

# **OFFICE OF EVALUATION WORK PROGRAMME**



## **Annual Consultation on Evaluation**

**17 May 2012**

**World Food Programme**  
Rome, Italy



## INTRODUCTION

1. This paper presents the Office of Evaluation's (OE) proposed programme of evaluations for 2013 and outlines the plans for 2014 and beyond. As it coincides with the arrival of new leadership for both WFP and OE, the paper also flags several wider evaluation issues and OE's plans for addressing them over the coming year. The Board's views are invited on both.

## EVALUATION STRATEGY

2. As it is neither possible nor desirable to evaluate everything, OE's selection of what to evaluate, when and how are critical to WFP's accountability and learning. The range and complexity of WFP's work has expanded in response to the changing external context and delivery of the Strategic Plan goals. Reflecting this complexity, OE has adapted its strategy and programme of work to help direct attention to the most appropriate organizational levels and issues.
3. As agreed with the Board and reflected in the 2011 Annual Evaluation Report (AER), OE has largely completed its transition from evaluations of single operations to evaluations of multiple operations and of strategy and policy. WFP's policy framework and main operating units – the country offices – are now systematically covered by OE's policy evaluation and country portfolio evaluation (CPEs) series.
4. Policy and country portfolio evaluations are complemented by a series of impact evaluations, which provide deeper assessments of the outcomes and impacts of major programming activities. Strategic evaluations look at the cross-cutting issues, systems and business processes that frame WFP's ability to achieve desired results.
5. OE proposes to continue this broad strategy for 2013 and into the medium term. The 2011 Annual Consultation on Evaluation (ACE) considered evaluation plans for the 2012–2013 biennium. Since then, WFP has moved to an annual planning cycle, with rolling outline plans covering two further years. As a result, the evaluation work programme presented to and approved by the Board in November 2011 was for 2012 only. The evaluation plans outlined in this document build on and update those presented at last year's ACE.
6. Plans for 2013 are reasonably firm proposals, assuming similar resource levels over the short term. Indicative plans for 2014 and, especially, 2015 have been kept open-ended. Through this approach, OE aims to maintain continuity over the short term, while retaining sufficient flexibility to respond to future evaluation priorities and needs shaped by WFP's changing internal and external environments.

## Evaluation Context

7. Over the coming year several significant external and internal processes may influence OE's future evaluation strategy and programme of work, including:
  - new priorities as set by WFP's next Strategic Plan;
  - the launch and roll-out of WFP's monitoring and self-evaluation strategy;
  - developments in the United Nations Transformative Agenda and system-wide arrangements for evaluation; and
  - wider processes and debates in the international development arena, such as the post-2015 international development goals, the Busan Declaration's priorities for partnership and mutual accountability, and the continuing drive for transparency and accountability for results.
8. To help ensure that WFP's evaluation policy and function are appropriate to these processes, and that OE's evaluation quality and management systems, resourcing and governance conform with evolving international best practice, a peer review of WFP's evaluation function is proposed for later in 2012 or early 2013, to be carried out by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC).

## Evaluation Prioritization

9. A large number of topics were identified for future evaluation at last year's ACE, and the Board and WFP management have requested several others since then. The priority, relevance and timing of these topics have been reviewed with senior management and external partners as appropriate., and priorities for 2013 have been selected, taking into account overall evaluation coverage, balance, OE's capacity and the evaluations' potential use.
10. Priorities have been set based on the assumption that resourcing levels remain the same in 2013 as in 2012; they do not include proposals for options relating to single operations evaluations, which are discussed later in this paper. Detailed plans and budgets will be presented in the context of WFP's 2013 Management Plan.<sup>1</sup> Should more resources be made available for 2013, OE will review its priorities and expand evaluation coverage accordingly. Longer-term resourcing needs will be assessed through internal review and the proposed peer review, and will be presented to the Board at a later date.

---

<sup>1</sup> Maintenance of 2012 budget levels implies staffing levels of one director, seven professional staff and three general service staff, with a non-staff budget of about US\$2.7 million. WFP's ratio of evaluation to overall budget is low relative to other United Nations agencies, including those based in Rome.

## **EVALUATION WORK PROGRAMME**

11. The plan is divided into evaluation categories. It covers priorities for evaluation in 2013, and outlines topics for 2014 and 2015.

### **Summary Evaluation Plan 2013–2015**

12. Table 1 summarizes the evaluation plans for 2013–2015, including six evaluations that start in 2012 and will be completed in 2013. Annex 1 provides a summary of evaluations under way in 2012. The plan proposes work on a minimum of 13 evaluations in 2013, possibly rising to 16 in 2014 if two strategic evaluations are conducted per year. Table 1 includes evaluation syntheses, and “other” evaluations which will be resourced separately if they proceed.

**TABLE 1: 2013 EVALUATION PLAN SUMMARY, AND 2014–2015 OUTLOOK<sup>2</sup>**

Type	Topic		
	2013	2014	2015
<b>Policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cash and vouchers</li> <li>• Nutrition (to be confirmed)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIV/AIDS</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic</b>	<b>Theme: Emergency preparedness and response</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparedness and Response Enhancement Programme (PREP)</li> <li>• Joint WFP/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Global Food Security Cluster</li> <li>• Urban food insecurity</li> <li>• WFP’s use of pooled funds</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase for Progress (P4P)</li> </ul>	
<b>Country Portfolio</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Niger (continued from 2012)</li> <li>• Congo (continued from 2012)</li> <li>• Timor-Leste</li> <li>• Uganda</li> <li>• Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)</li> <li>• Sudan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambodia</li> <li>• Indonesia</li> <li>• Iraq</li> <li>• Central African Republic</li> <li>• United Republic of Tanzania</li> </ul>	
<b>Regional Portfolio</b>	<b>Central America</b>		
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 of food for assets on livelihood resilience (continued from 2012)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 of food for assets</li> <li>• 3 of mother-and-child health and nutrition (MCHN)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 on MCHN</li> </ul>
<b>Synthesis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of food assistance on refugees in protracted situations series</li> <li>• Capacity development –review of evaluation lessons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food for assets series</li> <li>• Emergency preparedness and response series</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MCHN series</li> </ul>
<b>Other (to be confirmed)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in inter-agency real-time evaluations, e.g., South Sudan</li> <li>• School feeding: McGovern-Dole initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REACH (partnership for ending child hunger and undernutrition)</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup>This table does not include wider OE work described in Sections 3 and 4, such as evaluation dissemination, lesson learning, and the proposed peer review.

## Policy Evaluations

13. Following the Board's approval,<sup>3</sup> evaluation is now embedded in the WFP policy development cycle, and is to be conducted between four and six years after policy approval. This allows time for envisaged changes in systems and programming approaches to take effect, and for findings and recommendations to inform policy revision processes. Policy evaluations examine the policy's quality, including its internal and external consistency and relevance; the effects of the policy, its implementation and results; and how these effects were achieved. Annex 2 provides a summary of the policy evaluation cycle, indicating policies that have been evaluated recently and those for which evaluations are due. Based on a review of this list, the following proposed priorities take into account the need to maintain a balance of evaluation types, and WFP's capacity for absorbing and acting on the findings of complex policy and strategic evaluations.

### *Policy evaluation plans 2013*

14. Only one full policy evaluation is proposed for 2013. Alternative plans are proposed for the other policies identified in the evaluation cycle (Annex 2).
15. *Gender*: The gender policy is proposed as the highest priority for a full evaluation in 2013. The policy is relevant to both the internal and external contexts, and an evaluation would further embed the policy evaluation cycle into WFP's governance and accountability system given that the current policy, approved in 2009, responded to an earlier evaluation (2008). A new gender policy evaluation would provide a rare opportunity to assess the follow-through and continuing relevance of the earlier evaluation recommendations in the current policy; assess the quality and extent of policy implementation; and help inform future directions, taking account of developments in the international system. Gender is a major priority in this system and is expected to remain so under the post-2015 international development framework. Led by the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), a United Nations system-wide action plan with common performance standards has been developed, and an evaluation in 2013 would coincide with the proposed first reporting of United Nations entities on the system-wide action plan. The evaluation would also be well placed to take stock of WFP's 2010–2011 Gender Corporate Action Plan.
16. *Capacity development* is a major implication of WFP's transition from food aid to food assistance, and senior managers have indicated a need for the 2009 policy to be updated. According to the evaluation cycle, a policy evaluation is due

---

<sup>3</sup> "WFP Policy Formulation" (WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B).

between 2013 and 2015. Instead of a full evaluation, a synthesis paper of lessons from recent evaluations is proposed, to inform future policy. Capacity development issues were highlighted in 2011 strategic evaluations of the transition from food aid to food assistance, in the interim evaluation of P4P and in the school feeding policy evaluations. A desk-study would provide an opportunity to gather these findings together with those from other evaluations, including the 2008 policy evaluation that informed the current policy.

17. *Urban food insecurity* is an increasingly important issue for WFP, and the 2002 policy is widely regarded as lagging behind current practice. An evaluation of the policy itself would therefore not be the best use of OE's resources, so instead an evaluation of WFP interventions in urban settings is proposed as part of a new strategic evaluation series, as outlined later in this document.

#### *Policy evaluations 2014 and 2015*

18. *Cash and vouchers.* The use of cash and vouchers is proposed as a high priority for evaluation in 2014. Annex 2 indicates that the 2008 policy covering vouchers and cash transfers becomes due for evaluation between 2012 and 2014. As noted in the strategic evaluations of 2011, this expansion in the range of modalities available to WFP is one of the Strategic Plan's most profound shifts and is being applied across all contexts and types of WFP operation. Since 2011, support and guidance for the selection of appropriate modalities have been provided through the Cash for Change Service in Headquarters, and a roadmap for increasing the proportion of cash and vouchers to 40 percent of all WFP transfers by 2015.
19. In response to international policy interest and other factors, in 2009, WFP commissioned the International Food Policy Research Institute to conduct a major longitudinal study evaluating the impacts of cash and vouchers in WFP pilots in several countries. As was done in the recent school feeding policy evaluation, the results of this research will contribute to the evidence base for an evaluation of WFP's cash and vouchers policy and its implementation support, business processes, financing, modality selection, cost-effectiveness and monitoring systems.
20. *Nutrition.* The new nutrition policy was approved by the Board in February 2012, superseding the narrower 2004 policies referred to in Annex 2. According to the approved policy evaluation cycle, an evaluation would take place between 2016 and 2018.
21. However, when approving the policy, the Board requested that an evaluation be reported to the Board session in February 2015. Internal consultation, including with the Nutrition and HIV/AIDS Service, confirmed that the policy could be implemented sufficiently to enable the evaluation to start in early

2014. However, a series of impact evaluations on MCHN planned for 2014–2015, possibly in collaboration with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), would have a major bearing on the evidence base for the nutrition policy evaluation.

22. If the Board wishes to proceed with the requested early timing for the nutrition policy evaluation, OE will do its utmost to ensure coordination with the MCHN impact evaluations, so their data can inform the policy evaluation. The aim would be to present the first three MCHN impact evaluations to the Board alongside the nutrition policy evaluation in February 2015. The Board would be informed of the full impacts of MCHN in November 2015, when the final two MCHN impact evaluations and a synthesis of all five would be presented. An alternative would be for the Board to review its preferred timing for the policy evaluation to enable full consideration of the impact evaluation evidence base, and reschedule presentation of the nutrition policy evaluation report to the November 2015 Board session.
23. *HIV and AIDS*. WFP’s policy on HIV and AIDS was updated in 2010 following an evaluation in 2008; the next evaluation is proposed for 2015. Further plans for this evaluation will be reported in due course.
24. *Disaster risk reduction and protection*. Annex 2 also indicates that the recently approved policies for disaster risk reduction and protection will be due for evaluation from 2016.

### **Strategic Evaluations**

25. While traditional evaluations assess objective achievements retrospectively, strategic evaluations recognize WFP as an evolving organization, and aim to inform strategic direction and organizational effectiveness. These evaluations examine the new directions and corporate priorities, cross-cutting issues, systems and business processes that shape WFP’s ways of working, rather than a particular policy or programming area. Strategic evaluations analyse the extent and quality of performance, and the internal and external factors that affect WFP’s ability to work in new ways.
26. Strategic evaluation themes arise from issues: i) being discussed in the wider humanitarian and development community; ii) identified repeatedly in earlier evaluations, WFP reviews and the Annual Performance Report; and iii) highlighted in external reports – including those from the Joint Inspection Unit, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and other entities.
27. As summarized in the 2011 AER, OE’s recent series of strategic evaluations sparked an unprecedented amount of discussion concerning core issues related to policy and management of enabling systems, capacity, communications and partnerships to support WFP’s implementation of the Strategic Plan.

28. The 2010–2011 strategic evaluations focused primarily on the newer areas of WFP’s work emerging from the transition from food aid to food assistance. In 2013–2014 OE proposes to address the strategic theme of emergency preparedness and response, which forms the largest part of WFP’s operations.

*Strategic evaluation theme for 2013–2014: Emergency preparedness and response*

29. This over-arching theme was identified in response to the changing context of high food and fuel prices, which affect urban as well as rural populations; complex conflicts at the national and regional levels; shocks and slow-onset disasters; the increasing number of humanitarian actors; and the humanitarian Transformative Agenda. It is closely related to Strategic Objectives 1 and 2.<sup>4</sup>
30. A series of strategic evaluations would take stock of WFP’s recent efforts to enhance effectiveness, looking at several significant and interrelated elements over the next two years, and concluding with a synthesis. Four evaluations are proposed for 2013–2014.
31. *Preparedness and Response Enhancement Programme (PREP)*. This cross-cutting initiative to develop a new WFP response model for large-scale emergencies is scheduled for completion by the end of 2013. The evaluation would assess WFP’s progress in adapting capacity, systems, guidelines, services and partnerships to respond effectively in increasingly unpredictable and challenging environments and in the context of WFP’s shift from food aid to food assistance. It would be timed to inform the development of a new emergency response policy later in 2014.
32. *Joint FAO/WFP global food security cluster*. This evaluation would be conducted jointly with the FAO Evaluation Office to assess the value-added and effectiveness of this cluster, established in 2011. Planned to begin in late 2013, the evaluation is already in FAO’s work plan and was discussed with WFP’s Board last year. It is expected to contribute to the design of the international response architecture for emergency preparedness and response, and would provide a good opportunity for learning in this jointly led cluster involving two of the Rome-based agencies.
33. *Urban food insecurity*. This would examine WFP’s role and effectiveness in preparedness for and response to emergencies that display many of the new and complex dimensions of hunger – which often concern food prices and access rather than food availability – and in which WFP’s new tools and modalities for social protection and safety nets are particularly relevant.

---

<sup>4</sup> Strategic Objectives 1 – Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies; and 2 – Prevent acute hunger and invest in disaster preparedness and mitigation measures.

34. *WFP's use of pooled funds for humanitarian preparedness and response.* This evaluation would analyse the contribution of financial flows from all pooled funds – including the Central Emergency Response Fund, the emergency response funds and the common humanitarian funds – to the effectiveness of WFP's preparedness and response, including its work with cooperating partners.
35. A concept note and preliminary preparations for this series will be elaborated in 2012; the evaluations will be conducted in 2013 and early 2014; and a synthesis of the main themes and findings will be prepared in late 2014.

#### *Outlook 2014–2015*

36. On a very different strategic theme, the final evaluation of the P4P initiative is scheduled for 2014. This evaluation, drawing on P4P's in-built, well-resourced monitoring and evaluation system, provides a good opportunity for a summative evaluation of a major pilot programme. Although P4P is a specific programme, the evaluation is categorized as strategic because of P4P's wide operational reach, its innovative approach of building on existing WFP operations to enhance the developmental impact, and its implications for WFP's future strategy regarding cross-cutting issues such as procurement, capacity development, partnerships, monitoring and evaluation. Detailed evaluation planning, stakeholder consultation and design will begin in 2013, before programme implementation units are dismantled as the pilots come to end.
37. Further plans and themes for strategic evaluations in 2015 and beyond have been left open, to take account of the next Strategic Plan and wider internal and system-wide developments.<sup>5</sup>

#### **Country Portfolio Evaluations**

38. Introduced in 2009, CPEs are more strategic than individual operation evaluations and make efficient use of evaluation resources. They cover all the operations in a country, typically over a five-year period. They are intended as both an accountability instrument at the corporate level and a learning tool to inform future country strategy and operations. CPEs address a standard set of evaluation questions tailored to the specific country context and WFP's partnerships and operational profile relating to: WFP's alignment with national and international strategies and partners;<sup>6</sup> the management, internal coherence and synergy of strategic choices; portfolio performance and results.

---

<sup>5</sup> Topics mentioned previously include WFP's management for results and accountability; exit management; and management of innovation.

<sup>6</sup> WFP's shift to food assistance makes partnership and alignment particularly important, as emphasized by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the Accra Agenda for Action and the 2011 Busan Declaration.

39. Important criteria for CPE selection include demand and evaluations' potential for contributing to future programming decisions and practice. Selection also takes into account regional balance, portfolio size, range, and previous evaluation coverage. Following well-established arrangements, CPEs are prioritized and timed to feed into WFP's strategic decision-making by, for example, informing the country strategy and wider United Nations Development Assistance Framework process, and the design and approval of major operations within a country portfolio. The list of countries originally selected for the 2012–2013 biennium has been reviewed with regional bureaux and country offices; Table 2 shows the updated plan, by region and by year.

**TABLE 2: ONGOING AND PLANNED CPES FOR 2012–2014**

Region	Countries		
	2012	2013	2014
ODB	Afghanistan	Timor-Leste	Cambodia, Indonesia
ODC	Kyrgyzstan		Iraq
ODD	Niger		Central African Republic
ODJ	Zimbabwe		
ODN	Somalia, Congo	Uganda, DRC	United Republic of Tanzania
ODS		Sudan	
ODPC		Regional – El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua	

ODB: *Regional Bureau Bangkok (Asia)*

ODC: *Regional Bureau Cairo (Middle East, North Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia)*

ODD: *Regional Bureau Dakar (West Africa)*

ODJ: *Regional Bureau Johannesburg (Southern Africa)*

ODN: *Regional Bureau Nairobi (East and Central Africa)*

ODS: *Regional Bureau Sudan*

ODPC: *Regional Bureau Panama City (Latin America and the Caribbean)*

### *Country portfolio evaluations 2013*

40. In 2013, four new CPEs are planned, while the Niger and Congo evaluations will be ongoing from 2012. The Timor-Leste evaluation is expected to provide useful lessons on managing hand-over and exit, as WFP will be withdrawing from the country. The Sudan CPE, requested by Board members in 2011, will require careful scoping to take account of political and other contextual changes during the evaluation reference period.
41. Uganda and DRC are important countries for WFP. Uganda has been the site of several innovative programming and strategic approaches in recent years. The evidence base for the CPE will benefit from a recent decentralized operation

evaluation of the protracted relief and recovery operation for internally displaced persons and refugees and an ongoing evaluation of WFP's livelihoods programme in Karamoja. Although Uganda has been covered by several strategic or policy evaluations, it has never had a CPE, which is now a priority. DRC is still among WFP's five largest operations and was also designated a corporate emergency in 2008. It is also a pilot country for innovative programming under P4P, and for the use of cash and vouchers. The evaluation would begin in late 2013 and be completed in 2014.

42. In 2013, OE will introduce a regional portfolio evaluation, of Central America. If successful, this model can be adapted for other aggregates of countries, to help address an emerging gap in CPE coverage of smaller country offices and countries with fewer operations. As this is a new initiative, the concept and evaluation approach will require further design prior to starting the evaluation.

#### *Country portfolio evaluations 2014*

43. Five further CPEs have been identified for 2014: Cambodia, Indonesia, Iraq, the Central African Republic, and the United Republic of Tanzania, for which a joint evaluation may prove appropriate. Table 3 provides details of CPE coverage by region on a cumulative basis since their introduction in 2009, and including those proposed in this plan. In line with the move to annual work planning, these data will be updated annually to reflect the latest information available.

**TABLE 3: COUNTRY PORTFOLIO EVALUATION COVERAGE, BY REGION**

Parameter	ODB	ODC	ODD	ODJ*	ODN	ODS**	ODPC
% of US\$ value of portfolio	43	49	46	22	64	100	89
% of operations	41	41	25	10	67	100	65
% of reported actual beneficiaries	25	56	38	29	52	100	75
% of countries	38	25	21	13	70	100	50

*Sources and notes:* US\$ values and operations: for CPEs conducted, evaluation reports; for ongoing and planned CPEs, programme of work 2011 and 2012 at February 2012 (Operational Reporting and Analysis Branch (ODXR)). Beneficiaries: WFP data collection system Dakota, 2010.

Countries: OE database

\* In April 2011 the East and Central Africa Regional Bureau (ODN) was created, covering Burundi, Congo, DRC, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania . ODJ now covers Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

\*\* From April 2011, ODS covers the Sudan but not South Sudan.

## Impact Evaluations

44. The second major thrust of OE's evaluation strategy is to deepen assessment of outcomes and impact, both for WFP's internal management needs and in response to increasing international demand for more rigorous assessment of the contribution of assistance – including WFP's – to beneficiary outcomes and lasting impact on people's lives. OE's impact evaluations aim to inform the design of future operations, policy and strategy in the programming area evaluated. One criterion for selecting topics for impact evaluations is the possibility for feeding into policy or strategic evaluations and/or corporate policy/strategy decision-making. Impact evaluations also help to improve WFP's accountability to beneficiaries. In its evaluation design and management, OE seeks to increase attention to this relatively neglected evaluation issue, particularly in humanitarian contexts.
45. Questions examined in impact evaluations include: Was the right thing done in the circumstances? What difference did it make, and to whom? Was it sufficiently aligned with national or international norms and standards? How did it interact with other contributions and influences to generate negative or positive, intended or unintended impacts? What should WFP do differently to enhance outcomes and impact?
46. The approach applies mixed methods in a thematic series of evaluations, each of which assesses an identified programming area and covers several operations in several countries over about seven years. Criteria guiding the selection of themes include significant programming over sufficient time for lasting change to have occurred; and reasonable data availability to enable analysis of contribution or attribution.

### *Impact evaluations 2013*

47. Impact of food assistance on refugees in protracted situations, jointly with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). This series of four joint impact evaluations, begun in 2011, will be completed in 2012. In 2013, a synthesis report of the series will be presented to the high-level meeting of UNHCR and WFP, to provide evidence for improvements to policy and strategy in the search for durable solutions.
48. *Evaluation of the impact of food for assets on livelihood resilience.* In line with priorities agreed with the Board in 2011, three of the evaluations in this series of five – beginning in 2012<sup>7</sup> – will be completed in 2013; another two will be conducted in 2014, using the same methods and evaluation framework. A synthesis report of the series will be prepared in 2014.
49. In 2010, more than 50 percent of WFP's programmes were reported as addressing the risk of natural disasters and their impact on food security. This series of evaluations follows up on the 2009 strategic evaluation of the effectiveness of livelihood recovery interventions, which recommended further analysis of impact, especially of the role of food assistance in recovery processes and people's own efforts to build stronger livelihoods.

### *Impact evaluations 2014 and 2015*

50. *Mother-and-child health and nutrition.* For 2014, OE proposes a series of impact evaluations examining the impact of food assistance on MCHN, possibly jointly with UNICEF as WFP's main United Nations partner in nutrition. OE would conduct five country impact evaluations on this topic in 2014–2015, with initial planning starting in the fourth quarter of 2013. These evaluations would assess the outcomes and impact – intended or not – of MCHN activities, and identify the changes needed to enable the achievement of potential MCHN outcomes and impacts arising from the 2012 nutrition policy. The first three evaluations would be completed in 2014, and the final two, and a synthesis, in 2015.

---

<sup>7</sup> Owing to complexity and measurability issues, the design phase – which starts in 2012 – is being extended to ensure high quality.

TABLE 4: COUNTRIES SHORT-LISTED FOR IMPACT EVALUATIONS			
Region	Food assistance in protracted refugee situations	Food for assets on livelihood resilience	Mother-and-child health and nutrition
ODB	Bangladesh	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka	Bangladesh, Democratic People's Republic of Korea
ODC		-	Not applicable: relevant operations have small beneficiary numbers
ODD	Chad	Mali, Senegal	Burkina Faso
ODJ		Zambia	Malawi
ODPC		Guatemala, Haiti	Colombia, Guatemala, Haiti
ODS		-	Not applicable: relevant operations have small beneficiary numbers
ODN	Rwanda	Burundi, Ethiopia, Uganda	Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Uganda

### Joint Evaluations and the International System

51. Where appropriate, evaluations will be carried out jointly. As mentioned, two joint evaluations are currently under way: the joint global logistics cluster evaluation, with UNICEF and the Netherlands; and the joint impact evaluation of food assistance in protracted refugee situations, with UNHCR. OE has recently been asked to consider managing an external final evaluation of the joint-agency REACH initiative in 2014, with costs covered by one of its donors. Further possibilities in 2013 include the global food security cluster joint evaluation with FAO; other proposals will be examined as more detailed planning begins, such as the plans for nutrition impact evaluations with UNICEF.
52. As mentioned, the Transformative Agenda is expected to have significant effect on real-time and other system-wide evaluations. OE will continue to participate in these developments and in specific evaluations carried out by OCHA, wherever these are priorities for WFP. OE is on the management group for the 2012 Horn of Africa real-time evaluation, and is engaged in the review of real-time evaluation methods, to improve their quality, timeliness and alignment with the Transformative Agenda, including for the evaluation proposed for South Sudan.

53. OE will also continue to contribute to UNEG and other development and humanitarian evaluation networks, representing and continually updating its approach. OE is often asked for inputs to other agencies' evaluations, including OCHA-led and inter-agency evaluations, and will continue its efforts to meet this demand.

### **Operation Evaluations**

54. Operation evaluations focus on the effectiveness and efficiency of a single operation with respect to its objectives and to international and WFP norms and standards, examining the adequacy of design, implementation and results. The current plan for 2013 follows a similar pattern to that approved by the Board for 2012, reducing OE's inputs to a minimal advisory role in decentralized evaluations.<sup>8</sup> Although indirect coverage of operations through CPEs is increasing, it does not fully match the previous coverage of single operation evaluations.
55. The evaluation policy envisaged a mix of OE and decentralized management for operation evaluations. To date, however, the coverage achieved through this approach is unsatisfactory. As the Board knows, and as is confirmed in the 2011 AER, OE currently has neither the resources nor the structure for carrying out operation evaluations – or even for providing quality assurance for decentralized ones – on top of its agreed focus on more complex, policy, strategic, portfolio and impact evaluations.
56. However, 2012 sees an important internal development for WFP, with the launch of its monitoring and self-evaluation strategy. As this strategy focuses on self-evaluation, it makes little reference to the evaluation policy's requirements for decentralized operation evaluations. However, it could be a first step in addressing the current gap, although it will take time to achieve the evaluation policy's quantity and quality targets.
57. Over the coming months, OE will work with the Operations Department, the Resource Management and Accountability Department and others to clarify the strategy's vision for operation evaluations, and possible OE roles and resourcing. OE will update the Board on what is needed to ensure adequate coverage of operation evaluations; the application of standards and quality assurance systems for decentralized evaluations; and other modifications to WFP's evaluation function recommended by the proposed UNEG-OECD/DAC peer review.

---

<sup>8</sup> For example, a pilot test involving school feeding projects supported by the United States Department of Agriculture's McGovern-Dole initiative aims to improve the integration of programme support, country offices and OE, from design to evaluation. The first case study is in Ethiopia, and will be resourced from the initiative's own budget.

## EVALUATION DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION

58. OE will continue to pursue added value through synergies among evaluations and their products, to reinforce the evidence base and facilitate convergence of the knowledge generated.
59. Given the interest expressed by the Board and senior management, OE proposes increasing the use of evaluation syntheses to capture patterns and divergences in evaluation findings that are relevant to policy and strategy decision-makers, and to identify common findings on WFP's performance that need systemic support or correction. Table 1 identifies syntheses from the: series of impact evaluations of food assistance for refugees in protracted situations (2013); strategic evaluations of emergency preparedness and response (2014); evaluation of the impact of food for assets on livelihood resilience (2014); and impact evaluation of MCHN (2015). Also in 2013, a synthesis of lessons from evaluations related to capacity development will be prepared, based on findings from evaluations conducted since the evaluation of WFP's capacity development and policy in 2008 (see paragraph 16).
60. OE will encourage the use of these syntheses in other evaluations and in decision-making processes. In 2013–2015, OE will further integrate plans for the use of each evaluation into its evaluation design. These plans will include both how the evaluation is conducted and the dissemination of the evaluation report, with particular attention to opportunities for feeding into decision-making processes.
61. OE will also continue to prepare “closing the learning loop” products for internal WFP learning – top ten lessons and evaluation country syntheses – in response to demand.

## EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND QUALITY

62. During previous evaluation discussions, Board members raised issues relating to evaluation quality and coverage of value-for-money analysis, efficiency and gender. Ultimately, measurement depends on building the requisite data gathering and analysis into programme design and monitoring. OE's approach to these and other evaluation quality and management issues will be internally reviewed and benchmarked with similar work in the OECD/DAC Evaluation Network and UNEG.
63. A follow-up UNEG-OECD/DAC peer review<sup>9</sup> is proposed for late 2012 and early 2013. As noted in the Introduction, WFP is facing contextual changes expected to influence OE's strategy. Recent developments in WFP's approaches to evidence, monitoring and evaluation, risk, accountability and learning

---

<sup>9</sup> The last peer review of WFP's evaluation function was in 2007, leading to the approval of the 2008 evaluation policy. The follow-up is expected to take a “light touch” approach.

suggest that it is time to review the overall evaluation function and policy. A peer review would have the added advantage of facilitating benchmarking against state-of-the art principles and international practice in evaluation governance, management, methods, quality assurance, follow-up management, knowledge management, ethics, accountability and partnership, to help drive continual improvement in OE's contribution to WFP's overall effectiveness.

## ANNEX I

## EVALUATIONS UNDER IMPLEMENTATION IN 2012

Type	Title	Completion in 2012	Completion in 2013
<b>Policy</b>	Private-sector partnership and fundraising strategy	X	
<b>Strategic</b>	Global logistics cluster (joint)	X	
<b>CPE</b>	Zimbabwe	X	
	Somalia	X	
	Afghanistan	X	(EB.1/13)
	Kyrgyzstan		X EB.1/13
	Niger		X EB.A/13
	Congo		X EB.2/13
<b>Impact</b>	Food assistance in protracted refugee situations (joint):		
	Rwanda	X	
	Bangladesh	X	
	Chad	X	(EB1/13)
<b>Impact</b>	Food for assets on livelihoods resilience: three countries (to be decided)		X EBA/13 X EBA/13 X EBA/13
<b>TOTAL</b>		8	6

## POLICY EVALUATION CYCLE

Approved	Policy		
<b>Policy evaluation in progress</b>			
2008	Private-sector partnership and fundraising strategy	2012	
<b>Policy evaluations completed 2008–2012</b>		<b>Evaluation published</b>	
2009	School feeding policy	2012 <sup>a</sup>	
2004	Building country and regional capacities	2008	
2002	Enhanced Commitments to Women	2008	
2003	Programming in the era of AIDS: WFP's response to HIV/AIDS	2008	
<b>Evaluations relevant to policy development completed</b>		<b>Evaluation published</b>	
2006	Food procurement in developing countries <sup>e</sup>	2011 <sup>b</sup>	
2006	Targeting in emergencies	2007 <sup>c</sup>	
2004	Food-based safety nets	2011 <sup>d</sup>	
2004	Emergency needs assessments	2008 <sup>e</sup>	
<b>Potential future evaluations</b>		<b>Timeframe</b>	
2012	Nutrition policy	2016	2018
2012	Disaster Risk Reduction	2016	2018
2012	Protection policy	2016	2018
2010	WFP HIV and AIDS policy	2014	2016
2009	Gender policy	2013	2015
2009	Policy on capacity development	2013	2015
2008	Vouchers and cash transfers as food assistance instruments: Opportunities and challenges	2012	2014
2004	Food for nutrition: Mainstreaming nutrition	2008	2010
2004	Micronutrient fortification	2008	2010
2002	Urban food insecurity: Strategies for WFP	2006	2008

<sup>a</sup> Presented at EB.1/2012.

<sup>b</sup> In 2011, OE presented the mid-term evaluations of the global P4P initiative and the agriculture and market support project in Uganda.

<sup>c</sup> The 2007 evaluation of targeting was not a policy evaluation as such.

<sup>d</sup> The strategic evaluation of safety nets was not a policy evaluation as such, but covered the subject sufficiently to ensure that an additional policy evaluation is not warranted in the current planning horizon.

<sup>e</sup> Emergency needs assessments were included in the evaluation of the Strengthening Needs Assessments Project (2008) and the joint evaluation with FAO of food security information systems (2010).

## ACRONYMS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

ACE	Annual Consultation on Evaluation
AER	Annual Evaluation Report
CPE	country portfolio evaluation
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
MCHN	mother-and-child health and nutrition
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODB	Regional Bureau Bangkok (Asia)
ODC	Regional Bureau Cairo (Middle East, North Africa, Central Asia and Eastern Europe)
ODD	Regional Bureau Dakar (West Africa)
ODJ	Regional Bureau Johannesburg (Southern Africa)
ODN	Regional Bureau Nairobi (East and Central Africa)
ODPC	Regional Bureau Panama City (Latin America and the Caribbean)
ODS	Regional Bureau Sudan
OE	Office of Evaluation
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
P4P	Purchase for Progress
PREP	Preparedness and Response Enhancement Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund