

WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME

2006

Annual Evaluation Report

OFFICE OF EVALUATION JUNE 2007



World Food
Programme

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Preface | 2 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Evaluation Findings | 4 |
| Programme Delivery | 4 |
| Results | 7 |
| Effectiveness of Evaluation | 10 |
| WFP Evaluation System | 11 |
| Evaluation Policy | 11 |
| Participation in Groups and Networks | 12 |
| Training | 13 |
| WFP Evaluation Activities in 2006 | 14 |
| OEDE Programme of Work | 14 |
| OEDE Support for Decentralized Evaluations | 15 |
| Closing the Learning Loop | 16 |
| Conclusions and Outlook | 18 |
| Conclusions | 18 |
| Outlook | 19 |
| Annex I | 21 |
| Evaluations Completed in 2006 | |
| Annex II | 23 |
| Office of Evaluation Staff | |
| Annex III | 24 |
| OEDE Management Protocol | |
| Annex IV | 25 |
| Summary of WFP's Evaluation Policy | |
| Acronyms Used in the Document | 27 |


Preface

This is the third WFP Annual Evaluation Report. It summarizes the evaluations conducted in 2006 by the Office of Evaluation and by regional bureaux and country offices. The report has been discussed by the WFP Internal Evaluation Committee and by Board members at the annual informal consultation on evaluation.

The report has changed in several respects on the basis of experience in the last two years: for example, the sections on the development portfolio and emergency operations have been merged, and a broader range of evaluation topics has been included to expand the insights derived from our evaluation experience.

This evolution of the report will be complemented by future changes. From next year (i) we will see the initial results of current measures to enhance the quality of evaluation reports, which will increase the robustness of findings, (ii) a new analytical tool will enable comparison across a broader range of issues and will identify corporate concerns that need to be addressed and (iii) the report will be discussed at the Board's Annual Session together with management's response to evaluation findings.

Evaluation reports submitted to the Board are available on WFP's website (www.wfp.org).



Caroline Heider
Director, OEDE

Introduction

This third annual report of the Office of Evaluation (OEDE) provides a synthesis of findings from evaluations undertaken in 2006 in order to stimulate the discussion and resolution of systemic issues. This report also forms part of WFP's framework for learning and accountability for results – informing stakeholders in the Executive Board, leadership and management of WFP, Operations and the public on WFP performance and results.

The report covers all evaluations completed in 2006. These include 11 centrally managed evaluations undertaken by OEDE and 18 decentralized evaluations carried out by regional bureaux and country offices. These evaluations represented 18 percent of total direct expenditure¹ of the protracted relief and recovery operation (PRRO) category, 42 percent of the emergency operation (EMOP) category and 23 percent of the development programme (DEV) category.

- ▶ The centrally managed evaluations included four thematic evaluations, three PRROs, one EMOP and three country programmes (CPs).²
- ▶ The decentralized evaluations included seven PRROs, two EMOPs, seven CPs and two development projects.³ Of the 18 evaluations, 7 were undertaken in the West Africa (ODD) region, four in both the Asia (ODB) and Latin America and Caribbean (ODP) regions, two in the East and Central Africa (ODK) region and one in the Middle East, Central Asia and Eastern Europe (ODC) region.

As in previous reports, the synthesis of evaluation findings does not provide an overall assessment

of WFP activities. While some indications of overall directions may be discernible, no aggregation of findings or statistical reliability is feasible. Similarly, the projects, programmes and operations evaluated should not be judged as representative of WFP as a whole. Therefore, it is not possible to extrapolate definite trends and changes from the 2006 evaluations.

This report was discussed at the Internal Evaluation Committee (IEC) on 11 April 2007 and at the Informal Board Session on 17 May 2007. Once quality-improvement measures to enhance the robustness of the report (outlined on pages 19 and 20) are implemented, this report may be presented in future to the Board more formally. The report is structured into two main chapters: findings from evaluations and information on the evaluation system of WFP, followed by conclusions and an outlook for 2007.

¹ Total direct expenditure of each intervention generally refers to 2006 expenditure and includes direct operational costs (DOC), other direct operational costs (ODOC) and direct support costs (DSC), which were then compared to total direct expenditure for 2006 by programme category.

² See Annex I for details.

³ See Annex I for details.

Evaluation Findings

This chapter presents findings from WFP's humanitarian and development assistance evaluated during 2006. Findings focus on programme delivery and results, highlighting differences as appropriate.

Programme Delivery

Resources

Insufficient resources and pipeline breaks continued to impede the performance of both humanitarian and development assistance to varying degrees. These affected the number of beneficiaries reached, ration sizes or duration of assistance, and ultimately the achievement of stated objectives. Funding uncertainties made programming for cooperating partners and agencies difficult, particularly in a development context where WFP assistance is integrated into cooperating partners' and other agencies' annual programmes of work. Food-for-work (FFW) activities were the most affected: WFP support for these activities was reduced or sometimes suspended, as in the cases of the Liberia and Tajikistan PRROs.

Evaluations highlighted that an optimal mix of WFP staff resources for programming, technical expertise and logistics was necessary for implementing operations, but that cash-resource constraints made this difficult. The situation was aggravated in the Mali Country Office: because a PRRO had been implemented in parallel with the CP, staff resources were also used for the PRRO.

The business process review (BPR) piloted by WFP in 2004 was intended to improve resource and pipeline flows by using advance funding mechanisms against committed or anticipated

resources. The 2006 OEDE-managed evaluation confirmed that these objectives were achieved in the pilot projects: the use of contributions was maximized and food was made available to beneficiaries on a timely basis. For example, the evaluation found that in Darfur at least 30 percent more targeted beneficiaries could be reached on time because of the BPR facility.⁴

While cost savings have been achieved, the evaluation team estimated that the level was sometimes lower than operational managers had estimated originally – significantly so in the Uganda PRRO. Nevertheless, one of the advantages of BPR is its capacity to intervene in local and regional markets when prices are lower.

Despite the overall positive findings, the evaluation concluded that expanding the BPR to a substantially larger number of countries and operations should be approached with some caution and should be planned carefully. This is chiefly because the evaluation found a number of weaknesses in users' understanding of the BPR and in its overall control mechanisms. Some regional bureaux and country offices were unfamiliar with the BPR; operational managers did not appreciate sufficiently the overall level of financial exposure; and there was an inadequate overview of the various loans outstanding against an operation. Specifically, under the field-managed project cash account (PCA), funds needed later for landside transport, storage and handling (LTSH) had sometimes been excessively drawn down for additional food-procurement purposes, putting later payment of LTSH costs into difficulty. This

happened, for instance, in both southern Africa and in the Sudan (two of the four case studies of the BPR evaluation).

Logistics

Evaluations identified logistics as a strong point in WFP operations. For example, the Commodity Movement Processing and Analysis System (COMPAS), and its recent upgrade to COMPAS II by WFP and the World Food Programme Information Network and Global System (WINGS), have helped to improve the time and accuracy of distribution information up to the final delivery points and also to improve monitoring of LTSH funds.

The evaluation of the small-sized Gambia Education Development Project recommended a stronger WFP role in logistics (currently shared by WFP and the national project authorities). The WFP logistics manager should have responsibility for, and management of, all logistics activities. This will ensure that food discharge and delivery are undertaken as scheduled and that food aid reaches intended beneficiaries on time. In Yemen, for instance, owing to previous experience of mismanagement, the country office assumed responsibility for food management and logistics. The evaluation found that the good control system developed for the pipeline now allows a gradual transfer to the national project authorities, together with capacity-building measures and a transparent logistics management system. Both the Mali and Yemen evaluations pointed to problems regarding the quality of imported food and packaging.

Through its long-term collaboration with the Food Corporation of Bhutan, WFP has been able to bring relatively large amounts of food to remote areas at reasonable costs in the Bhutan CP. WFP has provided considerable support to developing staff capacity in addition to providing non-food items – for example, additional warehouse space to improve efficiency.

Partners

WFP's policies⁵ stipulate that WFP shall be proactive in seeking out partnerships. Improved partnership in terms of numbers and technical skills for implementing and monitoring recovery and development activities has been a key recommendation of many evaluations. More than 60 percent of the evaluations (of CPs and PRROs) found that the lack of experienced, technically adequate cooperating partners has been a serious constraint to implementation. The examples of the Haiti and Sierra Leone CP evaluations may be extreme. Both countries have only recently emerged from a protracted civil war, and weakened national structures and budget constraints have affected the implementation of these two CPs. However, these problems are also found to varying degrees elsewhere (for example, Mali, Niger).

The absence of partners in targeted areas in Haiti, for instance, has meant that the school-canteen programme could not start as scheduled. In addition, the Government's involvement was considered weak and activities were implemented more as a relief operation than as a development activity. The Sierra Leone CP was similar: WFP still operated through an emergency mode, and continued to assume primary responsibility for activity implementation of one component, with the Ministry seeming to play a subsidiary role. Strengthening the competencies of cooperating partners through training was recommended, in addition to providing financial support in proportion to the quantities of food actually distributed. The Liberia PRRO self-evaluation recommended cooperation with larger and better-equipped national and international organizations – they could act as intermediaries between WFP and the many community-based organizations for recovery activities and take over the dispatch, storage and monitoring of non-food items.

⁵ WFP/EB.A/99/4-A and WFP/EB.A/98/4-A.

Efficiency

In general terms – similar to the evaluation criterion “effectiveness” – 2006 evaluations found it difficult to apply the “efficiency” criterion. Centrally managed evaluations limited analysis to the cost-efficiency of delivering the inputs based on alpha value analysis.⁶ Further methodological work is needed in order to clarify fully this evaluation criterion.

The Tajikistan evaluation found that food for education (FFE) was the most cost-efficient because the food ration included pulses, which were expensive on the local market and had a high alpha value, while FFW was the least cost-efficient because the ration was mainly wheat flour, which was cheap on the local market.

Implementation was efficient in the Niger CP. Food delivery was relatively timely and regular, cooperating partners were rigorously selected, technical services were involved and populations participated in the activities. In other cases, however (Mali and Yemen), programme implementation efficiency was hampered by delivery delays and varying degrees of inappropriate commodity quality or packing. These problems could be addressed by intensifying local in-country procurement if cost effective.

The joint evaluation by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and WFP of the pilot food distribution projects⁷ concluded that the projects provided opportunities for rationalizing operations. The combined costs of secondary transport and final food distributions decreased to varying degrees in the pilot countries because of improvements in the distribution system.

Responding to Changing Needs

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are closely linked and mutually supportive. Evaluation relies on a good monitoring system with sound performance indicators and reliable tracking.

While COMPAS has facilitated adequate commodity monitoring from port to final delivery point, most evaluations have indicated that performance monitoring of outputs and outcomes was weak because of funding, staffing capacity, work priorities and unrealistic indicators. As a result, the systematic collection of information to guide programme implementation and report on results has not been possible.

The presence of WFP sub-offices in many countries facilitates the monitoring function. However, several evaluations found that sub-offices lacked a set monitoring plan, that reports were often delayed and that the reliability of reports was suspect. Frequently, data collected by cooperating partners were not timely or accurate, were inadequately analysed and were not followed up at the country office level. In the Nepal CP, for example, there was little evidence of any regular analytical report containing actions for follow-up and an implementation timeline.

In the Gambia – where WFP supported a small-scale education development project – national authorities lacked the human resources or budget to visit schools and collect and analyse data. In the context of the World Bank-funded “Education for All” Fast Track initiative to improve the quality of and access to education, the Government established a cluster monitoring system aimed at attaining quality education data. Regional education officers were appointed as cluster monitors to cover all aspects surrounding the school environment, including school feeding. The evaluation recommended that the project’s M&E system be revised accordingly.

Evaluations recommended selecting some significant but simple key outcome indicators (taking into account funding and staffing capacity), providing training and orientation for WFP country office and sub-office staff, and providing appropriate analytical tools. Considering that

⁶ Alpha value is the ratio of the local market price to the total cost to WFP for delivering the commodity from an external source to the locality: the closer the value is to 1, the more cost-neutral the transaction.

⁷ In July 2002, UNHCR and WFP agreed that WFP would take over, on a pilot basis and at its own expense, responsibility for the food distribution programme in five countries. The pilot projects were to be evaluated after one year of implementation.

cooperating partners undertake many critical information gathering activities, evaluations also underlined the importance of providing cooperating partners with periodic training on monitoring and reporting.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E) IN SOMALIA

The OEDE-managed evaluation of the Somalia PRRO 10191.00 – Food Aid for Relief and Recovery in Somalia – presented to the Executive Board in June 2006 showed that independent of security considerations that obviously affect the design of an M&E system, the failure to monitor planned outcomes was attributable to a number of factors:

- ▶ lack of field staff time allocated to this activity;
- ▶ lack of country office-level technical staff;
- ▶ low prioritization/lack of mandate on the part of country office management for collecting and analysing outcome data;
- ▶ the heavy demand for reporting on various initiatives from headquarters.

Lessons learned from the Somalia experience are that the design of an M&E system must take into account the utility of the system for informing programming decision making at the sub-office level. Country office management needs to ensure that standardized approaches and initiatives from headquarters are integrated into existing M&E initiatives aimed at meeting country office information needs.

The Policy, Strategy and Programme Support Division (PDP) is currently revising the conceptual framework and guidance for outcome measurement and has created a working group for this purpose in which OEDE participates. This working group will look particularly at indicators and targets, baseline and follow-up survey methodology, coverage and frequency, and data collection, analysis and reporting.

Results

Relevance

The evaluations reviewed concluded that WFP's humanitarian assistance and development portfolios generally addressed problems and objectives that were relevant and appropriate in

the context of national development priorities, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), poverty-reduction strategy papers and other relevant frameworks and mechanisms. The Sierra Leone CP emphasized that WFP has been and continues to be appropriately focused on areas specified in the National Food Aid Policy, where food aid has a clear comparative advantage. The Central America PRRO evaluation found that WFP delivered relevant assistance to the most affected communities in spite of difficult access. Several evaluations underlined that WFP was the only field-based agency in remote rural areas. They also stressed that partners considered this field presence and operational role in providing hands-on information from the field to the rest of the United Nations and international community as WFP's greatest strength.

School feeding was considered to be relevant as it addressed children's and their parents' particular needs and problems – in particular, long walking distances and food insecurity. It was also considered a suitable modality for promoting the use of mother-and-child nutrition (MCN) services, encouraging girls to attend school and creating assets for vulnerable households, although the success of the latter depended on technical assistance and other inputs.

Effectiveness: Achieving Objectives

The inadequacy of outcome data generally prevented the evaluations from assessing the effectiveness of individual activities or the overall effectiveness of the PRROs, EMOPs or CPs objectively. As noted above, projects, programmes and operations evaluated during 2006 experienced some shortfalls in resources, with consequent repercussions on their effectiveness. Four evaluations – of the Mali, Syria and Yemen CPs and the Cambodia PRRO – stressed that the operations would have been more effective if there had been better coordination and linkages with other agencies working in the same fields. The

Central America and Tajikistan PRRO evaluations noted that WFP assistance was spread over a large number of beneficiaries in many areas, diluting impact.

Targeting

Evaluations stressed the usefulness of vulnerability analysis and mapping (VAM) for informing targeting. Nonetheless, data do not always facilitate the measurement of intra-district variations in food security and poverty for the purposes of targeting the most vulnerable communities. In other cases, targeting has been affected by factors outside WFP's control: conflict, insecurity and lack of access. In the Somalia PRRO, for instance, redistribution according to equity rather than vulnerability was widespread. While this did result in inclusion errors and dilution, the many benefits in terms of social safety nets and social capital were believed to outweigh the disadvantages.

The thematic review of WFP's experience in targeting food aid in relief operations presented to the Executive Board in February 2006 found that WFP has made significant strides in targeting in recent years. This includes strengthened support for, and participation in, multi-stakeholder targeting structures, increased development and use of community-based targeting and distribution modalities, and an enhanced capacity to improve targeting over time.

STRENGTHENING TARGETING

The thematic review suggested that WFP could capture further gains in effectiveness and efficiency through additional investment in targeting. Stronger emphasis on more accurate targeting would not only bring WFP closer to achieving its goal of reaching the right people, but would save resources (as a result of reducing inclusion errors). The following priority actions were suggested:

- ▶ **More strategic selection of food aid modalities.** In many countries WFP can improve strategic analysis, particularly with regard to the objective comparison of costs, outcomes and impact. Selection of food modalities (general food distribution, selective or therapeutic supplemental food distribution, and school feeding) is often not based on the objective comparison of possible outcomes from various mixes. Instead, it is based on the particular experience of the local WFP team and the resources easily available to them (e.g. an expert FFW analyst, a good connection with a government official to implement a school-feeding project, a donor with a particular programme interest). Targeting in many operations continues to be too resource driven and insufficiently goal-driven.
- ▶ **Community-based targeted distribution (CBTD) as the inevitable option.** WFP is increasingly implementing CBTD, but CBTD is not appropriate everywhere. The conventional wisdom holds that CBTD is inappropriate in refugee situations, but the experience in Darfur suggests that CBTD can be a reliable (and the only viable) option in some high-risk environments in which WFP operates.
- ▶ **Making targeting a priority.** Additional investments in the key elements of targeting (vulnerability analysis, needs assessment, modality selection and mix) will continue to pay for themselves in terms of resources saved and additional food needs addressed. To increase investment in targeting, WFP must elevate the priority of targeting. Given the limited resources available to improve the food security of the world's 80 million food-insecure people, saving resources can translate directly to reaching more people in need.

Transition: Relief – Recovery – Development

Indicators for demonstrating a shift from general distributions to targeted recovery interventions – FFW, FFE, food for training (FFT) and MCN – were unavailable. Evaluations reviewed showed that at times of pipeline breaks, FFW and FFT activities were generally reduced or sometimes suspended, as in the Liberia and Tajikistan PRROs. FFW activities were also hampered during conflict and insecurity, for example in the Central African Republic, Liberia and Somalia PRROs and to some extent in the Nepal CP.

Implementation capacity for targeted activities depended on the availability of qualified partners with the appropriate technical skills. This was especially important for infrastructural or agricultural activities. Several PRRO evaluations recommended improving WFP staff's technical capacity at the sub-office level. In the case of Liberia, the Swiss government seconded two technical advisers in 2005, which was helpful but inadequate given the large number of project sites. Several agreements were later signed with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) for joint implementation of FFW and FFT projects, including seed protection, road rehabilitation and agricultural training for ex-combatants. In the light of scarce cash resources, it may be worthwhile to explore partnerships with other specialized United Nations agencies to a larger extent.

Six of the ten CP evaluations found that there was insufficient internal coherence and that components/activities were implemented in isolation, just as in the past under the project approach. In Nepal, for example, the lack of convergence between components stemmed from institutional arrangements, i.e. the absence of a mechanism to bring together key district and project staff and partners. At central level, planning

was carried out by the country office with line ministries – limiting the opportunities to channel inputs to the same geographical areas. Institutional arrangements in Sierra Leone, for instance the CP steering committee or the programme committee, were not in place. This prevented the integration of CP components in national and district recovery and development plans.

The Niger CP evaluation recommended that the country programme and its components should be designed together, which would help to preserve the programme's coherence. The Mali CP evaluation recommended examining complementarity between activities and target groups to allow beneficiaries to benefit from the package as a whole.

Once again, evaluations of the humanitarian assistance and development portfolios stressed that it is critical that the exit strategy be considered at a programme's outset. It is vital that WFP build a responsible exit strategy into the design planning and implementation process in order to ensure that WFP and government's joint achievements do not collapse once WFP assistance ends. The Tajikistan PRRO evaluation indicated that if WFP's ultimate objective is to facilitate a transition from emergency to development, and if the WFP exit strategy depends on a seamless handover to a government, PRROs must work in coordination with local authorities and government ministries from the outset. In Tajikistan, although the PRRO design called for the country office to outsource implementation to partners, WFP chose to carry out more direct implementation in partnership with local authorities and communities, thus helping to build local ownership. The Sierra Leone and Mali CP evaluations also emphasized that government support was critical for providing institutional support as well as community ownership. In the longer term, the Government will need to match external food aid resources with its own budget.

Evaluations of school-feeding projects⁸ suggested that they should incorporate some form of parental or community contribution – whether a payment in cash or in kind (through donated food or labour) – to guarantee that the programmes remain operational once WFP assistance has ended. With regard to FFW activities, evaluations concluded that the success and consequent sustainability of the activity relies on community ownership underpinned by strong technical oversight from government and cooperating partners. The Sierra Leone CP evaluation also underlined the need to invest in participatory rapid appraisal tools. These will empower communities to understand the activity's rationale and help them to identify, plan for and manage their own development process and activities and hence their exit strategy from WFP food assistance.

Effectiveness of Evaluation

Follow-up of Recommendations

The 11 evaluation reports presented during 2006 to the Executive Board contained a total of 147 recommendations. WFP responses in the Management Response Matrix (annexed to the Summary Evaluation Report) accepted 72 percent of recommendations fully and 25 percent partially. Three percent of recommendations were not accepted or found unfeasible for implementation. In 2007, OEDE will assess the implementation status of the recommendations that were fully and partially accepted by Management.

With regard to thematic review of targeting in relief situations, the MCN interventions and the Niger EMOP evaluation, the Board found the response matrixes to be inadequate and requested their revision. The Board furthermore instructed WFP with regard to the targeting review and requested that the Niger EMOP submit a progress report on the extent to which the teams' recommendations were implemented at a later session.

OEDE continues to work on a more systematic system for tracking evaluation recommendations and lessons learned. It is expected that the work undertaken by a task force of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), of which WFP is a member, will help improve the management response to evaluation recommendations, including follow-up actions, and provide inputs to the design of this system.

Influencing Change Processes

As a specific follow-up to the concern of the BPR evaluation about the multiplicity of different loans⁹ and the lack of control and oversight concerning the total loan portfolio for an operation, the Office of Budget headed a task force to review the various advance financing mechanisms available to projects. This should allow more transparency and more efficient use of advance funding mechanisms – the core aspect of BPR. The work of the task force, which included participants from the Operations Department (OD) and the Special Projects Branch (OEDSP), has now been completed. The task force will publish a paper providing comprehensive details of the various mechanisms and the requesting and approval processes in the near future.

Since the evaluation took place in 2006, the BPR has been subsumed into the broader new business model (NBM) and, among other things, the Fund Raising Division's work on improving donor forecasting (another weakness identified by the BPR evaluation) has continued.

10 ⁸ 18 of the 25 field evaluations covered school canteen programmes.

⁹ Working Capital Finance (WCF) and Project Cash Account (PCA) under the BPR; Direct Support Costs Advance Facility (DSCAF); Immediate Response Account (IRA); the external Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) – although the latter is now primarily grants, rather than loans.

Evaluation System

Evaluation Policy

WFP's evaluation policy of October 2003¹⁰ emphasizes that evaluation is a corporate policy responsibility. Consequently OEDE, which traditionally had exclusive responsibility for managing evaluations, now shares the evaluation function with regional bureaux and country offices. Any operation lasting longer than 12 months should be evaluated once during its lifetime.

The policy defined the main objectives of OEDE as:

- ▶ ensuring an independent evaluation service for the Executive Board, senior management and staff;
- ▶ supporting WFP in its efforts to become a better learning organization; and
- ▶ providing evaluation support for regional bureaux and country offices.

The evaluation policy encourages greater use of decentralized evaluations – including self-evaluations by staff and evaluations using external consultants for small- and medium-sized operations (including CPs, PRROs and EMOPs) managed by regional bureaux and country offices.¹¹

WFP-assisted operations are typically evaluated according to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. These comply with WFP's evaluation criteria developed from the Principles for Evaluation drawn up by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC)/ Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) evaluation network, in addition to the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) guide for humanitarian agencies.

The ALNAP guide also uses the criteria of coverage¹² and connectedness.¹³

All OEDE summary evaluation reports are presented to the Executive Board for consideration six months to one year after the start of evaluation arrangements. Full technical reports are also made available for information. These and the summary reports are posted on the internal and external OEDE websites. Ideally, summary evaluation reports are submitted to the same Executive Board session as the new project document presented for approval. This allows Board members to use evaluation findings when examining the latter document.

Additional measures¹⁴ to strengthen the evaluation function (approved by the Executive Board in May 2005) were implemented by OEDE during 2006:

Informal Consultation on Evaluation

- ▶ On 1 June 2006, the second informal consultation on evaluation was held with Board members to discuss the Annual Evaluation Report for 2005. The report, particularly in its synthesis of evaluation findings and lessons, was found to be a useful supplement to the individual evaluation reports presented to the Board throughout the year. With a view to adequately considering all issues, it was suggested that a request should be made to the Board to include the report on the agenda of the Annual Board Session, together with the Annual Performance Report.
- ▶ Board members also requested that a Corporate Management Response, similar to the individual evaluation reports, be produced at a future date for discussion by the Board to assess progress made in addressing corporate issues of concern.

¹⁰ WFP/EB.3/2003/4-C. A summary of this policy is given in Annex IV.

¹¹ Such evaluations have been conducted since 2001, during the first two years on a pilot basis.

¹² Coverage refers to the need to reach more population groups facing life-threatening risk, wherever they are.

¹³ Connectedness refers to the need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account.

¹⁴ WFP/EB.A/2005/5-E.

Internal Evaluation Committee (IEC)

► The Circular for the Establishment of the WFP Internal Evaluation Committee (IEC) was signed by the Executive Director on 23 January 2006. The IEC is composed of executive staff from the Operations, Policy and External Affairs departments, Oversight Services, and the Office of Evaluation, and three of the seven Regional Directors. Two meetings chaired by the Director for Results-based Management took place in 2006. During the first meeting, the Chairperson recommended that OEDE's programme of work and management responses to evaluation recommendations be reviewed and discussed at all meetings of the IEC. The second meeting also dealt with the successor arrangements for OEDE following the dismantling of the Office for Results-based Management. Given that the new Director of Evaluation will report directly to the Executive Director, it was agreed that the future Chairperson of the IEC should be the Director, Policy, Strategy and Programme Support Division.

Professionalization of the Evaluation Function

► In line with the report on the management of evaluation, in 2006 two posts were occupied by professional evaluators.¹⁵ Furthermore, a longer rotation period has been introduced for these posts to ensure continuity.

External Peer Reviews

► In 2006, a peer review was conducted for the evaluation of the Sudan EMOP 10339.0/1 – Assistance to Populations Affected by Conflict in Greater Darfur, West Sudan. Peer reviewers provided comments on the terms of reference, inception report and on the final evaluation report.

Participation in Groups and Networks

OEDE participates in different groups and networks in order to keep up to date on evaluation methodology, networking and contributing to the development of professional standards:

Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP).

OEDE is a member of ALNAP and attends the biennial meetings. The primary functions of the meetings are networking and information exchange of the organizations' accountability and learning activities to enhance the quality of humanitarian action. The broad theme of the June meeting in Nairobi was food security. The agenda of the December meeting, which took place in Rome and was hosted by FAO and WFP, included a presentation on the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC). The meeting outlined the TEC process, findings and implications, and also held workshops on joint evaluation, system response to the TEC recommendations, disaster-risk reduction, regulation within the humanitarian sector, ownership, and a proposed new approach for inter-agency real-time evaluation on the basis of a paper prepared by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

United Nations Evaluation Group.¹⁶ OEDE is also a member of UNEG and is involved in three of the five task forces¹⁷ and in one of the two working groups. It also co-chaired the Quality Stamp Task Force until August 2006¹⁸ with the Office of Evaluation of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).¹⁹ The Quality Stamp's objectives are to support UNEG members in applying UNEG professional norms and standards. At the annual UNEG meeting hosted by the United Nations

¹⁵ The new Director, a professional evaluator, took up her functions in February 2007.

¹⁶ UNEG was established in January 1984 (originally under the name of the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation). Its main objective is to provide a forum for the discussion of evaluation issues within the United Nations system. The OECD/DAC evaluation network and international institutions attend the annual meeting as observers.

¹⁷ OEDE participates in the following task forces: Quality Stamp, Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminar, Evaluation Capacity Development and the working group on Oversight.

¹⁸ The Director of Evaluation retired from WFP on 31 August 2006, and the Director of the Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office was elected Co-Chair.

¹⁹ At the time of writing this report, the Director of the UNIDO Evaluation Office was transferred to another department, and the new Director of OEDE was elected Co-Chair.

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Paris in March 2006, the task force presented the Baseline Synopsis Report.²⁰ This was based on a self-assessment by 23 of the 36 UNEG members on compliance with the norms and standards. The data and information are intended as a starting point for further exploration among UNEG members.

The task force's 2006-2007 programme of work foresees further work on the quality stamp, particularly with regard to exploring alternative ways for UNEG to produce an accreditation procedure and options for peer reviews based on different requirements and types of agencies. With a view to enhancing coordination with the DAC evaluation network for peer reviews, a joint DAC/UNEG (Quality Stamp) Task Force on Professional Peer Reviews of Evaluation Functions in Multilateral Organizations was created in June 2006. This task force developed the Framework for Professional Peer Reviews, which was discussed at its meeting in November 2006 in Paris. The peer review of WFP's evaluations function will be undertaken in 2007 according to this framework.

Training

In 2006, four OEDE staff attended specialized training in evaluation at the International Programme for Development Evaluation Training in Ottawa (Canada) and The Evaluator's Institute, Washington DC.

²⁰ The official report is available on the UNEG web site (www.uneval.org). Its link is also on the WFP website (www.wfp.org/operations/evaluation).

WFP Evaluation Activities

IN 2006

OEDE'S Programme of Work

As mandated by the Board, in 2006 OEDE concentrated on evaluating corporate issues and important EMOPs and PRROs, as shown in the box below.

OEDE EVALUATIONS, REVIEWS AND OTHER REPORTS

The following 14 evaluations, reviews and other reports undertaken by OEDE were completed during 2006 and presented to the Executive Board for consideration:

Thematic evaluations

- i) Thematic Review of Targeting in Relief Operations (at the Board's 2006 First Regular Session).
- ii) Thematic Review of WFP-supported Child Nutrition Interventions (at the Board's 2006 First Regular Session).
- iii) WFP/UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution (at the Board's 2006 First Regular Session).
- iv) Evaluation of the Business Process Review (at the Board's 2006 Annual Session).

PRRO evaluations

- v) Evaluation of PRRO Somalia No. 10191.0 (at the Board's 2006 Annual Session).
- vi) Evaluation of Central America PRRO No. 10212.0 (at the Board's 2006 Second Regular Session).
- vii) Evaluation of Tajikistan PRRO No. 10231.0 (at the Board's 2006 Second Regular Session).

EMOP evaluations

- viii) Evaluation of WFP's Response to the Crisis in Niger in 2005 (at the Board's 2006 Annual Session).

CP evaluations

- ix) Evaluation of WFP's Assistance to China, 1979–2005 (at the Board's 2006 First Regular Session).
- x) Evaluation of Country Programme Yemen No. 10137.0 (at the Board's 2006 Annual Session).

- xi) Mid-Term Evaluation of Country Programme Bhutan No. 10133.0 (at the Board's 2006 Annual Session).

Joint evaluations

- xii) Synthesis of the Tsunami Evaluation (Information Note) (at the Board's 2006 Second Regular Session).
- xiii) Inter-Agency Real Time Evaluation of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Cluster Approach in the South-Asia Earthquake (Information Note) (at the Board's 2006 Second Regular Session).

Annual Evaluation Report

- xiv) The annual evaluation report for 2005 was discussed with Board members at the annual informal consultation on 1 June 2006.

Preparatory missions were introduced in 2005 to solicit inputs from stakeholders and collect background data for the evaluation. Preparatory missions have proven to enhance the quality of evaluation, and are now undertaken for most evaluations. These missions, comprised of the Evaluation Manager and the team leader, contribute to creating ownership of the evaluation by involving the country office and other stakeholders in the evaluation design process.

Joint Evaluations

During 2006, OEDE was involved in two inter-agency evaluations of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) cluster approach: (i) the real-time evaluation of the IASC application of the cluster approach in the South Asia earthquake; and (ii) the IASC self-assessment of cluster roll-out countries – Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Liberia, Somalia and Uganda; both evaluations were managed by OCHA.

OEDE contributed US\$20,000 to the real-time evaluation of the cluster approach in Pakistan. Evaluation officers also participated in the OCHA-led Core Learning Group of both exercises, providing comments on terms of reference and evaluation methodology, and reviewing the reports.

REAL-TIME EVALUATION OF THE IASC CLUSTER APPROACH

The Pakistan earthquake in October 2005 was the first test-case for the cluster approach, which at the time was still being elaborated. The inter-agency real-time evaluation highlighted the approach's potential for improving response. Even though implementation was uneven and somewhat problematic in the beginning, it provided a single and recognizable framework for coordination, collaboration, decision making and action in a chaotic operational environment.

The IASC self-assessment of implementation of the cluster approach in the field was conducted by OCHA between September and November 2006, and WFP participated. The self-assessment highlighted the approach's potential to improve the overall effectiveness of the humanitarian response in spite of the challenges that remain – for example, management of the cluster and the interpretation of lead roles. An independent evaluation of the cluster approach, managed by OCHA and supported by an inter-agency steering committee in which WFP is represented, is planned for mid-2007.

A number of lessons emerged from the self-assessment:

- ▶ Gaps need to be addressed and identified adequately.
- ▶ Global cluster leads need to provide the necessary support to their respective field groups.
- ▶ Sector leads with appropriate skills and training should be appointed for priority areas of response.
- ▶ The agreed guidance needs to be translated into training and a "toolkit".

OEDE Support for Decentralized Evaluations

OEDE provided evaluation support to regional bureaux and country offices by commenting on draft terms of reference and mission composition and by recommending qualified consultants for evaluations in Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Niger, Syria and Uganda.

Capacity and funding for decentralized evaluations, and therefore their quality, generally remain problematic. Regional bureaux have no dedicated M&E officers to provide technical support for evaluation to the country offices. Contrary to OEDE-managed evaluations, which are funded from the Programme Support and Administration (PSA) under OEDE's biennial PSA budget allocation (based on a Board-approved programme of work), decentralized evaluations are funded from the interventions' direct support costs (DSC). Sufficient funds should be available for conducting a decentralized evaluation for the humanitarian assistance portfolio, but in practice M&E funds are sometimes re-allocated for unforeseen expenditures. Funds available for appraisal, project preparation and evaluation for the development portfolio are insufficient to cover the costs of decentralized evaluations; for 2006, these costs were estimated at US\$372,000. There is an urgent need to review the strategy for decentralized evaluations so that they are functioning and effective.

Table 1 shows that 54 percent of the revised programme of decentralized evaluations was implemented by regional bureaux and country offices in 2006.

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF DECENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS UNDERTAKEN DURING 2006

| | Regional bureau | | Country office | | Self-evaluation | | Total | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Revised target | Actual | Revised target | Actual | Revised target | Actual | Revised target | Actual | Per cent |
| ODB | 5 | 3 ²¹ | 4 | 2 ²² | - | - | 9 | 5 | 56 |
| ODC | 2 | - ²³ | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 | 1 | 33 |
| ODD | - | - | 8 | 5 | 4 | 2 ²⁴ | 11 | 7 | 64 |
| ODJ | 1 | - ²⁵ | - | - | 1 | - ²⁶ | 2 | - | 0 |
| ODK | 3 | - ²⁷ | 2 | 2 | - | - | 5 | 2 | 40 |
| ODP | 1 | - ²⁸ | 4 | 3 | - | 1 | 5 | 4 | 80 |
| ODS ²⁹ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TOTAL | 12 | 3 | 19 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 35 | 19 | 54 |

After-action reviews (AARs) and self-evaluations share a number of similarities and have the common purpose of serving as a learning tool. Both are currently used at the discretion of country offices. During 2006, four AARs in lieu of self-evaluations were conducted for the WFP Shipping Service in Banda Aceh (Indonesia), the Occupied Palestinian Territory PRRO, the Iraq EMOP and the Mauritania PRRO.

Smaller countries such as Namibia combined the evaluation of the current operation with the needs assessment for the next phase. Nonetheless, a joint assessment mission cannot substitute for an evaluation. Greater clarity is required on the purpose of each of these tools, the difference between them and guidance on their use, mandatory and voluntary.

Closing the Learning Loop

Using and Disseminating Evaluation Results

OEDE disseminates evaluation reports widely, internally and to the general public. Dissemination takes the following forms:

- ▶ *Evaluation reports* are accessible on the OEDE web pages of WFP's public website (www.wfp.org/operations/evaluation) and for WFP staff on the internal M&E knowledge base website. Hard copies of the full reports are available for Board members when the evaluation is discussed at the Board. In addition, hard copies of the full report are forwarded to WFP senior management, regional bureaux, and country offices. Country offices are requested to share the report with government authorities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), United Nations agencies and other concerned or interested agencies.
- ▶ *Two-page evaluation briefs* summarize major findings, recommendations and lessons learned of individual evaluations. These are posted on the OEDE web pages of WFP's public website; hard copies are distributed to senior management, liaison officers, regional bureaux, country offices, United Nations agencies and major donors.

²¹ Two evaluations were postponed and one cancelled.

²² Two evaluations were postponed for security reasons.

²³ Two after-action reviews were facilitated by ODC.

²⁴ One self-evaluation was replaced by an AAR.

²⁵ The planned evaluation was substituted by a country office-managed evaluation undertaken at the end of 2005. It should be noted that the major activity in the Southern Africa region covering seven countries and some 70 percent of resources in the region is the Southern Africa PRRO, which was evaluated by OEDE in late 2006. The report will be presented to the Board's Annual Session in June 2007. In 2005, OEDE undertook the Angola country portfolio evaluation consisting of the three most recent PRROs implemented from 2002 to 2004, and five special operations (SOs) designed to help the PRROs achieve their objectives. The 2004 PRRO represented eight percent of total resources.

²⁶ A self-evaluation was undertaken in 2005.

²⁷ Two evaluations were postponed and one evaluation was undertaken by the country office.

²⁸ One self-evaluation was facilitated by the regional bureau.

²⁹ Evaluations of the Darfur EMOP No. 10339.0/1 and Sudan EMOP 10048.0/1/2 have been conducted by OEDE in late 2006, and in February 2004 respectively.

► *Annual evaluation reports* draw from main findings and lessons of centralized and decentralized evaluation issues that go beyond individual evaluations. These reports are available electronically on the external and internal websites. Hard copies are distributed to WFP senior management, WFP liaison offices, regional bureaux, country offices, United Nations agencies and major donor representatives.

Programme Review Committee

OEDE evaluation officers provide comments in writing to the Programme Review Committee (PRC) to ensure that output and outcome indicators are coherent with programme design. OEDE comments also aim to ensure lessons are learned from evaluations and that recommendations are incorporated into the design of the new phase. When reviewing project documents, it is also ascertained whether the intervention adheres to WFP's evaluation policy, which stipulates that all projects, programmes and operations with a duration of longer than 12 months must be evaluated and budget allocations must be made for this purpose, unless it is included in OEDE's programme of work.

Programme Quality Assurance

OEDE is a member of the inter-divisional Programme Quality Assurance (PQA) team formed in 2004 to lead the process of establishing programme quality standards. OEDE contributes to this process through lessons learned and best practices from evaluations.

Conclusions and Outlook

The evaluations conducted in 2006 do not lend themselves to a simple aggregation of findings, but necessitate a more nuanced interpretation of observations and assessments. This situation stems, in part, from the nature of WFP's business (which takes place in highly varied and complex situations) and also from evaluation methodologies that need to be further developed, refined, and applied rigorously. The following paragraphs provide a synthesis of the main findings, which do not significantly differ between the humanitarian assistance and development portfolios.

Conclusions

Evaluations undertaken in 2006 showed that logistics is a recognized strength of WFP. Arrangements were most efficient and reliable when WFP, together with its implementing partners, managed the implementation process throughout.

The evaluation of the BPR confirmed that the tool had been effective in the pilot projects in managing financial resources and ensuring a larger number of recipients were reached in a more timely way. Its gradual expansion to a larger number of countries and operations will help to alleviate delays and shortfalls in resources that currently affect the delivery of the programme as documented in most evaluations.

Partnerships are a major objective of WFP, as defined in its Enabling Development Policy and as one of the five objectives in the Strategic Plan. Most evaluations in 2006 have shown that partnerships are difficult in areas where WFP typically operates: government structures are weakened by conflict or calamities; and NGOs

must rely on staff with relatively short-term assignments because of the hardship of postings that induce high turn-over rates. WFP's resource constraints, the urgency to deliver food to needy recipients (i.e. de-prioritizing capacity-building objectives and requisite resource allocations) and required but often missing competences for capacity building across a number of WFP fields of responsibility often puts this objective into a secondary position.

Evaluations found that WFP's assistance is, by and large, relevant and appropriate to the problems faced by the people WFP serves. Equally, the evaluations indicated that WFP's assistance was coherent with government strategies and with the UNDAFs.

With regard to reaching WFP's most relevant target group, namely the most food insecure and vulnerable, evaluations found that multi-stakeholder targeting, especially through community-based mechanisms, had been effective, although it was not a panacea to be used under all circumstances. In some contexts, questions remain about balancing considerations of vulnerability (i.e. targeting) with those of equity among all community members. Further improvements can be made if the right level of priority were assigned to improved targeting and needs assessments. This would result in strategic choices being made about modalities and channels chosen for delivering food aid.

Evidence from the 2006 evaluations is insufficient to report conclusively on the results achieved by WFP. Measuring effectiveness and impact poses – in the area of food aid – methodological challenges that WFP still needs to address. One

challenge is that resources are not secured at the time of approval of an operation. As a result, expected results – outcomes and impacts – are, by definition, over-estimated in the case of shortfalls or delays in resources. Thus, the expectations against which to evaluate need to be adjusted. Evaluations face data limitations: (i) data collected on outcomes and impacts are inadequate; (ii) M&E systems are insufficiently standardized, thus making a comparison of data across operations or over time difficult and unreliable; and (iii) data are not of sufficient quality. Collecting outcome and impact data during evaluation is costly and often beyond the budget available for independent evaluations. Using secondary data instead may be possible in some cases, but will require an understanding of the methodological implications – something OEDE will be working on.

The lack of linear progression from relief to recovery to development is another dimension that requires methodological attention. In many of the crisis-prone areas, people are subjected to a series of crises, for instance, repeated droughts, sometimes alternating with floods, or with recurring conflicts. Thus, it is more difficult to establish the ideal scenario in which success would be measured by the number of people that move from needing relief assistance to becoming partners in development programmes and projects.

Outlook

This outlook focuses on improvements to WFP's evaluation system to ensure that future individual evaluations, and thus Annual Evaluation Reports, generate more robust data that, over time, can be analysed for trends and for systemic issues that require senior management and Board attention.

WFP has a multi-tiered evaluation system, including centralized and decentralized evaluation functions; the latter are carried out to varying degrees by country offices and regional bureaux. OEDE is the guardian of evaluation standards and

principles in WFP, and it manages independent evaluations. It plays a central role in communicating evaluation findings – including those generated through decentralized evaluations – to:

- ▶ member countries through presentations at the Board and through a yearly informal consultation, which includes discussion of the Annual Evaluation Report;
- ▶ WFP senior management through a direct reporting line to the Executive Director and through the Internal Evaluation Committee;
- ▶ decision makers at various operational levels through the evaluation process, including debriefings with stakeholders; and
- ▶ feedback into the PRC and PQA mechanisms to inform the design of new operations and programme quality.

OEDE and WFP management recognize that continuously enhancing the evaluation functions across WFP is vital. This will ensure that evaluations contribute effectively to organizational improvements (learning) and also ensure accountability for results. To strengthen WFP's evaluation system, an independent peer review will be undertaken in 2007 to assess how well WFP's evaluation service compares with international best practice. The findings and recommendations of the peer review will be presented to the Board in February 2008.

In the meantime, OEDE will introduce a number of measures in 2007 to achieve the maximum value from evaluations and to increase their utility:

- ▶ **Quality standards for evaluations** will be developed using international best practice (ALNAP, OECD/DAC Evaluation Network and UNEG). The quality standards will be mandatory for all centrally managed evaluations from 2008 onwards. They will also be applied to decentralized evaluations before using the results

of Annual Evaluation Report evaluations. The quality standards will increase transparency and predictability in the evaluation process and the reliability and comparability of evaluation reports. This in turn will improve the annual reporting of evaluation findings.

- ▶ **Effectiveness of evaluations** — the degree to which evaluation recommendations are implemented — will be increased through: (i) careful screening and prioritization of evaluation recommendations; (ii) the piloting of a follow-up process after evaluations are completed to discuss with stakeholders action to be taken and development of the management response matrix; and (iii) the introduction of a tracking system for recommendations and lessons learned. The latter will enable OEDE to analyse and aggregate the types of recommendations and lessons that are accepted and acted upon and, thus, demonstrate areas in which WFP is progressing. The system will also help highlight areas in which corporate-level discussions are needed about necessary remedial measures.
- ▶ **Strategic choices** made for operations or thematic issues for evaluation will be enhanced. The system for tracking recommendations and lessons will also help identify areas in which systemic issues remain and indicate the need for further evaluation. OEDE's work programme is guided by the principles set out by the Board; the Annual Evaluation Report is expected to inform the Board about areas that would warrant further evaluation to ensure further improvements in WFP's operations.

OEDE will continue working with international evaluators and participate in joint evaluations of, for example, the One United Nations pilots, the review of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and inter-agency real-time evaluations.

In the course of 2007, OEDE will discuss with WFP management the future of decentralized

evaluations in WFP, including measures to strengthen the evaluation system and OEDE's contributions in this respect.

ANNEX I

Evaluations Completed in 2006

OEDE-Managed Evaluations

Summary Report on the Evaluation of WFP's Assistance to China (1979-2005), February 2006.

Summary Report on the Thematic Review of Targeting in Relief Operations, February 2006.

Summary Report on Thematic Review of WFP-supported Child Nutrition Interventions, February 2006.

Summary Report on the WFP/UNHCR Joint Evaluation of the Pilot Food Distribution, February 2006.

Summary Report on the Evaluation of Country Programme Yemen No. 10137.0, June 2006.

Summary Report on the Mid-Term Evaluation of Country Programme Bhutan No. 10133.0, June 2006.

Summary Report on the Evaluation of PRRO Somalia No. 10191.0, June 2006.

Summary Report on the Evaluation of WFP's Response to the Crisis in Niger in 2005, June 2006.

Summary Report on the Evaluation of the Business Process Review, June 2006.

Summary Report on the Evaluation of Central America PRRO No. 10212.0, November 2006.

Summary Report on the Evaluation of Tajikistan PRRO No. 10231.0, November 2006.

Synthesis Report on the Tsunami Evaluation (Information Note), November 2006.

Summary Report on the Inter-Agency Real Time Evaluation of the Inter-Agency Standing

Committee Cluster Approach in the South-Asia Earthquake (Information Note), November 2006.

Decentralized regional bureau and country office-managed evaluations and reviews, and self-evaluations

Asia Regional Bureau

Report on the Mid-term Review of PRRO Cambodia 10305.0 – Food Aid for Recovery and Rehabilitation, September 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Laos PRRO 10319.0 – Recovery Assistance to the Disaster Prone and Vulnerable Food Insecure Communities in the LAO PDR, July 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Myanmar PRRO 10066.2 – Assistance to Returnees and Vulnerable Groups in Northern Rakine State and Magway Division, March 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Myanmar EMOP 10345.1 – Emergency Food Assistance to Vulnerable Families in Shan State, April 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Country Programme Nepal 10093.0, June 2006.

Middle East, Central Asia and Eastern Europe Regional Bureau

Report on the Review of Development Project Syria 10070.00 – Support to Small Farmers and Herders on Marginal and Degraded Lands, June 2006.

West Africa Regional Bureau

Report on the Self-Evaluation of the School Feeding Programme, Liberia PRRO 10064.3, June 2006.

Report on the Self-Evaluation of the Food Support to Local Initiatives (FSLI) Programme, PRRO 10064.3, November 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Country Programme
Mali 10205.0, October 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Country Programme
Niger 10285.0, December 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Project Gambia
10311.0 – Support to Basic Education in Rural
Vulnerable Regions, May 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Country Programme
Cameroon 10214.0, June 2006.

Report on the Evaluation of Country Programme
Sierra Leone, October 2006.

Report on the Review of Central Africa PRRO
10189.1 – Assistance to Populations Affected by
Armed Conflicts in the Central African Republic,
December 2006.

Southern Africa Regional Bureau

None

East and Central Africa Regional Bureau

Report on the Evaluation of PRRO Ethiopia
10127.1 – Food Assistance to Somali, Sudanese
and Eritrean Refugees, May 2006.

Sudan Bureau

None

Latin America and Caribbean Regional Bureau

Report on the Self-Evaluation of EMOP Ecuador
10524.0 – Food Assistance to Flood-affected Families
in Los Rios Province, Ecuador, August 2006.

Report on the Self-Evaluation of Country
Programme Bolivia 2003–2007 – 10159.0, 2006.

Report on the Mid-Term Evaluation-cum
Appraisal of the Country Programme Haiti
10217.0 (School Feeding), May 2006.

ANNEX II

Office of Evaluation Staff

(As of 31.12.2006)

Mr Kees TUINENBURG, Director³⁰

Mr Julian LEFEVRE, Chief Evaluation Officer³¹

Ms Annemarie WAESCHLE, Senior Evaluation Officer

Mr. Alain CORDEIL, Senior Evaluation Officer

Mr Jeffrey MARZILLI, Evaluation Officer

Ms Katrin VON DER MOSEL, Evaluation Officer³²

Ms Pernille HOUGESSEN, Evaluation Officer³³

Ms Anne-Claire LUZOT, Evaluation Officer

Ms Aurelie LARMOYER, Evaluation Officer³⁴

Ms Eliana ZUPPINI, Senior Staff Assistant

Ms Rosa NETTI, Programme Assistant

VACANT, Research Assistant

Ms Fiona DUNCAN, Administrative Clerk

Ms Samantha MARTINI, Temporary Research Clerk

³⁰ Mr Tuinenburg retired as of 1 September 2006; his successor, Ms Caroline Heider, took up her functions on 1 February 2007.

³¹ Mr Lefèvre was Acting Director from 1 September 2006, when Mr Tuinenburg retired, to 31 January 2007.

³² Ms von der Mosel left OEDE in December 2006 on secondment to the Office of United Nations Volunteers.

³³ Ms Hougesen has been on leave without pay since May 2006.

³⁴ Former junior professional officer (JPO); temporarily against a current Evaluation Officer post.

ANNEX III

OEDE Management Protocol³⁵

OEDE provides an independent evaluation service to the Board and to the Executive Director.

WFP has an evaluation policy that is approved by the Board based on the twin pillars of accountability and learning.

OEDE will be located in the Office of the Executive Director as of 1 January 2007.

OEDE is currently one of the two offices constituting the RBM division³⁶. The Director of OEDE reports to the Director of the RBM division, who will ensure that the parameters are in place to enable OEDE to carry out its work.

OEDE is autonomous in carrying out its evaluation work. The budget and programme of work are approved by the Board.

OEDE consists of a director, senior staff and support staff. The director is appointed by the Executive Director and will have relevant professional evaluation experience in line with a job description that will be shared with the Board beforehand. With regard to professional staff, it will consist of a mix of professional evaluators, to be externally recruited and experienced internal staff. Reassignment cycles will be longer than usual. The final selection of staff will be made by the Director of OEDE, with due regard to HR procedures.

Terms of reference for evaluation work are finalized by the Director of OEDE following a process of consultation.

As a rule, OEDE-managed evaluations are undertaken by external and independent evaluators. The final decision on recruitment is taken by the Director of OEDE.

The Director of OEDE is responsible for signing off all evaluation reports before submitting them simultaneously to the Board and the Executive Director.

Summary reports of all OEDE-managed evaluations are shared with the Board. Full technical reports will be made available separately. Summary reports contain a management-response matrix as an annex.

OEDE will maintain a follow-up mechanism of evaluation recommendations.

OEDE prepares an annual evaluation report incorporating decentralized evaluations for discussion in the annual informal consultation with the Board.

OEDE will maintain an externally accessible website presenting WFP's evaluation policy, programme of work, evaluation reports and other information.

³⁵ The OEDE Management Protocol was developed in the context of "Strengthening the Evaluation Function in WFP" (WFP/EB.A/2005/5-E).

³⁶ As of 1 January 2007, OEDE will report directly to the Executive Director.

ANNEX IV

Summary of WFP's Evaluation Policy

WFP's October 2003 evaluation policy document (WFP/EB.3/2003/4-C) emphasizes that evaluation is a corporate responsibility resting on the twin pillars of accountability and learning, in a context of independence. OEDE, which previously had exclusive responsibility for managing evaluations, now shares the evaluation function with the whole of WFP.

OEDE's main objectives are to: (i) ensure an independent evaluation service for the Executive Board, senior management and staff; (ii) support WFP's move towards becoming a better learning organization; and (iii) provide evaluation support for regional bureaux and country offices.

On the basis of the principle that any programme, project or operation longer than 12 months should be evaluated, the division of labour is the following:

Evaluations managed by country offices or regional bureaux should include "... any operation at any time if the management need arises and if issues cannot be dealt with through self-evaluation; and any operation if the cumulative budget of all phases exceeds US\$50 million and if the previous evaluation took place more than three years prior...". If it is not "feasible or desirable" for a country office or regional bureau to manage the evaluation, OEDE should be approached.

Self-evaluations are to be "... undertaken by the country office in collaboration with the government, implementing partners and, when feasible, beneficiary representatives prior to the planning of a new phase or at operations' close. Normally, no external consultant should be involved other than as a facilitator of the process."

Evaluations managed by OEDE are to include "... all first-generation development CPs at mid-point; any operation if the cumulative budget of all phases exceeds US\$50 million and if the previous evaluation took place more than three years before (if such an evaluation is not undertaken by the country office or the regional bureau); any operation, thematic or policy evaluation requested by the Executive Board or by senior management; and OEDE-managed evaluations identified and proposed as part of its biennium work-planning exercise; these are undertaken with the agreement of the regional bureau and the country office."

The guiding principles of evaluation at WFP are the following:

- ▶ evaluations must serve a management purpose;
- ▶ evaluations must be independent and impartial;
- ▶ evaluations must be credible;
- ▶ evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons must be made public and disseminated to all stakeholders concerned;
- ▶ evaluation concerns must be addressed at the design of an intervention; and
- ▶ whenever possible, evaluations must be undertaken in partnership with recipient countries, sister United Nations agencies and interested donors.

OEDE reports simultaneously to the Executive Board and the Executive Director. Its budget and work plan are submitted to the Board for approval with WFP's Management Plan. Since 2004, the budget has been entirely funded from the PSA

budget. This budgetary independence has been an important part of the functioning of the evaluation service.

The location of OEDE in the Secretariat facilitates the integration of findings into the preparation of policies and formulation of projects and programmes.

During the discussions of WFP's evaluation policy, the Board requested the Secretariat to develop three related issues to strengthen WFP's evaluation function: the location of the Office of Evaluation, the merits and practicability of establishing a sub-committee of the Board on evaluation, and the staffing arrangements for the Office of Evaluation. Following discussions with the Sub-Group on Governance, it was decided to widen the discussion to include eight issues.³⁷ The report prepared by the Secretariat in cooperation with the Sub-Group on Governance was presented to the Board in 2005 for consideration. It included the following innovations to strengthen the role of evaluation:

- ▶ establishment of a consultative internal evaluation committee;
- ▶ an annual informal consultation on evaluation;
- ▶ establishment of three or four specialized evaluation officer posts, including a Director, filled by persons with a professional background in evaluation; the current rotation policy for WFP staff will be applied less rigidly;
- ▶ involvement of eminent outsiders for peer review of important evaluations; and
- ▶ a peer review of WFP's evaluation machinery in 2007.

³⁷ Is WFP devoting sufficient resources to evaluation? What scope exists for improving lessons in the Secretariat? Could the presentation of evaluation issues to the Board be improved? Should evaluation be the subject of annual informal consultation? What steps might be taken to strengthen the skills and experience of the staff in OEDE? Should the Board be involved, and if so how? Could the quality control of evaluation be enhanced by involving outsiders? Should WFP's evaluation machinery be the subject of a peer review by outside experts at some point?

Acronyms

| | | | |
|---------------|---|----------------|--|
| AAR | after-action review | IRA | Immediate Response Account |
| ALNAP | Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action | LTSH | landside transport, storage and handling |
| APR | Annual Performance Report | M&E | monitoring and evaluation |
| BPR | business process review | MCHC | mother-and-child health community |
| CBTD | community-based targeted distribution | MCN | mother-and-child nutrition |
| CERF | Central Emergency Response Fund | NBM | new business model |
| COMPAS | Commodity Movement Processing and Analysis System | NGO | non-governmental organization |
| CP | country programme | OCHA | Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee | OD | Operations Department |
| DEV | development programme | ODB | Asia Regional Bureau |
| DOC | direct operational costs | ODC | Middle East, Central Asia and Eastern Europe Regional Bureau |
| DRC | Democratic Republic of Congo | ODD | West Africa Regional Bureau |
| DSC | direct support costs | ODJ | Southern Africa Regional Bureau |
| DSCAF | Direct Support Costs Advance Facility | ODK | East and Central Africa Regional Bureau |
| EMOP | emergency operation | ODOC | other direct operational costs |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations | ODP | Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Bureau |
| FFE | food for education | ODS | Sudan Regional Bureau |
| FFT | food for training | OECD | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| FFW | food for work | OEDE | Office of Evaluation |
| IASC | Inter-Agency Standing Committee | OEDSP | Special Projects Branch |
| IEC | Internal Evaluation Committee | | |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| PCA | Project Cash Account |
| PDP | Policy, Strategy and Programme Support Division |
| PQA | Programme Quality Assurance |
| PRA | project rapid appraisal |
| PRC | Programme Review Committee |
| PRRO | protracted relief and recovery operation |
| PSA | Programme Support and Administrative (budget) |
| RBM | Results Based Management |
| SENAIP | Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessment Implementation Plan |
| SO | special operation |
| TEC | Tsunami Evaluation Coalition |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UNHCR | Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organization |
| UNMIL | United Nations Mission in Liberia |
| VAM | vulnerability analysis and mapping |
| WCF | Working Capital Finance |
| WINGS | WFP Information Network and Global System |

For more detailed information visit our Web site:

www.wfp.org

or contact:

WFP Office of Evaluation
Via Cesare Giulio Viola, 68/70
00148 Rome, Italy

E-Mail: HQ.Evaluation@wfp.org

Fax: +39-066513-2833



**World Food
Programme**