

# Evaluation Of The Smallholders Climate Portfolio of the Egypt Country Office from 2021 to 2025



Decentralized evaluation

Terms of reference

WFP [M&E UNIT/EGYPT COUNTRY OFFICE]

March 2025

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Reasons for the evaluation .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1. Rationale .....	2
2.2. Objectives .....	2
2.3. Key stakeholders.....	2
<b>3. Context and subject of the evaluation .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1. Context.....	5
3.2. Subject of the evaluation .....	7
<b>4. Evaluation scope, criteria and questions .....</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1. 3.1 Scope of The Evaluation.....	13
4.2. 3.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions.....	14
<b>5. Methodological approach and ethical considerations.....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1. Evaluation approach.....	16
5.2. Preliminary considerations on evaluability and methodological implications.....	16
5.3. Ethical considerations .....	17
5.4. Quality assurance .....	18
<b>6. Organization of the evaluation.....</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1. Phases and deliverables.....	19
6.2. Evaluation team composition.....	20
6.3. Roles and responsibilities .....	21
6.4. Communication.....	23
6.5. Proposal.....	23
<b>Annex 1. Map.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Annex 2. Indicative Timeline.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Annex 3. Role and composition of the evaluation committee .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Annex IV. Role, composition and schedule of engagement of the evaluation reference group .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Annex 5. Communication and knowledge management plan.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Annex 6. Acronyms and abbreviations.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Annex 7: Logical Framework .....</b>	<b>33</b>

# List of tables

Table 1: Preliminary stakeholder analysis .....	3
Table 2: Evaluation questions and criteria.....	14
Table 3 Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones.....	19

# 1. Introduction

1. These terms of reference (ToR) were prepared by the WFP Egypt Country Office (CO) based upon an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders. 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.

2. This evaluation is commissioned by WFP Egypt Country Office and will cover the period between 2021 and 2025 of the CO's smallholders climate resilience portfolio under the WFP 2021-2023 and 2023-2028 Egypt Country Strategic Plans. The final report is expected to be delivered by the Evaluation Team (ET) in September 2025, and publicly shared along with WFP Egypt CO's management response in November 2025. The purpose of this decentralized evaluation (DE) is to assess if WFP resilience portfolio has been successfully implemented and to draw on learnings for the formulation of WFP Egypt's strategic and operational direction in the country, as well as to ensure transparency and accountability towards stakeholders.

3. The climate resilience portfolio of the CO aimed to support smallholder farmers against negative climate impacts on their production and food security. The portfolio primarily targeted smallholder communities in Luxor, Aswan, Sohag, Assiut, Qena and Sharkia and was comprised of several projects among which were the "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through Livelihood Enhancement and Rural Innovation funded by the Government of the Netherlands and the "Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region- Phase 2" Project funded by the Adaptation Fund of the UNFCCC.

## 2. Reasons for the evaluation

### 2.1. Rationale

4. The evaluation is being commissioned for the following reasons:
  - a. To assess one of the major components of the CO operations, namely the climate resilience activities, through looking into its performance
  - b. To respond to the CO's, donor and government partners' needs for information on the lessons learnt, best practices and challenges of the climate resilience building activities under the portfolio.
  - c. to document intended and unintended results, reasons behind them and their contribution to broader development results.
  - d. to support changes in the design and targets set out as needed and will be used to inform the development of future similar activities.

### 2.2. Objectives

5. Evaluations in WFP serve the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning. This evaluation is conducted to feed into the formulation of WFP's operational and strategic direction in Egypt as well as the reporting to donors and other stakeholders, and therefore geared towards both the learning and accountability objectives as follows:

- **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the climate resilience portfolio between 2021-2025. Publicly shared and actively involving a wide range of stakeholders including donor countries, the evaluation will report on achievements, identify areas of improvement, and contribute to the discussion on WFP's strategic and operational direction in the country. Hence, ensuring WFP's credibility, increasing accountability to donors, and enhancing accountability to beneficiaries towards gender equality and their protection (promoting their safety, dignity, and integrity).
- **Learning** – The evaluation will draw lessons by determining reasons why certain results occurred or not and will identify and document good practices and pointers for learning. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. The evaluation will also provide evidence to inform adjustments to programme design, strategic direction, targets, or implementation mechanisms during the formulation of future similar activities. Findings will be actively disseminated, and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson sharing systems. The evaluation will also feed into the wider organizational learning by other COs where WFP is supporting the Government to overcome climate impacts on smallholder farmers' communities.
- Equal weight is to be given to the learning and accountability objectives of the evaluation.

### 2.3. Key stakeholders

6. The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a broad range of WFP internal and external stakeholders. Several stakeholders will play a role in the evaluation process in light of their role in the design and implementation of the climate resilience portfolio, their interest in the results of the evaluation, and relative power to influence the design, funding and implementation 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.

7. Accountability to affected populations, 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 country office (CO) in Egypt</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 programme and partnerships.
<b>Project Management Unit in the Governorates</b>	<b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - Responsible for day-to-day programme implementation. the field-based Project Management liaises with stakeholders at decentralized levels and have direct beneficiary contact. It will be affected by the outcome of the evaluation.
<b>Regional bureau (RB) for Egypt</b>	<b>Key informant and primary stakeholder</b> - Responsible for both oversight of country offices and technical guidance and support, the regional bureau has an interest in an independent/impartial account of operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings the extent to which the subject is contributing to overall regional priorities and where applicable 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 team supports the country office/regional bureau to ensure quality, credible and useful DEs.
<b>WFP HQ divisions</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 accountability as well as advocacy.
<b>WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV)</b>	<b>Primary stakeholder</b> – OEV has a stake in ensuring that DEs deliver quality, credible and useful evaluations respecting provisions for impartiality as well as roles and accountabilities of various DE 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. It will contribute to evaluation coverage of WFP work which is reported to the EB through the annual evaluation report
<b>External stakeholders</b>	
<b>Beneficiaries (men, women that are beneficiaries of the different interventions)</b>	<b>Key informants and primary stakeholders</b> - As the ultimate recipients of food assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought.
<b>Government Central and local (Particularly the Ministries of Agriculture, Irrigation and Social Solidarity)</b>	<b>Key informants and primary stakeholders</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.
<b>United Nations country team (UNCT)</b> (FAO, IFAD, UNIDO)	<b>Secondary stakeholder</b> - The harmonized action of the UNCT should contribute to the realization of the government's developmental objectives. It has therefore an interest in ensuring that WFP programmes are effective in contributing to the United Nations concerted efforts. Various agencies are also direct partners of WFP at policy and activity level.
<b>Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</b>	<b>Key informants and primary stakeholders</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.
<b>Donors</b> (particularly the Adaptation Fund of the UNFCCC and the Government of the Netherlands)	<b>Primary 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.

# 3. Context and subject of the evaluation

## 3.1. Context

8. Egypt is the most populous country in North Africa and the Arab world. Despite being classified as a middle-income country, Egypt faces long-standing development challenges and ranks 105 on the 2023 Human Development Index<sup>1</sup>. About 40 % of its population in Upper Egypt, 23% in rural Lower Egypt, and 14% in urban areas fall below the income poverty line<sup>2</sup>. The Food Security Index developed by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) shows that Egypt is moderately food secure, while the national Household Income, Expenditure and Consumption Survey (HIECS) shows that 15.9 % of the population has poor access to food<sup>3</sup>.

9. The Government of Egypt is committed to achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Egyptian Constitution of 2014 was formulated to pave the road towards the future and to give the legislative and legal background for this development. The second step was formulating Egypt's Sustainable Development Strategy: Egypt's Vision 2030, based on the embodiment of the new constitutional spirit, setting welfare and prosperity as the main objectives, achieved through sustainable development, social justice, and balanced geographical and social growth, while the right to secure access to food and nutrition is a priority<sup>4</sup>. The SDS is aligned with the SDGs and represents Egypt's road map to achieve the SDGs and Agenda 2030.

10. Since March 2021, Egypt has been grappling with a severe shortage of foreign currency, prompting three consecutive devaluations of the Egyptian pound (EGP), along with import restrictions and tightened regulations on foreign spending by banks. Presently, the official exchange rate hovers around 50 EGP to the US dollar to narrow the gap between official and parallel market rates, the latter reaching up to 71 EGP against the dollar in January 2024. This currency volatility has significantly affected prices across food and non-food commodities, leading to alarming inflation rates, with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) reporting an annual inflation rate of 31 percent and a staggering annual food inflation rate of 47 percent in January 2024.

11. A joint WFP/UNICEF study in 2023 revealed the disproportionate impact of inflation on poverty, food insecurity, and nutrition, particularly affecting rural communities and vulnerable populations. Despite some positive effects of the government's economic stimulus package, the study emphasized the necessity of expanding social assistance programs, scaling up food security and nutrition initiatives, prioritizing the most vulnerable, enhancing data systems, and integrating digitalization into national programs to alleviate the suffering exacerbated by the economic challenges.

12. The agriculture sector contributes 11.3 percent of Egypt's GDP but provides livelihoods for more than 57 percent of the population, with women accounting for 45 percent of the agricultural workforce.<sup>5</sup> More than 57 percent of Egypt's population lives in rural areas, where small-scale agriculture is the primary

---

<sup>1</sup> Human Development Report 2020, released on 15 December 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Household Income Expenditure and Consumption Survey, Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS), 2017/2018.

<sup>3</sup> Household Income Expenditure and Consumption Survey (HIECS), Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS), 2017/2018.

<sup>4</sup> WFP Draft Country Strategic Review, 2017.

<sup>5</sup> FAO. 2022. [Gender, Water and Agriculture: Assessing the Nexus in Egypt](#).



source of livelihoods and 87 percent of farm holdings are less than 1 hectare, particularly in upper Egypt.<sup>6</sup> About 70 percent of rural women work without remuneration for family farms and businesses, and only 2 percent of Egyptian women own land

13. Although cultivated land represents only 4 percent of the total area of the country, agriculture is among the Government's top three priority sectors for driving economic growth and job creation in Egypt.<sup>7</sup>

14. Being one of the highest per capita wheat consumption rates in the world, Egypt has topped the list of the world's major wheat importers since 2005. Imports are foreseen to further increase to cater for increasing needs that are attributable to the population growth. According to US Department of Agriculture, Egypt's wheat production for 2018-19 is estimated at 8.45 million tonnes, the same as the previous year, while imports are projected at 12.5 million tonnes, up from 12.3 million tonnes in 2017-2018. Likewise, Egypt's import of corn in 2018-2019 are estimated at 9.5 million tonnes, up 1 percent from the previous year, ranking it the fourth largest yellow corn feed importer<sup>8</sup>. It is also the seventh largest food oil importer, at the rate of three million tons per year. This reliance on wheat and cereal imports to feed an ever-growing population makes Egypt especially vulnerable to international price volatility and supply shocks.

15. A large portion of Egypt's food gap is connected to the country's shortage of water resources and the agricultural land needed to expand food production. As it has no effective rainfall except in a narrow band along the northern coast, Egypt's agricultural sector relies almost completely on irrigation from the Nile. The Nile accounts for more than 97 percent of both Nile and groundwater sources together, of which 85 percent is used in agriculture. With only 62 billion m<sup>3</sup> per year of fresh water resources, Egypt is classified among the countries suffering from "water scarcity". The per capita share of these resources has fallen below the minimal level of water needs, estimated at 1,000 m<sup>3</sup> per year, to 680 m<sup>3</sup>. Further, and according to Sustainable Agricultural Development Strategy Towards 2030 (SADS, 2009) the per capita fresh water is expected to decline from 711.0 m<sup>3</sup> in 2008 to 550 m<sup>3</sup> in 2030. Concerning land, only 3.5 percent of Egypt land area is arable with the total cultivated land reported as 8 million acres of "old" land in the Nile Valley and 2 million acres of reclaimed land<sup>9</sup>. At the same time, this is exacerbated by supply chain losses as high as 50 percent for fruits and vegetables and about 30 percent for wheat. All are factors contributing to increasing risks of shortages in food availability in the country.

16. The majority (around 70%) of Egyptian farmers are smallholders. Their productivity and incomes are limited by land fragmentation and degradation; the high cost of imported agricultural inputs, particularly in the light of inflation and the conflict in Ukraine; a lack of access to knowledge and sustainable agricultural practices; and limited access to markets. Climate change, including changes in temperature, increased water salinity and adverse weather events, are placing additional strain on vulnerable smallholders, further reducing productivity and incomes and threatening food security. Projected rises in temperature will subject Upper Egypt to reductions in food production of at least 30 percent by 2040, increasing the demand for crop water, reducing water use efficiency and increasing pest and disease infestations.<sup>10</sup>

17. Gender inequality and discriminatory practices persist, with roughly three times as many women as men of age 15–64 unemployed.<sup>11</sup> In terms of total numbers, there are 77 percent more unemployed women in rural than in urban areas.<sup>12</sup> Thus women living in rural areas are the most at risk of being left behind, where social norms along with poverty limit their access to education as well as income generation opportunities.

18. These findings guided the WFP's support for national food security and resilience-building

---

<sup>6</sup> Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics. 2022. Egypt Family Health Survey EFHS 2021

<sup>7</sup> Ministry of Planning and Economic Development. [Egypt's 2021 Voluntary National Review](#).

<sup>8</sup> Global Agriculture Information report for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, September 2018.

<sup>9</sup> Ministry of Agriculture. National Strategy for Climate Adaptation in Agriculture. August 2010.

<sup>10</sup> WFP analysis based on the anticipated impacts of climate change on food production, December 2022.

<sup>11</sup> Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics. 2021.

<sup>12</sup> National Council for Women. 2017. [National Strategy for the Empowerment of Egyptian Women 2030](#).

programs. In its Cooperation Framework with the Government of Egypt, WFP aligned its climate change and resilience building programme with Egypt's Vision 2030, the 2023–2027 government action program, national strategies, Presidential initiatives, and most importantly Haya Kareema, the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) for 2023–2027, and the regional resilience plan.

## 3.2. Subject of the evaluation

19. The subject of this activity evaluation is the smallholder's climate resilience portfolio of the WFP Egypt CO in the period 2021- 2025.

20. Since 2021, WFP has been supporting smallholders communities of Egypt in the face of climate change through several integrated activities including awareness and knowledge of climate-related risks and adaptation measures, reducing losses due to extreme weather, highlighting innovative and sustainable irrigation techniques, introducing adaptive crop production techniques, maximizing benefits from agro-waste and value addition, diversification of livelihoods, enhancing market access and building institutional capacity both at community and policy level. It also introduced gender transformative approaches that also encourage women's participation and empowerment while being compatible with local traditions and norms.

21. These activities primarily targeted smallholder communities in Luxor, Aswan, Sohag, Assiut, Qena and Sharkia and were implemented through several projects funded by the Government of Netherlands, the Adaptation Fund of the UNFCCC, BMZ, and the Coca Cola Fund.

22. Two of the main projects of the Portfolio in terms of the introduction of new activities as well as extension to a wider geographical scope were the "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through Livelihood Enhancement and Rural Innovation funded by the Government of the Netherlands and the "Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region- Phase 2" Project funded by the Adaptation Fund of the UNFCCC.

### 3.2. a. The "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through Livelihood Enhancement and Rural Innovation Project

23. WFP started in late 2020 the implementation of the "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through Livelihood Enhancement and Rural Innovation" project in collaboration with the Government of Egypt. It aimed to 1) build resilience and livelihoods of vulnerable rural communities in Southern Egypt and 2) build institutional capacity at the central and local levels for upscaling and sustaining interventions in Southern Egypt. The project was funded by the Government of the Netherlands with a budget of EUR 8 million over 4 years.

24. In 2021 WFP launched Phase II implementation of the "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through Livelihood Enhancement and Rural Innovation" project in collaboration with the Government of Egypt which aims to build on the work started in Phase I by focusing on digital transformation, access to financial services, and agro-waste management. Phase II has a budget of EUR 4 million over 4 years.

25. In June 2024, WFP and the Netherlands Embassy agreed to extend the two phases until 30 August 2025, as well as integrate the reporting for both phases in a joint report.

26. The two phases of the project targeted 60 villages in the five Governorates: Luxor, Aswan, Sohag, Assiut and Qena, directly benefitting a total of 92,000 smallholder farmers and indirectly 460,000 community members.

27. Phase 1 of the project is comprised of two outcomes:

**Outcome 1 Resilience built and livelihoods of vulnerable rural communities in Southern Egypt supported.**

Activities under this component include:

- Community mobilisation throughout the implementation period and raising awareness of the project. It aims at attracting beneficiaries to new interventions, expand to new villages, present possible mechanisms to ensure food security and encourage adoption of the interventions, particularly in the early stages.
- Support farmers increase their crop production by promoting land consolidation practices, improved agricultural techniques to optimize resource use and use of improved high-quality inputs.
- Improved irrigation water management through a set of hard as well as soft interventions that help farmers reduce their water consumption in irrigating their crops and maximise returns.
- Provision of early warning messages to help farmers reduce losses in cases of foreseen extreme weather spells through establishment of climate information centres in target villages.
- Diversification of smallholder families' livelihoods through supporting small-scale animal production.

**Outcome 2: Institutional capacity at the central and local levels built for upscaling and sustaining interventions in Southern Egypt.**

Activities under this component include:

- Capacity building of government staff, local partner NGOS/CDAs and local academic institutions to allow them to sustain the different activities at the village level and upscaling to other villages through training and integration of the different interventions in their planning and extension services, in curricula of local academic institutions (universities and secondary agricultural schools), etc.
- Documentation and dissemination of knowledge and lessons generated through different specialized media channels, with the aim of wide outreach to farmers, rural inhabitants and other stakeholders.

28. Phase II builds on the work conducted under Phase I to complement the agricultural, irrigation, and livelihood activities and work on post-harvest phases including agro-processing, agro-waste management, value-chain development, and institutional capacity building. The combination of Phase I and Phase II of the "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through Livelihood Enhancement and Rural Innovation in Southern Egypt" activities provide a comprehensive project that covers the food value chain for the smallholder farmer in the 60 villages in Upper Egypt from plantation to value addition and waste. Phase II includes 3 main outcomes:

**Outcome 1: Bioconversion techniques for enhanced sustainability of agricultural waste management and environmental safeguards introduced.**

This aims to introduce bioconversion techniques and innovative waste management practices to enhance the sustainability of agricultural production while simultaneously reducing environmental impacts and improving the livelihoods of smallholder farmers. Activities under this component include:

- Production of animal fodder using agricultural wastes, such as green silage and nutrient-rich alternative fodder. These efforts aimed to transform agricultural residues, like sugar cane and maize straw, into valuable resources for livestock feed, thus reducing the dependency on traditional fodder and optimizing the use of available resources.
- Introduction of composting techniques to manage organic waste effectively and turn it into organic fertilizers that can substitute chemical alternatives while increasing land productivity and crop quality.
- Establishment of pilot units of anaerobic digestion technology to produce biogas from agricultural waste, providing renewable energy and reducing the reliance on fossil fuels. The units also provide organic fertilizers that the beneficiary can use to substitute chemical alternatives. Demonstration units were established to showcase the benefits of biogas, with plans for scaling up through revolving loans.
- Introduction of briquetting technology to convert agricultural waste into briquettes that can be used as alternative fodder for livestock, offering an alternative to buying fodder while creating employment opportunities for local youth.

- In Aswan and Luxor, where date palm waste is abundant, the project established pilot units to process palm waste into products such as handicrafts and wood sheets. This initiative not only aimed to reduce environmental pollution caused by the burning of palm waste but also sought to empower women by involving them in the production and marketing of these products.

#### **Outcome 2: Access to Financial Services for Smallholder Farmers**

This outcome focuses on improving smallholder farmers' access to financial services, enabling them to increase productivity, manage risks, and enhance their resilience to economic and environmental shocks. Recognizing the challenges faced by farmers in Upper Egypt in accessing formal financial services, the project aimed to bridge this gap by promoting financial literacy and introducing innovative financial solutions. Activities under this component include:

- Facilitating financial awareness sessions targeting both smallholder farmers and CDAs. These programs focused on enhancing financial literacy, helping farmers understand the risks and benefits associated with financial products, and the currently available financial products.
- Collaborating with private sector partners to onboard beneficiaries on the AgriMisr platform, an online marketplace that allowed farmers to buy and exchange goods, access financial services, and participate in digital transactions. By connecting smallholder farmers to this platform, the project aimed to integrate them into broader market systems, providing them with better access to inputs and services at more competitive prices.

#### **Outcome 3: Digitalization, Institutional Capacity Building, and Knowledge Management**

This outcome aims to leverage digital tools and advanced technologies to improve agricultural practices, water management, and institutional capacity building. This outcome was critical in supporting the sustainable development of rural communities by enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of agricultural interventions. Activities under this component include:

- Provision of advanced and tailored advice and introduced digital solutions on good agricultural practices (GAP), focusing on key crops and utilizing satellite data to optimize water usage. Demonstration plots were established in selected villages to showcase drip irrigation techniques, with water management tools integrated into the project's digital platforms to provide real-time advice to farmers.
- Strengthening the capacities of Community Development Associations (CDAs) into viable small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Through detailed assessments and tailored support packages, the project aimed to professionalize these local service providers, enabling them to sustain their operations independently. This included providing training on business operations, client segmentation, and marketing strategies, as well as supporting them in setting up a help desk for ongoing support.
- Strengthening the institutional capacities of CDAs and government officials and improving market access for smallholder farmers by conducting value chain analyses and stakeholder consultation workshops and building partnerships with market actors and export markets.

This project is hereafter referred to as the "Dutch Project".

### **3.2.b The Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region-Phase 2 Project**

29. WFP and the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR) started responding to climate impacts on agriculture and livelihoods of Upper Egypt in 2013 through the 'Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region' Project. Funded by the Adaptation Fund, this project aimed to improve the adaptive capacity of the Southern zone (the governorates) in the face of climate-induced reduction in food production.

30. The 'Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region' was completed in April 2020 and proved a highly successful model for supporting vulnerable villages in Southern Egypt.

31. Building on the success of this project a second phase to further extend climate resilience among vulnerable smallholders' communities in the region was developed. The "Building Resilient Food Security

Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region- Phase 2" project (15 September 2021 – 15 September 2025) aimed to replicate interventions that proved to be successful in building climate resilience in 15 new villages throughout the Governorates of Southern Egypt, namely Assuit, Sohag, Qena, Luxor and Aswan. Selecting villages in districts not covered by Phase 1 aimed to widen the outreach and allow for further replication, magnifying the impact potential of the intervention.

32. The Phase 2 project was also to leverage the trust and capacities that Phase 1 has managed to build to introduce two new adaptation interventions (intensifying production through plastic-covered tunnels and diversifying production through the introduction of aquaculture) that would widen the scope of resilience and contribute to strengthened adaptive capacity within the zone.

33. Phase 2 project also aimed to generate more knowledge, and document new lessons learnt and best practices on climate resilience building and enhancing food security of vulnerable communities in the face of climate threats.

34. To fulfil the objectives, the project has two components and 9 outputs and is expected to reach 33,850 men and 32,700 women beneficiaries as demonstrated in the below table:

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target
The resilience of Southern Egypt farming communities built in the face of climate change and variability risks to food security	The proportion of Southern Egypt farming communities that are more climate resilient through adoption of adaptation techniques	40%	70%
<b>Outcome One:</b> Enhanced resilience of target rural communities in Southern Egypt in the face of anticipated climate impacts on food production through knowledge and technology transfer.	Percentage of target communities in Southern Egypt demonstrating knowledge of climate change and variability and means to reduce risk to their livelihoods.	77%	100%
<b>Output 1.1.</b> Community-level mobilization and climate adaptation planning	Number of people participating in awareness sessions and mobilized to participate in project activities in targeted communities	125,000 (70,000 men and 55,000 women)	195,000 (107,250 men and 87,750 women)
<b>Output 1.2.</b> Establishment of an early warning system for loss reduction	Number of functioning early warning units established	49	59

	Number of people using the system	200,000	300,000
<b>Output 1.3.</b> Introduction and use of water-saving irrigation	Number of acres benefiting from improved irrigation efficiency using low-cost solutions	8000	11,000
	Number of water users' associations established and operationalized	100	150
<b>Output 1.4.</b> Adaptation in cultivation and crop diversification promoted	Number of people, disaggregated by sex, benefiting from demonstration farms, enhanced extension services, and farm-to-farm visits to enhance their resilience and reduce climate risks	37,000 (90% men)	47,000 (90% men and 10% women)
<b>Output 1.5.</b> Building resilience through livestock and poultry production	No. of men and women trained on risk reduction in small ruminants and poultry; animal nutrition or alternative fodder production	30,000 (90% women)	50,000 (10% men and 90% women)
	Number of men and women benefiting from small loans	30,000 (90% women)	50,000 (10% men and 90% women)
<b>Output 1.6.</b> Introduction of aquaculture	Number of aquaculture units established	Currently there are no small or large aquaculture units established	5 medium size and 100 small size aquaculture units established
	Number of men and women trained on fish production at established aquaculture units	Currently there are no demonstration and training units available	730 men and 370 women trained

<b>Output1.7</b> Introduction of plastic-covered tunnels for intensifying production	Number of plastic-covered tunnels established	Currently there are no small or large plastic-covered tunnels	30 plastic-covered tunnels established
	Number of men and women trained on production and harvesting of vegetables in plastic-covered tunnels	Currently there are no demonstration or training units available	75 men and 75 women trained
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Climate adaptation institutionalized in government and non-governmental stakeholders' practices	Number of key institutions with enhanced capacities to deliver services for climate risk reduction in rural communities	49 NGOs and 20 governmental with capacities to deliver services for climate risk reduction	64 NGOs and 30 governmental entities develop needed capacities
<b>Output 2.1.</b> Capacity building of governmental staff and local academic institutions	Number of capacity-strengthening activities for government staff facilitated by the Project	30	60
	Number of officials engaged in capacity-strengthening activities, disaggregated by sex	800	1,600
	Number of capacity-strengthening activities to schools and universities facilitated by the Project	50	70
	Number of students engaged in capacity- strengthening activities, disaggregated by sex	1,000 male and 1,000 female students	3,000 (1,500 males and 1,500 females)
<b>Output 2.2.</b> lessons learned, and best practices documented and disseminated	Number of knowledge materials produced on risk reduction in agriculture	18 (8 documentaries and 10 flyers/booklets)	33
	Number of success stories documented	4	6
	Number of online messages	50	100

	Number of TV and radio programs aired	10	15
	Number of social media channels established/used	7	10
	Number of events organized and presentations made	20	40

Phase II of the AF project (15 September 2021 – 15 September 2025) is hereafter referred to as the “AF Project”.

### 3.2.c The Other Projects of the Portfolio

35. The BMZ project aimed to replicate the activities of the Dutch project in other villages in Sohag, Luxor, Aswan and at, a much less scale, in Sharkia. The Coca Cola fund aimed to pilot a modern irrigation system in one crop (sugar cane) in one village in Luxor.

36. With the AF and Dutch projects being principal in the Portfolio, their evaluation, along with minor add-ons of addition of visits to 3-4 villages ( where the Coca Cola model is implemented and where BMZ operated but they do not operate) would enable the evaluation of the entirety of the portfolio.

## 4. Evaluation scope, criteria and questions

### 4.1. 3.1 Scope of The Evaluation

37. Building on these two projects and the findings of previous evaluations (mid-term and Final Evaluation of the AF Phase 1 Project and mid-term Evaluation of the Dutch Project), the evaluation shall focus on assessing the climate adaptation interventions of the WFP Egypt Office between 2021-2025. The scope of the evaluation extends to cover the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coherence, adaptive management, equity, human and ecological sustainability and security of the two projects. It will cover the geographical area the two projects have operated to date, namely 75 villages in the governorates of Sohag, Assiut, Qena, Luxor and Aswan. It will also include, but to a much lesser extent, Sharkia, where the Dutch project was replicated through the BMZ project.

38. In addition, the scope of the evaluation shall include assessing:

- a. the impact of the activities of the Portfolio on promoting gender equality and women's empowerment within the targeted communities.
- b. the economic feasibility of specific interventions, through a cost-benefit analysis of specific activities carried out through this project. These assessments would highlight the effectiveness, sustainability, and return on investment. Examples of questions to be answered include but are not limited to: rate of productivity increase per feddan with all inputs, cost of land rehabilitation per feddan, agro-waste bioconversion activities, agro-processing activities, and in-kind loans. These in-depth analyses (short case studies) of the impact and sustainability of specific project activities will be used as a blueprint for subsequent project proposals and activities.



- c. the climate-related impact of the portfolio activities by calculating the reduction of carbon emissions and water savings because of different activities such as the introduction of modern irrigation and other good agricultural practices.
- d. access to clean energy for beneficiaries as a result of the different activities such as the introduction of solar pumping stations and biogas units.

39. To comply with donor requirements regarding project reporting, the scope of the evaluation shall cover the production of two distinct evaluation reports, one for the two main projects detailed above (the Dutch and the AF projects) and one for the portfolio. The report for the AF should include a rating of the project using the AF's rating scale.

40. The evaluation should comply with the WFP and the Adaptation Fund's [Evaluation Principles](#) and can rely on the Adaptation Fund [guidance notes](#). Based on the findings on these two projects, along with an additional look into the Dutch model in 2-3 villages in Sharkia and the Coca Cola Fund pilot in one village in Luxor, the evaluation will enable WFP to draw lessons on its smallholders' climate portfolio and accordingly develop a third expected report for the Portfolio. This report would rely primarily on a synthesis from the AF and Dutch projects, along with the mentioned additional visits to 3-4 villages in Sharkia and Luxor.

## 4.2. 3.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

41. The evaluation will apply the international criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, Coherence, Coverage and Scalability. It will also look into the equity, human and ecological sustainability and security of the portfolio. Gender equality and empowerment of women will be mainstreamed throughout the evaluation and be integrated in the analysis linked to all evaluation questions.

42. To address the learning objective, the evaluation will answer the following main questions:

- To what extent is the design of the Project relevant to the local context over its lifetime, and is it contributing to strengthening climate resilience of food systems as intended?
- What are the general and specific effects (food security, resilience/income) that the Project has had, or is likely to have, on the targeted population?
- To what extent are the benefits of the Project expected to last/expand after major assistance ceased?
- For example: rate of productivity increase per feddan with all inputs, cost of land rehabilitation per feddan, agro-waste bioconversion activities, agro-processing activities, and in-kind loans.
- To what extent has the Project activities been adopted by non-beneficiaries in the targeted communities? For example: neighbouring smallholder farmers adopting the model, beneficiaries building their own models based on the Project models and activities
- How well does the intervention fit?

43. To address the accountability objective, the evaluation will address the following key questions,

- Are the benefits of the intervention shared fairly between groups and geographies?
- Does the intervention make evidence-based decisions
- Does the intervention affect the ability of human and natural systems to support the equitable life of all species on the planet? Is the intervention sensitive to conflict and fragility?

44. 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.

45. The questions are summarised in Table 2 and will 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 (learning) and performance of the two Projects and the Portfolio (accountability), with a view to informing future strategic and operational decisions.

**Table 2: Evaluation questions and criteria**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>
Relevance	KEQ 1 - To what extent is the design of the Projects relevant to the local context over its lifetime, and is it contributing to strengthening climate resilience of food systems as intended?
Efficiency	KEQ 2 – To what extent were the projects implemented in the most efficient way to deliver their objectives?
Effectiveness	KEQ 3a- To what extent were the intended objectives of the Projects achieved (or are likely to be achieved), and did it result in unintended outcomes?  KEQ 3b – What was the return on investment overall and for specific activities?
Impact	KEQ 4 – What are the general and specific effects (food security, resilience/income) that the Project has had, or is likely to have, on the targeted population?
Sustainability of the activities	KEQ 5 - To what extent are the activities and benefits of the Projects expected to last/expand after major assistance ceased?  For example: rate of productivity increase per feddan with all inputs, cost of land rehabilitation per feddan, agro-waste bioconversion activities, agro-processing activities, and in-kind loans.
Scalability	KEQ 6 – To what extent have the Projects’ activities been adopted by non-beneficiaries in the targeted communities?  For example: neighbouring smallholder farmers adopting the model, beneficiaries building their own models based on the models and activities introduced
Coherence	KEQ 7- How well does the intervention fit?
Equity	KEQ 8- Are the benefits of the interventions shared fairly between groups and geographies?
Adaptive management	KEQ 9- Do the interventions make evidence-based decisions
Human and ecological sustainability and security	KEQ-10- Do the interventions affect the ability of human and natural systems to support the equitable life of all species on the planet? Are the interventions sensitive to conflict and fragility?

# 5. Methodological approach and ethical considerations

## 5.1. Evaluation approach

46. The methodology will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ the relevant evaluation criteria above
- Apply an evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints
- Ensure through the use of mixed methods that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholder groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used

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

48. The methodology should 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 considered. The methodology should ensure that primary data collected is disaggregated by sex and age; an explanation should be provided if this is not possible.

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

50. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations must reflect gender and equity analysis as appropriate within the context of the subject of evaluation. The findings should include a discussion on intended and unintended effects of the intervention, including along gender equality and equity dimensions. The report should provide lessons/ challenges/recommendations for conducting gender and equity-responsive evaluations in the future.

51. The following mechanisms for independence and impartiality will be employed: the evaluation team will work independently in the design and implementation of the evaluation, final decisions on and approval of evaluation products will be made by the evaluation committee; and an evaluation reference group will review and provide feedback, in relation to data collection and the methodology.

52. The evaluation team will expand on the methodology presented above and develop a detailed evaluation matrix in the inception report.

## 5.2. Preliminary considerations on evaluability and methodological implications

53. There are no foreseen impediments in seeking primary data. Additionally, secondary information is abundant. The main source of data for evaluation will include Project Reports, Annual Country Reports (ACR) for 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, the WFP Egypt Country Strategic Plans (CSP 2018-2023) and (CSP 2023-

2028), and the mid-term evaluation report for Phase I, July 2023. In addition, the evaluation team will have access to program plans, periodic reports from cooperating partners, and monitoring reports on activities and outputs. All data on outputs is disaggregated by gender.

54. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will be expected to critically assess data availability, quality and gaps expanding on the information provided above. This assessment will inform the data collection and the choice of evaluation methods. The evaluation team will need to systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data during the reporting phase.

### 5.3. Ethical considerations

55. The evaluation must conform to [UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation](#) (Integrity, Accountability, Respect, Beneficence<sup>13</sup>). Accordingly, the evaluation team is responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation process. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting personal data and privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of stakeholders (the evaluators have the obligation to safeguard sensitive information that stakeholders do not want to disclose to others), ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of respondents, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups), ensuring appropriate and inclusive representation and treatment of the various stakeholder groups in the evaluation process (and that sufficient resources and time are allocated for it), and ensuring that the evaluation results do no harm to respondents or their communities.

56. Personal data<sup>14</sup> will be processed in accordance with principles of fair and legitimate processing; purpose specification; proportionality and necessity (data minimization); necessary retention; accuracy; confidentiality; security; transparency; safe and appropriate transfers; and accountability.

57. The evaluation team 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.

58. Should the evaluators uncover allegations of wrongdoing and misconduct in the implementation of a programme either by a WFP staff or a partner (including fraud, food diversions, misuse of WFP assets, harassment, sexual harassment, etc), the evaluation team should report those allegations to WFP Office of Inspection and Investigation (OIGI) through WFP hotline (<http://www.wfpHotline.ethicspoint.com>)<sup>15</sup>. At the same time, commission office management and the REU should also be informed.

22. The commissioning office has ensured that the evaluation team and evaluation manager will not have been and/or are not currently involved in the design, implementation or financial management of the WFP climate resilience portfolio in the period 2021-2025, have no vested interest, nor have any other potential or perceived conflicts of interest.

59. Conflicts of interest are typically identified by a lack of independence or a lack of impartiality. These conflicts occur when a primary interest, such as the objectivity of an evaluation, could be influenced by a secondary interest, such as personal considerations or financial gains (UNEG 2020 Guidelines). There should be no official, professional, personal or financial relationships that might cause, or lead to a perception of bias in terms of what is evaluated, how the evaluation is designed and conducted, and the findings presented. A conflict of interest can also occur when, because of possibilities for future contracts, the evaluator's ability to provide an impartial analysis is compromised. Cases of upstream conflict of

---

<sup>13</sup> Beneficence means striving to do good for people and planet while minimizing harms arising from evaluation as an intervention.

<sup>14</sup> Names or identifying information from evaluation participants (e.g. interviewees, survey respondents).

<sup>15</sup> For further information on how to apply the [UNEG norms and standards](#) in each step of the evaluation, the evaluation team can also consult the [Technical Note on Principles, Norms and Standards for evaluations](#).

interest are those in which consultants could influence the analysis or recommendations so that they are consistent with findings previously stated by themselves. Cases of downstream conflict of interest are those in which evaluators could artificially create favourable conditions for consideration in future assignments (e.g. making recommendations for additional work with aim of being contracted to conduct that work). The potential for bias increases when an evaluator's work is solely focused on one agency. During the evaluation process, the evaluators are not allowed to have another contract with the evaluand/ unit subject to evaluation. To avoid conflicts of interest, particular care should be taken to ensure that independence and impartiality are maintained.

60. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the [2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#), including the Pledge of Ethical Conduct, the 2014 Guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation as well as the [WFP technical note on gender](#). The evaluation team and individuals who participate directly in the evaluation at the time of issuance of the purchase order ( or individual contracts) are expected to sign a confidentiality agreement and a commitment to ethical conduct.<sup>16</sup> These templates will be provided by the country office when signing the contract.

## 5.4. Quality assurance

61. 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.

62. 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.

63. The WFP evaluation manager will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation progresses as per the [DEQAS Process Guide](#) and for conducting a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their finalization. There will be several rounds of reviews and feedback until draft deliverables are up to the expected quality.

64. To enhance the quality and credibility of DEs, an outsourced quality support (QS) service directly managed by the OEV reviews the draft ToR, the draft inception and evaluation reports, and provides a systematic assessment of their quality from an evaluation perspective, along with recommendations.

65. The evaluation manager will share the assessment and recommendations from the quality support service with the team leader, who will address the recommendations when finalizing the inception and evaluation reports. To ensure transparency and credibility of the process in line with the [UNEG norms and standards](#)<sup>17</sup>, a rationale should be provided for comments that the team does not take into account when finalizing the report.

66. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the data collection, synthesis, analysis and reporting phases.

67. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the directive on disclosure of information [WFP Directive CP2010/001 on information](#)

---

<sup>16</sup> If there are changes in the evaluation team or a sub-contracting for some of the planned evaluation activities, the confidentiality agreement and ethics pledge should also be signed by those additional members.

<sup>17</sup> [UNEG](#) Norm #7 states “that transparency is an essential element that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability”

[disclosure.](#)

68. WFP expects that all deliverables from the evaluation team are subject to a thorough quality assurance review by the evaluation firm in line with the WFP evaluation quality assurance system prior to submission of the deliverables to WFP. In case evaluators are contracted directly as individuals, the team leader is responsible for thorough QA before submission of drafts.

69. 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.

## 6. Organization of the evaluation

### 6.1. Phases and deliverables

**[Include an indicative time frame, including milestones/deadlines; and highlight deliverables for each stage. Ensure a reasonable amount of time is provided for each phase. See DEQAS Process Guide and Annex 2 for further details.]**

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

**Table 3 Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones**

Main phases	Indicative timeline	Tasks and deliverables	Responsible
1. Preparation	March 2025	Preparation of ToR Final ToR Selection of the evaluation team & contracting  Library of key documents	Evaluation manager
2. Inception	<b>April 2025</b>	Document review/ briefing Inception mission [in person or remote] Inception report	Evaluation team
3. Data collection	<b>May 2025</b>	Fieldwork  Exit debriefing	Evaluation team
4. Reporting	<b>May-August 2025</b>	Data analysis and report drafting Comments process  Final evaluation reports	Evaluation team/Evaluation Manager

5. Dissemination and follow-up	<b>September- November 2025</b>	Management response  Dissemination of the evaluation report	Evaluation team/Evaluation Manager
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

## 6.2. Evaluation team composition

71. The evaluation team is expected to include 2-6 members, including the team leader, with a mix of national/regional and international evaluator(s) with relevant expertise. To the extent possible, the evaluation will be conducted by a gender, geographically, culturally and linguistically diverse and balanced team who can effectively cover the areas of evaluation. The evaluation team should have good knowledge of gender, equity, wider inclusion issues and, to the extent possible, power dynamics. It will have strong methodological competencies in designing feasible data collection and analysis as well as synthesis and reporting skills. At least one team member should have demonstrated recent experience with WFP evaluation. At least one team member should have relevant subject matter expertise.

**Table 4: Summary of evaluation team and areas of expertise required**

	Expertise required
<b>Team Leadership (Senior level evaluator)</b>	<b>MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent team management skills (coordination, planning, ability to resolve problems and deliver on time).</li> <li>• Strong experience in leading evaluations at country level, such as evaluations of agricultural development, climate resilience, livelihoods, or rural socio-economic.</li> <li>• Experience with applying the approach proposed in section 5.1 including reconstruction, and use of theories of change in evaluations</li> <li>• Strong presentation skills and excellent writing and synthesis skills.</li> <li>• Experience facilitating in-person and hybrid meetings and workshops.</li> <li>• Experience in the development contexts.</li> </ul>
	<b>DESIRABLE</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with WFP programmes and modalities of intervention.</li> <li>• Good knowledge of country context, proved by previous experience in the country.</li> <li>• Previous experience leading or conducting WFP evaluation(s).</li> <li>• Good knowledge of gender, equity, wider inclusion issues and, to the extent possible, power dynamics</li> </ul>

	Expertise required
Thematic expertise - Evaluator	<b>MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluency and excellent writing skills in Arabic</li> <li>Demonstrable analytical skills relevant to rural socio-economic development or rural agricultural development</li> <li>Experience in development contexts.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prior experience in evaluating design, implementation, outputs, and outcomes.</li> </ul> <b>DESIRABLE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiarity with WFP programmes and modalities of intervention.</li> <li>Previous experience leading or conducting WFP evaluation(s).</li> <li>Good knowledge of country context, proved by previous experience in the country.</li> <li>Good knowledge of gender, equity, wider inclusion issues and, to the extent possible, power dynamics</li> <li>Administrative and logistical experience</li> </ul>
Quality assurance Evaluator	<b>MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in quality assurance of evaluations.</li> </ul>
	<b>DESIRABLE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiarity with WFP programmes and modalities of intervention.</li> <li>Previous experience with WFP evaluation(s).</li> </ul>

72. 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 and Arabic 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.

73. 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).

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

### 6.3. Roles and responsibilities

74. The WFP Egypt CO **management** (Director or Deputy Director) will take responsibility to:

- Assign an evaluation manager for the evaluation Ithar Khalil, Head of the M&E Unit
- Establish the internal evaluation committee (EC) and the evaluation reference group (ERG)
- Approve the final ToR, inception and evaluation reports
- Approve the evaluation team selection
- Ensure the independence and impartiality of the evaluation at all stages through EC and ERG
- 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 debriefings with internal and external stakeholders
- Oversee dissemination and follow-up processes, including the preparation of a management response to the evaluation recommendations.



75. The **evaluation manager** manages the evaluation process through all phases including:
- Acting as the main interlocutor between the evaluation team, represented by the team leader, the firm's focal point, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process
  - Drafting this evaluation Terms of Reference in consultation with key stakeholders
  - Identifying and contracting the evaluation team and preparing and managing the evaluation budget;
  - Preparing the terms of reference and schedule of engagement for the EC and ERG ;
  - 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;
  - Ensuring EC and ERG are kept informed on progress, and escalating issues to the EC as appropriate
  - Conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products.
  - Submit all drafts to the REU for second level quality assurance before submission for approval
76. An internal Evaluation Committee (EC) is formed to steer the evaluation process and ensure it is independent and impartial. [The roles and responsibilities of the EC include overseeing the evaluation process, making key decisions and reviewing evaluation products. Annex 3 provides further information on the membership/composition of the evaluation committee and roles and responsibilities.
77. The regional bureau will take responsibility to:
- Advise the evaluation manager and provide technical support to the evaluation throughout the process through the REU
  - Participate in discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the evaluation subject as required through the [name the technical units relevant for the subject of evaluation]
  - Provide comments on the draft ToR, inception and evaluation reports from a subject-contents perspective through the [name the relevant RB technical units]
  - Provide second level quality assurance of all evaluation products through the regional evaluation unit before they are approved
  - Support the preparation of a management response to the evaluation and track the implementation of the recommendations.
78. While Andrew Fefe, Evaluation Officer of the REU is the RB focal person for this DE and will perform most of the above responsibilities, other regional bureau-relevant technical staff may participate in the ERG and/or comment on evaluation products as appropriate.
79. Relevant WFP Headquarters divisions will take responsibility to:
- Discuss WFP strategies, policies or systems in their area of responsibility and subject of evaluation.
  - Comment on the evaluation TOR, inception and evaluation reports, as required.
80. **Other Stakeholders (National Government including relevant ministries, implementing partners / NGOs, partner UN agencies)** will provide information as needed by the Evaluation team.
81. **The Office of Evaluation (OEV).** OEV is responsible for overseeing WFP DE 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 REU, EM and Evaluation teams when required. Internal and external stakeholders and/or the evaluators are encouraged to reach out to the REU 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 or other risks to the credibility of the evaluation process

## 6.4 Security considerations

82. **Security clearance** where required is to be obtained from the WFP Egypt CO

- 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.

83. As per annex I of LTA agreement, companies are expected to travel to all relevant WFP programme countries, including those with hazardous contexts. Prior to company participation in a mini-bid and submission of proposal, the company is advised to check whether government restrictions are in place that prevent team members from travelling to countries/areas to carry out the services. If it is the case that government restrictions prevent team member travel, the company should not participate in the mini bid.

## 6.4. Communication

84. To ensure a smooth and efficient evaluation process and enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders throughout the process. This will be achieved by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders.. The evaluation team will propose/explore communication/feedback channels to appropriate audiences (including affected populations as relevant) during the inception phase.

85. Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation firm will make arrangements and include the cost in the budget proposal.

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

87. As per norms and 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. Following the approval of the final evaluation report, the evaluation will be published in WFP internal and public websites. The executive summary of the report is expected to be translated into Arabic.

88. Evaluators shall provide a copy of the evaluation reports that is free of personally identifiable information (PII) and proprietary information. Final versions of evaluation reports ready for publication should be accessible to persons with disabilities. For guidance on creating documents accessible to persons with disabilities, please see the following resources: <https://www.section508.gov/create/documents>; <https://www.section508.gov/create/pdfs>

## 6.5. Proposal

89. The offer will include a detailed budget for the evaluation, including consultant fees, travel costs and other costs (interpreters, etc.). The budget should be submitted as excel file separate from the technical proposal document.

90. Travel, communications and daily substance allowance during travel days should be budgeted for in the proposal to be submitted by the company.
91. Following the technical and financial assessment, an improved offer could be requested by WFP to the preferred bid(s) to better respond to the TOR requirements. WFP may conduct reference checks and interviews with proposed team members as part of the decision-making process and selection,
92. Please send any queries to [Ithar.Khalil@wfp.org](mailto:Ithar.Khalil@wfp.org) Head of the M&E unit of the CO.

# Annex 1. Map



# Annex 2. Indicative Timeline

	Phases, deliverables and timeline	Level of effort
<b>Phase 1 - Preparation (total duration: Recommended – 2.25 months)</b>		
EM	Desk review, draft ToR and quality assure (QA) using ToR QC	(2 weeks)
REU	Quality assurance by REU	
EM	Revise draft ToR based on feedback received	(3 days)
EM	Share draft ToR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS, if required	N/A
EM	Revise draft ToR based on DEQS and share with ERG	(3 days)
ERG	Review and comment on draft ToR	(1 day)
EM	Revise draft ToR based on comments received and submit final ToR to EC Chair	(3 days)
EM	Start recruitment process	(0.5 day)
EC Chair	<b>Approve the final ToR and share with ERG and key stakeholders</b>	(0.5 day)
EM	Assess evaluation proposals/ Conduct interviews and recommend team selection	(2 days)
EC Chair	<b>Approve evaluation team selection</b>	(0.5 day)
EM	Evaluation team contracting and PO issuance	(1 day)
<b>Phase 2 - Inception (total duration: Recommended – 1.75 months)</b>		
ET	Desk review of key documents	(5 days)
EM/ET	Inception briefings, with REU support as needed	(1-2 days)
ET	Inception mission in the country (if applicable)	(1 week)
ET	Draft inception report	(2 weeks)
EM	Quality assure draft IR by EM and REU using QC	(2 days)
ET	Revise draft IR based on feedback received by EM and REU	(2-3 days)
REU	Share draft IR with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS, if required	(0.5 day)
ET	Revise draft IR based on feedback received by DEQS	(2 days)
EM	Share revised IR with ERG	(0.5 day)
ERG	Review and comment on draft IR	(1 day)
EM	Consolidate comments	(0.5 day)
ET	Revise draft IR based on feedback received and submit final revised IR	(3 days)
EM	Review final IR and submit to the evaluation committee for approval	(2 days)
EC Chair	<b>Approve final IR and share with ERG for information</b>	(1 week)
<b>Phase 3 – Data collection (total duration: Recommended – 0.75 months)</b>		
ET	<b>Data collection</b>	(3 weeks)
ET	<b>In-country debriefing (s)</b>	(1.5 day)
<b>Phase 4 – Reporting (total duration: Recommended – 2.75-3 months)</b>		
ET	Draft 3 evaluation reports (Report 1 for Dutch Project, Report 2 for AF Project, synthesis report for Portfolio)	(4 weeks)
EM	Quality assurance of draft ER by EM and REU using the QC,	(2-3 days)

ET	Revise and submit draft ER based on feedback received by EM and REU	(2-3 days)
EM	Share draft ER with quality support service (DEQS) and organize follow-up call with DEQS, if required	(0.5 day)
ET	Revise and submit draft ER based on feedback received by DEQS	(2-3 days)
ERG	Review and comment on draft ER	(0.5 day)
ET	Learning workshop	(1 day)
EM	Consolidate comments received	(0.5 day)
ET	Revise draft ER based on feedback received	(2-3 days)
EM	Review final revised ER and submit to the evaluation committee	(2-3 days)
EC Chair	<b>Approve final evaluation report and share with key stakeholders</b>	(1 day)
<b>Phase 5 - Dissemination (total duration: Recommended – 1 month)</b>		
EC Chair	Prepare management response	(5 days)
EM	<b>Share final evaluation report and management response with the REU and OEV for publication and participate in end-of-evaluation lessons learned call</b>	(0.5 day)

# Annex 3. Role and composition of the evaluation committee

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

94. Composition: The evaluation committee will be composed of the following staff:

- The Country Director or Deputy Country Director (Chair of the Evaluation Committee)
- Evaluation manager (Evaluation Committee Secretariat)
- Head of Programme or programme officer(s) directly in charge of the subject(s) of evaluation
- Regional evaluation officer (REO)
- Country office monitoring and evaluation (M&E) officer (if different from the evaluation manager)
- Country office procurement officer (if the evaluation is contracted to a firm)
- HQ Climate Finance Team
- RBC Resilience Team

Evaluation Phase and engagement task	Estimate level of effort in days	Tentative Dates
<b>Preparation Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Select and establish ERG membership.</li> <li>• Reviews the revised draft ToR prepared by the EM</li> <li>• Approves the final TOR</li> <li>• Approves the final evaluation team and budget</li> </ul>	1 day	February-March 2025
<b>Inception Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief the evaluation team on the subject of the evaluation.</li> <li>• Inform evaluation design through discussions with the evaluators.</li> <li>• Support identifying field visit sites on the basis of selection criteria</li> <li>• Review the revised draft IR</li> <li>• Approve the final IR</li> </ul>	2 days	April 2025
<b>Data Collection Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Act as key informants: responds to interview questions</li> <li>• Facilitate access to sources of contextual information and data, and to stakeholders</li> <li>• Attend the end of field work debriefing(s) meeting</li> <li>• Support the team in clarifying emerging issues/gaps how to fill them</li> </ul>	2 days	May 2025
<b>Analysis and Reporting Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review final evaluation report after quality assurance by ET + EM</li> <li>• Approve the final ER</li> </ul>	2 days	August 2025
<b>Dissemination and Follow-up Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decide whether management agrees, partially agrees or does not agree with the recommendations and provides justification</li> <li>• Lead preparation of the management response to the evaluation recommendations</li> </ul>	2 days	November 2025

# Annex IV. Role, composition and schedule of engagement of the evaluation reference group

## [See TN Evaluation Reference Group]

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

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

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

## Composition [Adjust table as required]

Country office	Name
Core members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country Director or Deputy Country Director (Chair)</li> <li>• Evaluation Manager and Head of M&amp;E (secretary)</li> <li>• Head of Programme</li> <li>• CO Programme (smallholders' climate resilience)</li> <li>• Government</li> </ul>	Rossella Fanelli Ithar Khalil Amani Gamal El Din Safa Ashoub Dr. Aly Hozayen
Regional bureau	Name
Core members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Evaluation Officer</li> <li>• A member of the Regional Programme Unit</li> <li>• Regional Gender Adviser</li> </ul>	Andrew Fefe Aya Salah-Ahmed Yousri
Headquarters (optional)	Name



### Schedule of ERG engagement and Time commitments

[Below is a typical schedule for engaging the ERG. The EM should adjust the estimated level of effort to suit the context of the specific evaluation.]

Evaluation Phase and engagement task	Estimate level of effort in days	Tentative Dates
<b>Preparation Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and comment on the draft ToR</li> <li>• Where appropriate, provide input on the evaluation questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify source documents useful to the evaluation team</li> <li>• Attend ERG meeting/conference call etc</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>1 day</b>	<b>March 2025</b>
<b>Inception Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet with evaluation team to discuss how the evaluation team can design a realistic/practical, relevant and useful evaluation.</li> <li>• Identify and facilitate dialogues with key stakeholders for interviews</li> <li>• Identify and access documents and data</li> <li>• Help identify appropriate field sites according to selection criteria set up by the evaluation team in the inception report.</li> <li>• Review and comment on the draft Inception Report</li> </ul>	<b>1 days</b>	<b>April 2025</b>
<b>Data Collection Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Act as a key informant: respond to interview questions</li> <li>• Provide information sources and facilitate access to data</li> <li>• Attend the evaluation team's end of field work debriefing</li> </ul>	<b>2 days</b>	<b>May 2025</b>
<b>Analysis and Reporting Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and comment on the draft evaluation reports (Dutch in July, AF and Portfolio reports in August) focusing on accuracy, quality and comprehensiveness of findings, and of links to conclusions and recommendations.</li> </ul>	<b>2 days</b>	<b>July, August 2025</b>
<b>Dissemination and Follow-up Phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disseminate final report internally and externally, as relevant;</li> <li>• Share findings within units, organizations, networks, and at events;</li> <li>• Provide input to management response and its implementation</li> </ul>	<b>2 days</b>	<b>November 2025</b>

# Annex 5. Communication and knowledge management plan

97. The following plan summarizes the communication flow and the management of knowledge

Stakeholder (s)	Product	Communication mode	Timing
Members of the EC	Presentation of the Evaluation approach and deliverables, Evaluation TOR, Inception report, Final report	Committee Meetings, Circulations for review	At delivery of every product
Members of the ERG	Inception report, Final report	Meeting/circulation for review	At delivery of drafts
The Government of Egypt (Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Irrigation, etc)	Executive summary +infograph on key findings	Soft copy to be sent. Hard copies to be printed for dissemination in events	Completion of portfolio synthesis report
CO Communications and reporting teams	Executive summary +infograph on key findings	Soft copy to be sent. Hard copies to be printed for dissemination in events	Completion of Portfolio synthesis report
The AF of the UNFCCC	AF project - Evaluation report	Soft Copy to be sent	Completion of report of AF project
The Netherlands Government	Dutch Project-specific report	Soft copy to be sent	Completion of the report of the Dutch project
WFP OEV	Final report	Soft copy to be sent	Completion of Portfolio synthesis report
WFP regional and HQ resilience units	Final report, AF project - Evaluation report, Dutch Project-specific report	Soft copy to be sent	After each of the three reports

# Annex 6. Acronyms and abbreviations

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>ACR</b>	Annual Country Report
<b>CDA</b>	Community Development Association
<b>CO</b>	Country Office
<b>CSP</b>	Country Strategic Plan
<b>DE</b>	Decentralized Evaluation
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN
<b>IFAD</b>	International Fund for Agricultural Development
<b>LTA</b>	Long Term Agreement
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>OEV</b>	Office of Evaluation (of WFP)
<b>REU</b>	Regional Evaluation Unit (of WFP)
<b>TOR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UNIDO</b>	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

# Annex 7: Logical Framework

..\CSP 2023-2028\CSP\_Detailed\_Logframe\_FOR\_PRINT-OUT\_v1.09- September 2023-final version.xls

**Egypt Country Office**

**World Food Programme**

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70,  
00148 Rome, Italy - T +39 06 65131

**[wfp.org/independent-evaluation](https://wfp.org/independent-evaluation)**