and Southern Africa region?
- What results did evaluations find that they delivered for beneficiaries?
- What factors (positive or negative) affected the achievement of results?
- What lessons did evaluations identify as important for WFP to consider in the design of its nutrition activities in future?

Box 4: What defines the quality of evaluative sources?

The requirement to only include evidence sources that have been vetted for quality is grounded on the need to ensure that the quality of evidence from individual evaluations is high, in turn supporting the credibility of the SEE. Considerations for quality assessment include:

- WFP commissioned evaluations: In WFP, centralized and decentralized evaluations undergo an external quality assessment process respectively referred to as Post-Hoc Quality Assessment / Support Systems (PHQA / QSS). Independent assessors rate the quality of final evaluation reports against set evaluation quality standards. Provided the evaluation is rated as either 'satisfactory' or 'highly-satisfactory' (60% 100%), the evidence is validated for use in a summary of evaluation evidence.
- Non-WFP evaluations: If the summary of evaluation evidence plans to use evaluations commissioned and conducted outside WFP, a minimum condition for their inclusion is that they have undergone a form of quality assessment through which they obtained at least a 'satisfactory' (or equivalent) quality rating.
- Once the evaluation universe is identified, and considering the volume of sources and evidence that appears to be available (usually, more than five evaluations), the SEE manager, in consultation of SEE users and SEE lead, may decide to adjust or narrow the SEE objectives and lines of inquiry, to align with the available evidence. Here too, it is advised to ensure lines of inquiry and kept to a manageable number and

realistic in view of evidence available from a preliminary review of reports contents. This may require carefully managing SEE user group demands, and will allow keeping a

realistic delivery plan.

Reconfirming SEE objectives and lines

of inquiry in view of available evidence.

- Outlining the approach and process, which the SEE will follow, which include specifying:
 - the skills and experience required for the SEE lead (see Phase 2 below).
 - The timeline and level of effort required for the SEE. Adequate time should be factored in for the draft SEE report's quality review, users' feedback and subsequent revisions. And timeline should ensure timely delivery against date by when the SEE is required.
 - Anticipated arrangements for disseminating SEE results (see Phase 7).

The **SEE manager** shares the framing note with the **user group**, who will review and feedback on the specific purpose and objectives, and the set of proposed lines of enquiry the SEE aims to address and on the evaluative evidence sources selected.

Box 5: Why only evaluations?

Understanding that users may have interest in evidence summaries that also consider non-evaluative sources, experience has shown that drawing from sources of various nature does not support SEE quality and clarity.

Evaluation evidence is generated as a results of methodical evidence triangulation and integrates the principle of independence. As such, it does not easily integrate with evidence drawn from other types of papers that may, for example, reflect a more advocacy-oriented stance. In addition, and because SEEs are produced within WFPs evaluation function, OEV cannot be held responsible for evidence that has not been vetted by an evaluation function.

Nevertheless, evaluation evidence can be fed into other type of products that integrate non-evaluative sources, beyond SEEs.

2 SELECT & BRIEF SEE LEAD

SELECT & BRIEF SEE LEAD

SEEs may be conducted internally, by WFP staff members, or outsourced to external providers. In either case, it is important to select as SEE lead someone with the required skill sets (see Table 3: Key skills required to lead a SEE).

The **SEE manager** will identify and if appropriate, hire the **SEE lead**. When needed, he/she will organise a first meeting to brief the SEE Lead on SEE subject matter, which may also include users, with the aim to clarify demands and expectations and discuss focus, approach and timeline. The framining note is also shared with the SEE lead. Typically, this phase may take 1-3 weeks, depending on whether the SEE lead is hired externally.

Table 5: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Select SEE lead	Brief SEE lead
SEE manager	L	L
SEE users group		L
SEE lead	Р	Р
SEE QA		
DoE		
OEV Comms		

Key: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P- Participate actively in step



PREPARE AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The SEE Lead's first task is to prepare an analytical framework aligned to the lines of inquiry identified in the framing note. This task usually takes approximately one week. As evidence emerges, the framework may change or be adapted, on an ongoing basis.

The SEE manager (alt. QA) reviews the analytical framework to ensure it is adequate to allow supporting the extraction of evidence and address the SEE lines of inquiry.

Box 6: What is an analytical framework?

The analytical framework for the SEE is the structured tool against which evidence will be extracted and later analysed. It should be shaped around the main lines of enquiry of the SEE and is done after an initial overview of a sample of reports, which helps guide the development of SEE lines of enquiry.

To develop the analytical framework, the SEE lead breaks down each line of enquiry into a short set of 'analytical fields', or key words against which evidence will be collected from evaluations. This makes the evidence collection fully systematic, since it establishes where different 'pieces' of evidence should be located.

Each line of enquiry should have between 2-4 analytical fields, with a maximum of approximately 20 overall. The framework should be validated by the commissioning unit prior to subsequent steps being undertaken.

The template of analytical frameworks is provided in Annex 2.

Table 6: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Develop analytical framework	Validate analytical framework
SEE manager	Р	L (unless lead and manager are the same person)
SEE users group		
SEE lead	L	
SEE QA		
DoE		L (alternative, if lead and manager are the same person)
OEV Comms		

Key: L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P- Participate actively in step



EXTRACT EVIDENCE (AGAINST ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK)

This phase is generally the most time-consuming. Experience to date in OEV has shown that the extraction of evidence may take up to ½ day per report, counting the need for iterative returns to source reports during extraction phase and understanding that any estimate is highly dependent of the complexity of lines of inquiry.

The SEE lead extracts relevant evidence from the component evaluation reports, and map this into the analytical framework, against the analytical fields.

Populating the analytical framework is a qualitative data extraction process, whereby data is taken from the selected evaluation reports and plotted into a matrix, where they provide relevant evidence to inform analytical dimensions. Quantitative analysis of WFP monitoring and operational data, such as beneficiaries, funding and outputs/outcomes,

may also be extracted, as appropriate. SEEs may also consolidate the recommendations from different evaluations, identifying common themes and patterns, if relevant to the lines of inquiry underpinning the SEE.

As the evaluation reports are reviewed and new evidence emerges in the evidence extraction process, the analytical fields can be adapted and/or merged, to better match the evidence available.

The source of each data piece, page or paragraph number, should be recorded so that the later findings of the SEE are fully traceable back to their original source.

The SEE lead shares the output with the SEE manager, in the form of a matrix populated with all the evidence that will be analyzed and used to draft the SEE narrative.

The SEE manager calls a meeting referred to as 'mid-point consultation' (cf. mid-point consultation template) for the SEE lead to go over eventual adjustments needed to the SEE objectives based on evidence available. The SEE users may be invited if substantial adjustments (evidence gaps) are foreseen, to discuss the likely consequences on the eventual SEE report.

Table 7: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Populate the analytical framework	Leads mid-point consultation
SEE manager	P	P
SEE users group		P
SEE lead	L	L
SEE QA		
DoE		
OEV Comms		

L: Lead - takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: Participate actively in step

FORM SEE FINDINGS & DRAFT REPORT

The **SEE lead** analyzes the evidence extracted into the analytical framework to identify recurrent evidence that will form the key findings of the Summary. Analysis and report drafting may take approximately 2 weeks, depending on the scope of the SEE.

The **analysis** is the evidence processing stage that generates the eventual narrative summary, and involves the following:

- Reviewing all the evidence identified against the analytical fields, to identify trends emerging, which can be consolidated, considering:
 - Density of evidence against each field (# evaluations reports; # instances with common evidence), bearing in mind that a given evaluation alone may reflect evidence from many cases (e.g., when building on other evaluations, or several case studies).
 - Key patterns and key differences across evidence.
 - Key factors that may explain variations or contradictions.

- Any additional themes emerging from individual evaluation reports, which are not fully reflected within the analytical fields.
- Qualitative reflection of any evidence found to be particularly substantial and relevant, from a given evaluation, or few evaluations.
 A finding may be of particular significance for various reasons: they may reflect a specific, or new practice or a particularly virtuous dynamic worth pointing underline; and may emerge from an evaluation that has done focused research on a given point.
- Analysing patterns within each theme to help answer each SEE line of enquiry and highlighting evidence gaps within each theme, considered to be a key finding as well.

The **SEE lead** has primary responsibility for timely delivery of the SEE report, so that it meets the quality parameters presented in this guidance note. Quality parameters are summarized in Annex 3, to provide SEE QA reviewing draft reports a quick reference guide.

Table 8: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Conduct analysis	Draft SEE report
SEE manager		
SEE users group		
SEE lead	L	L
SEE QA		
DoE		
OEV Comms		

L: Lead - takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: Participate actively in step

For the **SEE report** to convey clear messages, a mix of the following can be used:

- Examples to illustrate certain finding or practices.
- Tables or boxes to highlight individual findings or worthy cases.
- Footnotes citing the evidence sources should be used so that readers can track the evidence basis; or providing complementary information.

The **SEE report** follows a simple structure, which can be adapted based on user group needs. A template is available, to be adapted based on user's needs:

- For SEEs managed by OEV: <u>Summary of Evaluation Evidence Report template centralized</u>.
- For SEEs managed by the Regional Evaluation Unit Teams, or Country Office:
 Summary of Evaluation Evidence Template decentralized.

Main elements for the report are:

- A brief overview of the SEE, including: key descriptive features of the theme/ programmatic area and overview of the context; purpose and intended use; focus / lines of enquiry; how it was conducted (methodology), and scope /evidence base.
- Clear and well-substantiated findings, consolidated around the main emerging findings or alongside the initially set lines of inquiry.
- Key messages that recap the main findings, particularly in relation to the findings which occurred most frequently and list the key messages. This will form the absis for the Brief, which will be circulated to a wider audience.
- Evaluation universe, or evidence source in annex.

SEEs should be concise. Normally, they have a maximum length of 15-18 pp, though they can be shorter or (sometimes) longer, depending on their scope (breadth of their themes) and the number of evaluations included.

SEEs do not include recommendations, which are found in evaluations and Syntheses.

For each finding, the evidence base should **be highly transparent**. This requires that for each finding, the source evaluations reporting the finding should be stated. This may imply when appropriate, making reference to the number of evaluations that reported a similar fining. For example: 'Regarding the relevance of WFP's nutrition activities in the region, [n] evaluations found X, while [n] evaluations found Y.' It also entails that all source evaluations are systematically cited, and referenced in footnotes. This will allow for stakeholders to verify that evidence from evaluation is accurately represented. Box 7 below provides an example of a SEE narrative, reporting the evidence base in a highly-transparent manner.

Box 7: What is an analytical framework?

At least six evaluations4 found both unconditional and conditional cash transfer initiatives linked to enhanced control over decision-making, particularly for women. Examples arose in Pakistan (a conditional programme), the Syria regional response, where cash was largely unconditional; Jordan; Somalia; Nepal; and the Dry Corridor covering four countries in Central America. The freedo m of choice over expenditure provided by cash for beneficiaries was cit ed as a key benefit. In Jordan, the introduction of the 'Choice' modality, where beneficiaries could select restricted e-vouchers, unrestricted cash or a 'choice' of both, was appreciated for its flexibility in meeting diverse needs.5

Six evaluations⁶ found that cash transfer programmes significantly enhanced efficiency both for WFP and for beneficiaries (though see trade-offs under Lessons Learned, below). Costs were reduced and timeliness increased. In Jordan, for example, WFP's use of blockchain within its cash-based response allowed for real time overview of transactions, to permit immediate adaptation and troubleshooting.⁷

See <u>WFP Summary of Evaluation Evidence</u> on Cash-based transfers.

QUALITY ASSURE & FINALIZE SEE REPORT AND BRIEF

The **SEE lead** share the draft SEE report when ready, for feedback on its content to help ensure the quality and utility of the SEE.

The **SEE manager** / **SEE QA** reviews the draft SEE Report with a focus on ensuring credibility and validity of the findings, and clarity of the overall content. Further guidance on QA is available in the SEE Report - contents & quality parameters (see Annex 3). The commented draft report is shared back with the SE lead for review.

The **SEE lead** revises the draft, and ensures to keep a version where all changes are visible in Track changes, to ensure due visibility on how comments offered were addressed. The TC version is shared back to the SEE QA for transparency, and SEE manager for sharing with the SEE users.

The **SEE users** receive the new iteration of the SEE report for their review and comments, to ensure the accuracy of the evidence presented and incorporating inputs from a subject matter perspective.

The **SEE lead** addresses the comments of the user group, also using track changes for track records as described above. He shares a final version of the SEE report with the SEE manager, which includes a section on key messages, that will constitute the core contents of the SEE Brief. The SEE report may be sent for peer-review by the OEV use unit, as a way of promoting consistency across SEEs and validating it against quality parameters promoted.

The **SEE Brief** consists in 2-3 pages, which take-up the most significant findings of the SEE report. It follows a simple structure described in the SEE Brief template and can be adapted based on specific user needs. Its contents is therefore also reviewed by the SEE QA and users:

- For SEEs managed by OEV or another HQ Division: <u>SEE Brief template</u> centralized.
- For SEEs managed by the Regional Evaluation Unit Teams, or Country Office: <u>SEE Brief template - decentralized.</u>

For SEEs commissioned by OEV or another HQ Division, the brief is sent to the Director of Evaluation for **review and approval**. For SEEs commissioned at decentralized level, the brief is **reviewed and approved** by the Regional Evaluation Officer, unless the REO is SEE lead or manager, in which case QA is with OEV Head of use unit. Examples of completed SEE Briefs are provided here below:

- Summary of Evaluation Evidence Brief:
 Lessons on School Feeding in West and
 Central Africa.
- Summary of Evaluation Evidence Brief on Social Protection.

Table 9: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Review and comment on draft SEE report	Validate the final SEE report	Prepare SEE brief	Review and comment on SEE brief	Review and approve SEE brief, managed by OEV
SEE manager	L			L	
SEE users group	L			L	
SEE lead		P	L		
SEE QA	L	L		L	
DoE					L
OEV Comms					

L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: Participate actively in step

PUBLISH & DISSEMINATE THE FINAL PRODUCT

This section provides an overview of the final phase in the process, including publishing and disseminating the SEE report and brief, aiming to maximize utility of SEE. The main outputs of this phase are the final edited and formatted SEE report and brief.

The **SEE manager** shares the final SEE report and Brief with relevant communications unit for publication.

The **SEE manager** is also responsible for ensuring that SEE-related information is duly recorded in the Management Information System (MIS), including key milestones in the process, and posting of final reports.

The SEE report will be **published** on WFP's internal website, whilst the brief will be published on both internal and external WFP websites.

Box 8: protocol for HQ-led SEE finalization

For SEEs commissioned at HQ level, the OEV Communications Unit supports the production of a graphically enhanced version of the SEE Brief, and publication of both SEE report and Brief.

These should be sent at the following e-mail address: oev.comms@wfp.org.

The following information should be provided:

- Commissioning unit.
- List of countries covered by the SEE.
- List of source evaluations (universe) used, for insertion at the end of the Brief.
- A "blurb" to introduce the SEE focus and coverage, to describe the summary product on the website.

Table 10: Summary of responsibilities

STEPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	Publish the final products	Records in MIS	Disseminate the final products
SEE manager	Р	L	L
SEE users group			P
SEE lead			
SEE QA			Р
DoE			Р
OEV Comms	L		

L: Lead – takes overall responsibility to undertake the step; P: Participate actively in step

PRODUCT

The SEE should be **disseminated** in a timely manner, and as planned at Framing Note stage. The dissemination is key to making sure that the summary findings and lessons are made available to the intended audience so that they can be used to help improve WFP interventions, strategies, and policies.

Box 9: Effective ways to disseminate

- Circulate the SEE reports and brief to the user group and other stakeholders, as relevant.
- Alerting of the SEE reports publication through a post on the <u>WFP Evaluation</u> <u>Community</u> or other relevant thematic <u>WFP communities</u> (by the SEE manager).
- Share the findings and key messages through newsletters, as apppropriate.
- Hold interactive session for evaluation evidence-sharing ("I-SEE!"), either inperson or remotely engaging the user group, the OEV function and other relevant stakeholders. The session can take various forms, such as: webinar, workshop, brown-bag lunch.
- Identify and use other emerging opportunities for sharing or using the findings and key messages, e.g. workshops, consultation meetings at Country Office, Regional Bureau or Headquarters levels.

After the SEE is finalized and published, a good practice is for the SEE manager to reach out to representatives of the user group to gather insights from users on the SEE utility, thus feeding a use stories repositories, and inducing learning and improvement.



Annexes

Annex 1: Summary of evaluation evidence and evaluation synthesis: key differences

Features	Summary of Evidence	Evaluation Synthesis
Aim	Aims to foster internal learning on a given topic through use of evaluative evidence	Aims to inform corporate/policy/strategic decisions by providing access to concise evaluative evidence that meets defined quality standards; and to elevate recurring issues emanating from evaluations which require corporate attention
Demand	Essentially demand-driven i.e. in response to specific user requests	May be driven by corporate needs
Focus	Is usually pitched at the country/regional/ thematic level	Is pitched at the corporate/strategic level
Lead	Can be conducted by an internal WFP staff member or outsourced to an external provider	Is outsourced to an external provider
Funding	Funded by the commissioner (unless agreed otherwise with OEV)	Syntheses are funded by the respective commissioner (OEV, HQ/RO)
Timeframe	Takes 4 months maximum	Can take up to 10-12 months
Quality requirements	Adhere to a limited set of quality parameters provided in the SEE Report - contents & quality parameters (Annex 3 of this guidance)	Adhere to the Centralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System (CEQAS) for Synthesis
Format	Does not contain recommendations, but includes 'key messages' to inform readers	Contains recommendations which require a management response
Methodology	Fully desk based. Does not include interviews or other types of data collection activities	Desk based plus limited number of additional interviews additional methods such as KII interviews at different phases of the synthesis, and review of secondary data.
Publication	SEE report and brief are released internally; SEE brief is published externally ⁸	Is published and disseminated externally
Executive Board	Is not presented to the Executive Board	If commissioned by OEV, Is presented to the Executive Board and requires a response of Management to the recommendations. HQ Divisions and Regional Office-commissioned syntheses are submitted to the relevant approval entity, but not presented to the EB



Annex 2: Analytical framework template

The following is the <u>analytical framewor template</u>.

SEE Question	SEE Sub-question	Eval Report 1	Eval Report 2	Eval Report 3	 # reports with evidence	# para. with evidence	Strength of evidence
SEE question 1: xxx	Sub question 1.1: xxx	text extracted: evidence that addresses the (sub) question	text extracted: evidence that addresses the (sub) question	text extracted: evidence that addresses the (sub) question	 #	#	score
	Sub question 1.2: xxx				 #	#	score
			•••		 •••	•••	•••
SEE question 2: xxx	Sub question 2.1: xxx				 #	#	score
	Sub question 2.2: xxx				 #	#	score

Annex 3: SEE report contents & quality parameters

The following offers guidance on typical SEE report contents and quality parameters that may be used when reviewing the quality of a Summary of Evaluation Evidence.

General

- Evaluation sources are systematically referenced using footnotes.
- The language is precise, unambiguous and clear.
- The report is free of grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors.
- The report template and applicable editing standards has been followed.
- The report does not exceed the number of pages established at framing stage.

Introduction

Rationale and purpose

Content	Assessment criteria
Brief overview of the summary of evaluation features to explain what a summary is, and why and the summary was carried out, including: Definition of a summary of evaluation evidence Rationale, purpose and expected users of the SEE	 → Expected content is included and is sufficient to explain to readers: what is a summary of evaluation evidence; → Clearly stated demand and reason for the SEE, its timing and audience, and how it is intended to be used

Subject of the summary

Content	Assessment criteria
 Brief overview of the SEE subject (theme, programmatic area), including: Definitions as appropriate Key descriptive features that serve to understand the subject of the SEE Overview of the context, including any relevant strategy, or decision-making process relevant to the SEE 	 → Information is relevant and sufficient to provide an understanding of the subject being summarized. → Information provided sufficiently contextualizes the SEE

Approach, methods and limitations

Content	Assessment criteria
Brief overview of what the SEE aimed to cover and how it was undertaken, including:	
 Key lines of inquiry and analytical framework, against which the evidence was extracted 	
 The approach and methods applied to undertake the summary, including a description of the approach to analysis, including how rigor was ensured 	→ Expected content is included and information allows reader to understand how the summary was conducted and supports the credibility of the
 A concise account of process phases, including consultations 	SEE → Information is aligned with the framing note and
 Clear description of the evidence base ('universe') including number and types of evaluations; time-frame and geographic coverage), and listed in full in an Annex 	any difference is explained and justified
 Limitations encountered and their effect on the evidence base and findings 	

Findings

Content **Assessment criteria** Concise presentation of the results of the analysis undertaken across extracted evidence, against each line of inquiry, including: Content criteria: → Expected content is included , and notably: An analysis of evaluations consolidated around the key themes, presenting patterns and Findings are well-substantiated and present a clear differences (i.e. not listed separately or in and concise analysis against the SEE lines of inquiry sequence) Findings make explicit reference to evaluations Transparent reference to the evidence base sources cited in footnotes and references to including with clear indication of evidence strength evaluations that have reported on the specific and including any outliers, with use of footnotes to finding are always indicated refer evaluation sources Finding reflect a use of the entire universe of Findings exclusively rely on evaluation sources and evaluations, rather than only a few. reporting evidence gaps Findings are true to the source evaluations and do Presentation criteria: not introduce new evidence or author's new judgement over it A structure that allows key messages to emerge against all initially defines lines of inquiry Findings are illustrated with examples showing

Key messages

appropriate

good practices, and the use of tables and visuals as

Content	Assessment criteria	
 Key messages recap on main findings, particularly in terms of the evidence that most frequently appears in the evaluations, or that has particular significant resonance. These entail a logical flow from the findings presented before, and connections made across these findings against the main SEE themes 	 → Key messages are clear, coherent and follow logically from the findings → Key messages are succinct and present a recap of the main findings → Key messages are free of personal considerations → No new evidence is introduced 	
 Key messages can be structured around main emerging themes, by programmatic area, or along the lines of inquiry 	 → Key messages are listed by theme/ programmatic area/ SEE question → Key messages reflect both strengths and areas for 	
 They reflect areas of strength and areas for improvement and are written with to draw key learning elements for WFP 	improvement→ Key messages contribute to organizational learning in WFP and guide future action	
- Key messages are between 700-900 words	→ Are between 700-900 words	

Annexes

Content	Assessment criteria
Annexes should be listed in the order in which they are cited in the main text.	Additional technical annexes are relevant and necessary to supplement the main text Output Description:
Ensure that the following annexes are included as a minimum:	References are made in the main part of the report to relevant annexes
- SEE Framing Note	→ Numbered in the order in which they appear in text
 List of evaluations consulted 	→ Minimum required annexes are included

Endnotes

1 WFP (2021) Strategic Plan 2022-2025

2 https://www.wfp.org/publications/wfp-evaluation-policy-2022

3 Patton, Michael Q (2012) Essentials of Utilization-Focused Evaluation, Sage. Publications

4 Results of WFP's Food Assistance to conflict-affected population in Pakistan from 2015 to 2017; Evaluation of the WFP's Regional Response to Syrian Crisis (2015-2017); Evaluation of WFP's General Food Assistance to Syrian Refugees in Jordan from 2015 to mid-2018; Joint Evaluation of the 2017 Somalia Humanitarian Cash-Based Response; Evaluación final del Proyecto "Respuesta al fenómeno de El Niño en el Corredor Seco", El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras y Nicaragua, 2016 - 2018; End term evaluation of Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO 200875);

5 Evaluation of the WFP's Regional Response to Syrian Crisis (2015-2017); Evaluation of WFP's General Food Assistance to Syrian Refugees in lordan from 2015 to mid-2018

6 Synthesis report of WFP's country portfolio evaluations in Africa (2016–2018); Sierra Leone PRRO 200938: a decentralized evaluation; Evaluation of the WFP's Regional Response to Syrian Crisis (2015-2017); Evaluation of WFP's General Food Assistance to Syrian Refugees in Jordan from 2015 to mid-2018; South Sudan Country Portfolio Evaluation 2011-2016

7 Evaluation of WFP's General Food Assistance to Syrian Refugees in Jordan from 2015 to mid-2018

8 Should the SEE commissioner have a specific need for SEE brief to remain internal, this should be communicated to OEV so that it will not be externally published.

Photo credits

Cover page: WFP/Sayed Asif Mahmud

Page 4: WFP/Sayed Asif Mahmud

Page 6: WFP/Marianela Gonzalez

Page 9: WFP/Rein Skullerud

Page 13: WFP/Badre Bahaji

Page 20: WFP/Michael Castofas





