Update of the WFP Evaluation Policy

Executive Board Informal Consultation

September 2021
Theory of Change

Enhancing use of evaluations
ENHANCING USE OF EVALUATIONS

NEW PROVISIONS
• A new outcome in the Theory of Change
• An Evaluation Advisory Panel *inter alia* to support introduction of innovative and agile approaches and methods to facilitate use

STRENGTHENING ESTABLISHED MECHANISMS
• Executive Board review of evaluation evidence and management responses
• WFP management reports to the Executive Board on follow up to centralised evaluation recommendations
• Procedures to ensure that evaluation evidence is incorporated into policies, strategies, plans and programmes
• Implementing the WFP Evaluation Communications and Knowledge Management Strategy
ENHANCING USE OF EVIDENCE: THE EVALUATION FUNCTION AS A LEARNING PARTNER

STRONGER COLLABORATION WITHIN WFP

• Working with Headquarters Divisions to embed evaluation evidence into corporate knowledge management systems and learning

• Supporting Regional Bureaux to share learning and evidence from evaluation across the region
  • E.g. Evidence learning events

• Finding ways to develop stronger collaboration on learning at all levels of the evaluation function

CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL AND REGIONAL EVALUATION AND EVIDENCE PARTNERSHIPS
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Theory of Change
- Enhancing use of evaluations
Coverage Norms

Scenarios for decentralized evaluation

Criteria guiding decision-making
• Norms for centralised evaluations will remain the same as in the previous policy and updated through the AER

• The coverage for Impact Evaluations will continue to be determined based on evidence priorities and capacity

• Country Strategic Plan evaluation coverage remains at a CSPE per cycle, but will be reviewed as part of the CSP policy evaluation

• Finalisation of the scenario for decentralised evaluations will determine coverage norms

• Joint evaluations are likely to increase as a proportion of all evaluations; there is potential for more system-wide evaluations
PROGRESS TO DATE

• Coverage projections as of 2016 Corporate Evaluation Strategy

• Actuals for 2016 and 2018 based on completed evaluations

• Significant progress on coverage based on the expectations of the 2016 policy

• Minimum coverage for decentralized evaluations not yet achieved

* Including all evaluations completed and planned to be completed in 2021, as well as all ongoing decentralized evaluations/planned to start within 2021. Impact evaluations are multi-year (ongoing in 2021)
SCENARIOS FOR DECENTRALIZED EVALUATION

• Confirmation to maintain current coverage in small country offices, leaving three options: status quo and two levels of enhanced coverage

• Proportion of joint evaluations is still difficult to calculate, but is unlikely to have a substantial effect on costs

• Some progress on UNSDCF system-wide evaluations through development of evaluation guidelines
Implications of scenarios for Decentralized Evaluations (2021 to 2030)

- **Status Quo**: at least one DE per CSP or ICSP cycle
- **Scenario 1**: for small and medium-sized offices: at least one DE per CSP or ICSP cycle. For large and very large offices: at least one DE every three years
- **Scenario 2**: increase in frequency for all country offices: at least one DE every three years
Evolution of evaluation function scenarios (2022 to 2030)
GUIDING DECISION MAKING FOR DECENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS

- Coverage norms indicate when certain types of evaluation should be undertaken.
- For decentralized evaluations, the policy proposes criteria to guide decision-making on what might be most useful to evaluate.
Criteria to guide decision-making for evaluations commissioned by Country Offices, Regional Bureaux or HQ Divisions

- Strategic relevance to WFP
- Evidence gaps (at the country, regional or global level)
- Programme expenditure
- Emergency response
- Before replication or scale-up of pilots, innovations, and prototypes
- Innovative results (e.g. achieved across a region or through innovative multi-country programmes that are centrally funded or supported)
- Formal commitments to stakeholders (e.g. to national partners to inform national programmes, or to funders as part of funding requirements)
- Likelihood of influencing policy making or potential for leveraging partnerships
- Feasibility of undertaking the evaluation
Financial Instruments

The Contingency Evaluation Fund

Costing the Function
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programme support and administrative budget</th>
<th>Programme resources country portfolio budget</th>
<th>Multi-donor trust fund (donor contributions)</th>
<th>Multilateral Contingency Evaluation Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized evaluation oversight:</td>
<td>Decentralized evaluation conduct and management (staff time): implementation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support country offices that face genuine resource constraints in respect of planned and budgeted decentralized evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized evaluation conduct and management (OEV annual work plan)</td>
<td>Country strategic plan evaluation conduct: adjusted direct support costs (DSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support country offices that face genuine resource constraints for planned and budgeted CSP evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact evaluation conduct and management (OEV annual work plan)</td>
<td>Impact evaluation data collection costs</td>
<td>A dedicated multi-donor trust fund managed by OEV that channels donor resources to specific WFP impact evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support small country offices that face genuine resource constraints in respect of impact evaluation data collection costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV overall function responsibility (standards, oversight, reporting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINGENCY EVALUATION FUND

• Intended to meet genuine resource constraints (currently decentralized evaluation only)

• Expanded scope is agreed in principle
  • CSP evaluation funding gaps
  • For small Country Offices, data collection funding gaps for impact evaluations
  • Potentially, supporting regional multi-country or regionally led evaluations
  • Potentially, to fund scoping and preparation for CSP evaluations

• Eligibility and assessment criteria validates genuine nature of resource constraints
COSTING THE EVALUATION FUNCTION

• The costings for the evaluation function for 2023 give a floor for the financial target for the function: approximately USD 33.5 million which will range 0.4% to 0.5% of contribution income, depending on the organizational forecast.

• The ceiling will be determined based on the coverage norms (scenario) agreed for decentralized evaluations.

• Costs can be forecast around the different elements of the function:
  - Centralized evaluations
  - Impact evaluations
  - Decentralized evaluations based on scenarios
  - Human resource costs

• The ceiling is likely to be lower than other UN agencies given the specific nature of WFP’s work (i.e. proportion of general food assistance – common services).
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Financial Instruments
- The Contingency Evaluation Fund
- Costing the Function
ACRONYMS

AER: Annual Evaluation Report
CE: Centralized Evaluation
CSP: Country Strategic Plan
CSPE: Country Strategic Plan Evaluation
DE: Decentralized Evaluation
IAHE: Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation
ICSP: Interim Country Strategic Plan
SWE: System Wide Evaluation
Thank you!
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