

برنامج
الأغذية
العالمي



Programme
Alimentaire
Mondial

World
Food
Programme

Programa
Mundial
de Alimentos

**Executive Board
Annual Session**

Rome, 3–6 June 2014

EVALUATION REPORTS

Agenda item 7

*For information**



Distribution: GENERAL
WFP/EB.A/2014/7-D
5 May 2014
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE PEER REVIEW OF THE EVALUATION FUNCTION AT THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME

* In accordance with the Executive Board's decisions on governance, approved at the Annual and Third Regular Sessions, 2000, items for information should not be discussed unless a Board member specifically requests it, well in advance of the meeting, and the Chair accepts the request on the grounds that it is a proper use of the Board's time.

This document is printed in a limited number of copies. Executive Board documents are available on WFP's Website (<http://executiveboard.wfp.org>).

NOTE TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

This document is submitted to the Executive Board for information.

The Secretariat invites members of the Board who may have questions of a technical nature with regard to this document to contact the WFP staff focal point indicated below, preferably well in advance of the Board's meeting.

Director, OEV*: Ms H. Wedgwood tel.: 066513-2030

Should you have any questions regarding availability of documentation for the Executive Board, please contact the Conference Servicing Unit (tel.: 066513-2645).

* Office of Evaluation

Summary Report of the Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the World Food Programme

Peer Review Panel members:

- Colin Kirk, Director of Evaluation, United Nations Children's Fund (Chair)
- Henri Jorritsma, former Vice Chair of the Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Network and Deputy Director of the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands
- Susanne Frueh, Executive Secretary, United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (and member of the 2007 WFP Peer Panel)

Advisors to the panel:

- Simon Lawry-White, Senior Consultant
- Jessica Alexander, Consultant

Background to the Peer Review

1. The first Development Assistance Committee/United Nations Evaluation Group (DAC/UNEG) peer review of the evaluation function at WFP was conducted in 2007. The Executive Director of WFP agreed that a second peer review should take place in 2013–2014, following the standards agreed by the Joint DAC/UNEG Task Force on Peer Reviews.
2. The review's core assessment question was: Are WFP's evaluation policy, function and products independent, credible and useful for learning and accountability purposes, as assessed by a panel of professional evaluation peers against United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2005) and the evidence base? A peer review provides an opportunity for evaluation peers to learn from each other, to exchange experience on good practice in evaluation, especially across the United Nations system, and to consider together how the evaluation function of the organization reviewed can be enhanced. This is the constructive spirit in which the panel offers its findings and recommendations.
3. The Executive Director requested an extended review period to allow the panel to consider the evolving organizational changes in WFP. The panel therefore made two visits to WFP Headquarters in Rome in May 2013 and January 2014. The Chair of the panel will present its final report at the Annual Consultation on Evaluation in May 2014, and the Board will consider the management response to the report at its 2014 Second Regular Session.

Main Findings

4. *Climate for evaluation.* There appears to be an increasingly favourable climate for evaluation in WFP. Evaluation enjoys a good reputation and receives considerable attention from senior management and the Board. The central Office of Evaluation (OEV) has been strengthened over the past six years, in terms of its resourcing, professionalism, and the relevance and quality of its evaluation products. Since the arrival of the Executive Director in 2012, evaluation has been given further impetus by her focus on demonstrating results and accountability and enhancing monitoring, reporting and evaluation in WFP, as set out in the Framework for Action. In "Fit for Purpose", the Executive Director's statement of intent for reforms in WFP, she committed herself to improving monitoring, reporting and evaluation, supported by a field-based evaluation function. WFP's transition from food aid to food assistance is reinforced in the new WFP Strategic Plan (2014–2017), and is moving WFP away from tried and tested programming approaches to innovative and less proven strategies, making evaluation even more important as a means of demonstrating what works.

5. *Progress since the 2007 peer review.* WFP has made significant progress since the first peer review, especially with the approval of the 2008 evaluation policy,¹ which provides clearer safeguards for the independence of evaluation, better definition of the roles of OEV and other actors in evaluation, and formalization of a balanced evaluation programme. The implementation of a system of eliciting a management response to each OEV evaluation has increased management accountability for evaluation results, while senior management and the Board recognize that the development of a quality assurance system has increased the quality, credibility and ownership of OEV evaluations. However, the management response to the 2007 peer review included other commitments against which limited or no progress has been made: no evaluation strategy has been developed; although the 2008 policy attempted to clarify evaluation terminology, staff are still confused by it; the implementation of monitoring systems to provide reliable data for evaluations has been slow; a Board sub-committee on evaluation has not been formed (and the panel does not support the establishment of such a committee); and a programme for increasing country-level evaluation capacity was launched, but has not been sustained. While resources for evaluation have increased since 2007, the 2008 evaluation policy did not establish a formula for safeguarding the allocation of these resources.
6. *Monitoring and self-evaluation strategy.* In 2012, WFP developed a monitoring and self-evaluation (M&SE) strategy, which reflects the revised approach to results-based management and addresses evaluation issues beyond the scope of the current evaluation policy. The strategy makes commitments to developing a menu of evaluation tools, and reiterates the WFP policy commitment to undertaking at least one self-evaluation during the life of every operation, with the assumption that the necessary funding will come from project resources. The strategy gives the regional bureaux a clear role in the oversight of decentralized evaluation but does not explain how decentralized evaluation capacity is to be built. Roll-out of the M&SE strategy did not begin until 2013 and the strategy is currently undergoing further development, led by the Performance Management and Monitoring Division (RMP). Dropping of the term “self-evaluation” is being considered, and OEV, regional bureaux and RMP are trying to delineate their roles, which the M&SE strategy has not clarified. A successful monitoring strategy is important in rectifying the widely recognized lack of reliable monitoring data, which is required to enhance evaluation evidence. The M&SE strategy is not a substitute for an evaluation strategy.
7. *Office of Evaluation.* OEV provides WFP with a strong central evaluation unit that produces high-quality evaluations. The Office has been professionalized since the 2007 peer review and has established its functional independence. It has delivered reliably and to schedule on its demanding programme of work, conducting the portfolio of evaluations agreed in consultation with management and the Board. OEV has improved

¹ WFP/EB.2/2008/4-A

its strategic targeting, quality and communication of evaluations through tailored products, and evaluation evidence has informed the reformulation of corporate policy and strategy. Currently, the Director of OEV has no responsibility for decentralized evaluation, putting WFP out of step with comparator United Nations organizations that have both centralized and decentralized evaluation functions. The WFP Circular on appointment of the Director of OEV allows the Director to return to employment with WFP at the end of his/her term, which is also out of step with other United Nations organizations. The panel proposes that the Director of OEV's appointment be limited to a single, non-renewable term of six years.

8. *Engagement in evaluation.* OEV is increasingly engaging WFP management and staff in the evaluation process, especially at the start and end of evaluations, to increase ownership and improve the quality of evaluation reports, including their recommendations. OEV is also increasing the use of evaluation evidence to inform WFP decision-making. Without compromising its independence, OEV could support efforts to apply evaluation learning more fully in project design. There is also scope for greater engagement of national stakeholders in WFP country-level evaluations.
9. *Evaluation resources.* It is difficult for OEV to strike a balance among the various roles assigned to it by the evaluation policy. OEV has enjoyed significant budget increases since 2008, both in its regular budget and – since 2012 – via a special account set up to support a three-year (2013–2015) programme for reviving operation evaluations. Even so, demand considerably outstrips OEV's capacity to deliver. In consultation with senior management and the Board, OEV needs to clarify how much of its effort should go into conducting evaluations – and of which types – and how much into communicating evaluation results, strengthening evaluation across WFP, contributing to organizational learning, and engaging in inter-agency networks and system-wide evaluation. With its current programme of work, OEV cannot fulfil all of these roles with the resources at its disposal.
10. *Evaluation quality.* This review assessed the quality of 20 evaluation reports, including those for seven decentralized evaluations. While OEV evaluations were highly rated, the quality of decentralized evaluations was more varied, but was satisfactory to good overall. The Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) has played a major role in ensuring the consistently high quality of OEV evaluations and gives WFP perhaps the most comprehensive evaluation management and quality assurance process in the United Nations system. Despite these obvious benefits however, OEV is aware that EQAS may have become too onerous and needs to be simplified. Most OEV evaluations are now carried out via long-term agreements. According to OEV, this has increased unit costs, but not the average cost of evaluations; brought time savings for evaluation managers, especially in initiating evaluations; and widened the pool of available consultants.

11. *Management response to and follow-up on OEV evaluations.* The introduction of a management response system that makes management responsible for agreeing on, implementing and tracking responses represents an important step forward since the last peer review. The WFP system for tracking the implementation of management responses is one of the most systematic in the United Nations system, although – unlike the parallel audit tracking system – it is not available online. Some management responses to evaluation recommendations are formulaic, especially when recommendations and/or responsibility for follow-up are not clear. Some Board members are concerned that the impact of follow-up actions is not reported or validated.
12. *Decentralized evaluation.* Decentralized evaluation – evaluation not conducted by OEV – was a major topic of discussion during the peer review because, in contrast to centralized evaluation, its development has been neglected. The peer review and the Business Process Review (BPR) have prompted discussion about how, or whether, decentralized evaluation is to be enhanced. According to data collected by RMP, WFP country offices are conducting increasing numbers of evaluations, and the assessment of a small sample of decentralized evaluation reports showed that some evaluations managed by country offices are of a satisfactory or good standard. It is not known how well these reports are used, responded to by management, or followed up on, and WFP Headquarters has not systematically collected decentralized evaluations to analyse their quality, as some comparator United Nations agencies do. WFP does not track investment in evaluation at decentralized levels, and WFP financial reporting systems cannot provide this information. As part of the BPR, OEV and RMP have commissioned an assessment of decentralized evaluation capacity, which will show strengths and weaknesses in the planning, conducting and use of decentralized evaluations. WFP has seriously underestimated the effort required to establish and maintain a decentralized evaluation function and has invested much less in decentralized evaluation capacity than, for example, the United Nations Development Programme or the United Nations Children’s Fund. In Fit for Purpose, the Executive Director set out her agenda for organizational change and gave her commitment to establishing a field-based evaluation function. There is increased resolve to find sustainable means of financing decentralized evaluation, but WFP senior managers are not yet fully agreed that strengthening decentralized evaluation is the right strategy for WFP. Establishing an effective decentralized evaluation function may be the most challenging element of WFP’s future evaluation agenda.
13. *Operation evaluations.* Since 2008, WFP has not been meeting its annual policy targets for operation evaluations – 10 centralized and 20 decentralized. For 2013–2015, OEV has an ambitious programme of more than 60 operation evaluations, backed by a special account that draws on project funds, with the intention of progressively transferring the responsibility for operation evaluations to regional bureaux. Under the Executive Director’s commitment to field-level evaluation, OEV has obtained additional resources

for operation evaluations and has launched the first 12, working with regional bureaux and outsourcing much of the management to companies with long-term agreements. However, there is still insufficient planning of how regional bureaux can manage such evaluations after 2015, and most regional bureaux are not equipping themselves for the task.

14. *Regional bureaux.* The appointment of six regional monitoring and evaluation (M&E) advisers in 2013 is a positive step, but the advisers – and their Regional Directors – are clear that their main focus is on monitoring, although evaluation is part of their job description. The need to improve monitoring across WFP, including by rolling out the Country Office Monitoring and Evaluation Tool, will demand considerable efforts from country offices and regional bureaux. At least in the medium term, monitoring is likely to command far more attention than evaluation at regional bureaux, including from the regional M&E advisers. It may not be realistic to expect these advisers to manage operation evaluations using the OEV outsourced management model, and regional bureaux will require additional resources if they are to develop decentralized evaluation capacity in country offices. The BPR assessment of decentralized evaluation capacity will throw more light on these two issues.

Strategic Choices for the Future

15. Senior management should decide the most appropriate model for the evaluation function in WFP, and discuss this model with the Board. The panel proposes the following three alternative models as a basis for decision-making. These are discussed in detail in the full report:
 - ❖ *Model 1 – Centralized evaluation.* In model 1, WFP continues to look to OEV as the source of high-quality and impartial evaluation, with any decentralized evaluations seen as being internal lesson-learning exercises for the office concerned and providing a measure of accountability to donors. Decentralized evaluations receive limited support, with no expectation that OEV or regional bureaux will provide consistent support or quality assurance. The special account continues to fund OEV operation evaluations beyond 2015, but at a lower level than for the 2013–2015 series.
 - ❖ *Model 2 – Centralized evaluation plus demand-led decentralized evaluation.* Model 2 extends model 1 by adding OEV quality standards and guidance for decentralized evaluation; technical support from OEV and regional bureaux provided on demand to country offices commissioning evaluation to improve evaluation quality; and OEV reporting on the quality of decentralized evaluation reports. Regional bureaux generate annual regional plans for evaluation based on country offices' intentions and coordinated with OEV's programme of operation evaluations. (As in model 1, the latter continues at a reduced level after 2015.) There is no WFP-wide plan for resourcing, strengthening or systematizing the decentralized evaluation function. OEV is given the resources to establish a help desk and enhance the roster of evaluation consultants from which country offices can draw, in partnership with regional bureaux. Resources will be required for two

additional full-time professionals in OEV and one evaluation professional at each regional bureau.

- ❖ *Model 3 – Centralized and decentralized evaluation.* In model 3, WFP adopts an eight- to ten-year roadmap for expanding and enhancing the evaluation function at all levels, with regional bureaux supporting evaluations at the regional and country levels, through country-level evaluation officers and evaluation focal points, with backup from OEV. OEV has two full-time staff members dedicated to supporting decentralized evaluation, each regional bureau has a full-time regional evaluation adviser and country offices with large operations – for example, those projected to exceed USD 150 million per year – have dedicated evaluation officers. OEV assesses the quality of evaluations from all organizational levels. Decentralized evaluations are conducted according to set criteria and on a planned cycle agreed by the Regional Director in consultation with the Director of Evaluation.
16. Models 2 and 3 recognize the added value of decentralized evaluation; model 1 does not. Model 1 can be achieved within the current allocations to evaluation from the Programme Support and Administrative budget and special account, but would require reducing OEV's evaluation output by 10 to 20 per cent. Models 2 and 3 cannot be delivered within the current resource framework.
 17. All three models have advantages and disadvantages, and a case can be made for each of them. Model 1 is the most easily achieved because it is closest to the current situation. The panel prefers model 2 because it recognizes the reality and potential added value of decentralized evaluation and is in line with the Executive Director's intent set out in Fit for Purpose for the establishment of a field-based evaluation function. In many respects, model 3 represents an ideal model but requires investment in evaluation capacity at a level well beyond anything WFP has so far contemplated and for which there does not seem to be an appetite among senior management. The panel believes that establishing model 2 as a first step could produce measureable improvements in the quantity and quality of decentralized evaluations within two to three years. At that point, WFP could review progress and decide whether the greater investment in its decentralized evaluation function is generating sufficient value added to take the next major step in developing evaluation across WFP.
 18. The panel proposes that the Executive Management Group decide which model to follow in mid-2014, after the BPR assessment of decentralized evaluation capacity is complete. This decision will underpin WFP's response to the peer review, which will be considered by the Board at its 2014 Second Regular Session.

Summary Assessment against the Peer Review Criteria

19. The terms of reference for the peer review asked the panel to make an independent assessment of the WFP evaluation function against the three principal criteria of independence, credibility and utility.

Independence

20. Overall, the functional independence of centralized evaluation in WFP is high, without full structural independence. Intentionality² is well established for centralized evaluation and WFP is making well-planned and rational decisions about the selection of OEV evaluations. Functional independence of the centralized evaluation function is expressed as follows:
- ❖ The Director of OEV consults WFP managers when drawing up the OEV work plan but retains the final choice over evaluation subjects in the work programme submitted to the Board.
 - ❖ The Director has full discretion in the selection of subjects for evaluation.
 - ❖ The Director has full authority over the management of OEV's human and financial resources for evaluation, but not over the level of those resources.
 - ❖ OEV has not generally sought funding for its activities directly from donors.
 - ❖ OEV is independent in supervising evaluators.
 - ❖ The Director of OEV submits evaluation reports to the Board and publishes evaluations on WFP's public website without interference from management.
21. The Director of OEV issues an annual evaluation report on progress against the OEV work programme, summarizing the main OEV evaluations for the year and making new recommendations based on a synthesis of OEV evaluation findings, which require a management response that is presented to the Board.
22. The panel considers that independence and utility could be strengthened by OEV assuming full ownership of its evaluation reports, as OEV is better placed than evaluation consultants to determine the final shape of each report and its recommendations.
23. There is a risk that WFP may overemphasize the need for independence in its decentralized evaluations, where the primary aims are impartiality and quality. Ensuring a degree of separation between the project manager and those organizing the evaluation will increase the level of confidence in being able to achieve a balanced, impartial result.

Credibility

24. The evaluations managed by OEV are highly credible and are respected by the Board, senior management and external parties. The panel finds that OEV evaluation reports are of high quality, backed by a highly structured set of standards and procedures in the EQAS.

² Intentionality is an evaluation norm referring to a clear organizational intention to plan and use evaluation to inform decision-making and improve performance.

25. Compared with other United Nations evaluation functions, WFP's central evaluation function performs well in terms of spending, numbers of evaluations, transparency and quality assurance. The Director and staff of OEV are seen as credible in inter-agency fora and evaluation networks and are often asked to participate because they make valuable contributions. OEV has competent staff but insufficient capacity for some of the functions it is expected to perform, especially in helping to ensure that evaluation results are utilized and in developing evaluation capacity across WFP. OEV's reputation remains strong, based on its generation of high-quality reports.
26. The good use that WFP makes of evaluation reports is further evidence of their perceived reliability and relevance. The low coverage of operation evaluations since 2010, compared with WFP's policy commitment, is being addressed. Future credibility depends on OEV ensuring that its portfolio of evaluations remains relevant to WFP as it evolves.
27. The credibility of the evaluation function is somewhat reduced by shortcomings in the management response system and by field staff's perception that evaluations are not always sufficiently realistic and rooted in the country context.

Utility

28. Over the review period, evaluation has become more accepted; the past tendency for it to be marginalized has been reduced. All types of OEV evaluation are seen to be relevant and useful and are used across WFP. OEV evaluations are a useful accountability tool as their reports are discussed by the Board, with the exception of those for single operation evaluations, which are presented in synthesis reports.
29. The review found several examples of WFP staff using evaluation to benefit country programmes and global policy and strategy development. In general, the learning from evaluation is limited by the lack of a corporate knowledge management function. However, OEV-managed evaluations are used well, not only for accountability to the Board, but also in influencing policy and strategy. They are also well used at the field level for immediate programme improvements.
30. OEV intends to make greater use of evaluability assessments, especially for WFP strategies. Evaluability assessments provide not only a check on whether the proposed intervention can be evaluated, but also a systematic analysis of its coherence, feasibility and metrics. This should help to increase the quality of assessed strategies. The panel considers that evaluations can be made even more influential by selectively targeting evaluation lessons towards WFP project design, evaluability and evaluation planning.

Recommendations of the peer review

31. The panel presents the following recommendations for consideration by WFP management and the Board.
32. The panel's recommendations are divided into two sets. Recommendations 1 to 10 apply regardless of the evaluation model that management selects under Recommendation 1. Recommendations 11 to 15 are relevant only if WFP selects an evaluation model that includes the intentional strengthening of decentralized evaluation, i.e. model 2 or 3.
33. **Recommendation 1: Evaluation model for WFP.** WFP management should take decisions concerning the most appropriate model for the evaluation function in WFP, using the three models set out in paragraph 15 and making sure that the necessary human and financial resources are made available to implement the preferred model. These decisions should be made when the results of the BPR assessment of decentralized evaluation capacity become available and before the management response to the peer review is submitted to EB.2/2014.
34. **Recommendation 2: Evaluation policy.** WFP should revise the 2008 evaluation policy in line with the selected evaluation model to ensure that financial resources for evaluation are protected; criteria for evaluation selection and coverage are clearly specified; the roles of the Board, OEV and management at different levels of the organization are clarified; evaluation terminology is revised; and the typology of evaluations is brought into line with current WFP practice. The policy should also specify WFP's role in developing national evaluation capacity, and the involvement and role of partners in country-level evaluation.
35. **Recommendation 3: Oversight of the evaluation function.** The Board should request the development of a set of key performance indicators to support its oversight of evaluation across WFP, giving OEV adequate time to establish the necessary systems. The panel suggests the following as a possible set of indicators:
 - 1) the numbers, types and coverage of evaluations taking place across WFP;
 - 2) the human and financial resources used for evaluation;
 - 3) progress in the development of WFP's capacity and competence in evaluation; and
 - 4) ratings of the quality of evaluations, including decentralized evaluations if model 2 or 3 is selected.
36. The Board should ensure that WFP management has systems and processes in place to maximize the use of evaluation results in policy and strategy development, as well as in project and programme design. The strategic use of evaluation results should be the Board's main focus in its deliberations with WFP management, over and above discussion of individual evaluations.

37. **Recommendation 4: Management response.** WFP management should improve the quality and effectiveness of management responses to evaluations, in particular by giving due attention to the ownership of follow-up. This requires the active engagement of relevant senior managers and other stakeholders during the evaluation process and beyond. Specifically:
- ❖ OEV should continue to improve the quality of evaluation recommendations by ensuring that they are clear, realistic and relevant to WFP's context and structures. OEV should also strengthen its dialogue with evaluation consultants and management at the draft report stage, including through its current good practice of holding workshops with major stakeholders so that, as far as possible, recommendations are agreed before the evaluation is complete – although OEV may retain recommendations with which management does not agree.
 - ❖ WFP management should nominate a member of the Executive Management Group to be responsible for engaging management in each OEV evaluation from its outset through to its presentation to the Board, with RMP in a supporting and advisory role.
 - ❖ WFP should provide staff with online access to the RMP database for tracking progress in implementing the management responses to recommendations, so that the staff responsible can enter completed actions online, as they already do for audit recommendations.
 - ❖ WFP should replace the current management response template with a more detailed format for setting out action plans in which management can specify more clearly how it intends to act in response to each evaluation.
 - ❖ WFP management may request OEV's informal comments on how well a draft management response corresponds to the findings, conclusions and recommendations of an evaluation. The management response will still be fully owned by management, and OEV will in no sense be approving or taking responsibility for its content.
38. **Recommendation 5: Vesting evaluation independence in OEV.** For each evaluation it manages, OEV should take ownership of all aspects of the evaluation report, including the recommendations. Independence is vested in OEV, not in evaluation consultants.
39. **Recommendation 6: Evaluation quality assurance.** OEV should commission an external consultant to review the EQAS and identify evaluation steps and elements that can be simplified, reducing the time inputs of staff and consultants, the number of steps and the duration of evaluations. OEV should also take account of the panel's proposals on improving evaluation quality.
40. **Recommendation 7: Utilization of evaluation.** In redesigning its project and programme planning and approval process, WFP management should ensure that evaluation evidence is taken into account, not only from any evaluations of the project under consideration, but also from other relevant evaluations; management should request OEV's assistance in identifying such evaluations if necessary.

41. OEV should strengthen its inputs to WFP's revision of project and programme planning, design and approval processes to encourage the use of evaluation evidence and improve arrangements for evaluation within projects, in particular by promoting the design of projects that can be evaluated effectively (evaluability); the use of prior evaluations of a project, and other relevant evaluations; and planning to facilitate evaluation from the outset.
42. **Recommendation 8: Evaluation training.** OEV should develop evaluation training in partnership with the Human Resources Division, including modules for evaluation planning and management in WFP management training; and WFP induction courses covering the essential elements of evaluation concepts and purposes, and the evaluation policy.
43. **Recommendation 9: Roles and responsibilities.** WFP management should ensure that regional monitoring and evaluation advisers have a reporting line to OEV for technical oversight and support on evaluation, and review of their performance with regard to evaluation.
44. WFP management should clearly delineate the roles of OEV and RMP, giving OEV the lead responsibility for evaluation standards and guidance at all levels of WFP, with RMP taking the lead on monitoring and all forms of project/programme review by management.
45. WFP management should request Regional Directors to take responsibility for receiving and reviewing management responses to the single operation evaluations and decentralized evaluations in their regions.
46. Internal Audit and OEV should agree how to identify audit risks regarding compliance with the WFP evaluation policy, and should develop standard questions for testing the compliance of individual country offices, regional bureaux or Headquarters divisions where risks of non-compliance are identified.
47. **Recommendation 10: Monitoring and evaluation guidance.** OEV should work with RMP to make sure that WFP guidance on evaluations and, separately, on monitoring and review are distinct but mutually compatible and understood by country offices; that any regional and global training of M&E officers is coordinated; and that management reviews are used as key inputs to operation evaluations, country portfolio evaluations and other types of evaluation.

Further recommendations

48. Should WFP select an evaluation model that includes further enhancement of decentralized evaluation – evaluations managed by regional bureaux and country offices – the following recommendations would also apply.

49. **Recommendation 11: Evaluation strategy.** OEV should develop an evaluation strategy in line with the selected model for evaluation. The evaluation strategy, separate from the monitoring and review strategy, should set out how WFP will develop evaluation capacity, resourcing, selection, coverage, and utilization across the Organization.
50. **Recommendation 12: Role and designation of the Director of Evaluation.** To support the Board's governance of the function, the Board should request the Director of OEV to oversee and report on the evaluation function across WFP. In its annual report, OEV should include an assessment of the quality of decentralized evaluations and the salient issues emerging from these evaluations. In line with this change in role, the Board should request WFP management to redesignate the Director of OEV as the Director of Evaluation.
51. To avoid any possible conflicts of interest, the Board should limit the Director's term to a single period of six years, non-renewable, and without the right of return to WFP. This would replace the current arrangements – a term of four years renewable once, with the possibility of re-employment in WFP.
52. The Executive Director should redesignate the Director of OEV as the Director of Evaluation. The Director should retain direct responsibility for OEV-managed evaluation and should also be responsible for standard-setting, oversight and support of evaluation across WFP.
53. **Recommendation 13: Decentralized evaluation standards and guidelines.** OEV should develop appropriate and realistic standards for decentralized evaluations based on a simplified version of its EQAS and reflecting the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group. Once these standards are agreed, OEV should issue guidelines to country offices on the management of decentralized evaluations.
54. **Recommendation 14: Evaluation expertise.** WFP management should ensure that the WFP People Strategy includes the development of a staff cadre for assessment, monitoring and evaluation in WFP, so that regional bureaux and country offices have the human resource capacity and expertise to implement the evaluation strategy.
55. **Recommendation 15: Evaluation database.** OEV should develop an online database for all centralized and decentralized evaluations into which country offices and regional bureaux can upload their evaluation reports. OEV can use this database to make an annual assessment of the quality of evaluation reports, with a summary included in the Annual Evaluation Report. WFP may be able learn from the database solutions developed for this purpose by the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Children's Fund.

Response to all Recommendations

56. In responding to and implementing these recommendations, WFP will need to adopt a sequenced approach to the development and revision of documents relating to evaluation, as follows:
- ❖ Develop the management response to the peer review. This will require inputs from management and the Board, with advice from OEV (OEV should not prepare the response). The response will need to take into account the BPR assessment of decentralized evaluation capacity, due by May 2014.
 - ❖ OEV adjusts its work programme for 2015 taking into account the results of the peer review and the BPR assessment of decentralized evaluation capacity.
 - ❖ Revise the evaluation policy.
 - ❖ Develop an evaluation strategy, either in parallel with or after revision of the evaluation policy, in line with the selected model for evaluation.
 - ❖ Update the references to evaluation in programme guidance.
 - ❖ Make sure that the evaluation strategy and the monitoring and review strategy are consistent.

ACRONYMS USED IN THE DOCUMENT

BPR	Business Process Review
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EQAS	Evaluation Quality Assurance System
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
M&SE	monitoring and self-evaluation
OEV	Office of Evaluation
RMP	Performance Management and Monitoring Division
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group