

# Evaluation Terms of Reference



## SUMMARY TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Evaluation of WFP's Regional Response to the Ebola Virus Disease Crisis (EVD) in West Africa

*The Ebola epidemic across West Africa was three times larger than any outbreak previously recorded for this devastating disease, leading the World Health Organization (WHO) to declare the outbreak to be a "global health emergency of international concern". As of January 2016, at least 28,600 people had contracted the Ebola virus, killing more than 11,300 in West Africa alone. For the first time in history, the EVD outbreak occurred in both rural and urban areas and crossed national boundaries. Its broader effects, beyond its impact on people's health, have been dramatic, with substantial economic and social damage affecting more than 20 million people in the three Ebola affected countries (Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone) and the broader region. Limiting the human costs and economic impacts of the EVD outbreak has required very quick and significant financial resources and coordination. The effort has gone beyond the UN system and has been characterized by multi-stakeholder responses, involving Red Cross & Red Crescent Movements, many Non-Governmental Organisations (ONG), the private sector, military groups, and contributions from national governments and regional bodies the world over.*

#### Subject and Focus of the Evaluation

This evaluation will have a regional focus with specific attention to WFP's response from January 2014 to December 2015, in the three Ebola affected countries: Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

The evaluation will cover all WFP operations implemented during the above timeframe including IR-EMOPs (200698, 200749 and 200758), the regional EMOP 200761 (Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone) and regional Special Operations (200760, 200767 and 200773), assessing the following interventions/pillars: i) Delivering food and nutrition support alongside the health response; ii) mitigating the impact of the health emergency on food security; iii) ensuring the movement of partner staff and materials and; iv) providing common services and infrastructure support for health partners. The evaluation will also consider operational and functional areas such as logistics, procurement, ICT, information/reporting, financial, human resources to determine what, and how far, achievements were supported or inhibited by operational factors and to identify best practices that can feed organizational learning.

#### Objectives and Users of the Evaluation

Although the evaluation will have the dual objectives of accountability and learning, the emphasis will be on organisational learning considering that this is an opportunity to assess WFP's strategies, systems, tools, procedures and actions in response to the unique demands of the EVD outbreak. Specifically, this evaluation will:

- i. Assess relevance, coherence (internal and external), coverage, coordination, effectiveness, efficiency, and connectedness as well as the performance and results of WFP's regional response to the Ebola outbreak (accountability).
- ii. Determine the reasons for observed results and draw lessons to inform WFP's management decisions with respect (a) to positioning, partnerships, innovations and programme strategy and (b) to WFP's response to possible future emergencies of a similar nature that demand WFP to provide more than food assistance (learning).

Primary users of the evaluation include the Regional Bureau of West Africa in Dakar (RB Dakar), the concerned Country Offices (Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone), WFP HQ Senior Management and HQ Divisions/Technical Units. Other stakeholders with an

interest in the findings include the affected populations, NGOs, civil societies, the private sector, regional Governments, entities and local organisations, WFP's Executive Board, as well as Inter-Agency Principals and Directors.

#### Key Evaluation Questions

Based on initial consultations with WF stakeholders, three areas of enquiry have been identified including: *Partnership and Coordination; Learning, Adaptation and Innovation; and Performance and Results.*

#### **Question 1: Partnership and coordination: To what extent did WFP develop an integrated response and position itself to add value to the global EVD response?**

- i) Was WFP's response coherent with national priorities and effectively and efficiently coordinated with the governments of Ebola affected countries?
- ii) To what extent WFP's response has been coordinated with UNMEER's and other UN agencies, enabling synergies and multiplying opportunities at strategic and operations levels and taking account of the shifting frameworks for coordination?
- iii) Was WFP's response coherent and aligned with the priorities of other partners (including UN and bilateral agencies, NGOs, private sector, civil societies, etc.), enabling synergies at operations levels?
- iv) To what extent a transition strategy (scale-up/scale-down of the response) has been developed and integrated in implementation, namely in terms of partnerships and (national and local) stakeholders' involvement and their capacities strengthened through WFP's response?

#### **Question 2: Learning and Adaptation: How did WFP use and adapt the internal procedures, systems and tools during the response to inform decision-making?**

- i) Were WFP's corporate systems, guidelines, protocols and procedures adequate relevant and flexible to assess and address the various needs/requests including safeguard of staff in terms of health/wellbeing?
- ii) To what extent was WFP's response (and activities) aligned to WFP's corporate policies? To what extent were these policies relevant to operational needs and objectives?

- iii) How WFP's traditional tools such as VAM, monitoring, reporting, protection, gender, Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) including complaints and feedback mechanisms and others adapted in large scale epidemic context, helping to reduce costs and maximize effectiveness? To what extent were they instrumental and appropriate in adjusting WFP's response?
- iv) Was WFP's response aligned to UN standards and Humanitarian Principles?
- v) How WFP managed risks in the Ebola context, including if/how the organization's risk appetite has evolved?
- vi) Were WFP's L3 activation protocols timely and to what degree have they impacted the effectiveness and efficiency of the response? How effective, efficient and timely has been the coordination between the various WFP's levels (including the Regional Ebola coordination cell), in the light of the L3 requirements?
- vii) Assess staffing and human resources issues including skills but also pre-deployment training, and safeguarding of staff's well-being, given that this emergency was a non-traditional response.
- viii) Assess the potential for sustainability and replication in future emergencies, of structures and institutional arrangements.

### Question 3: Performance and results: What were the performance and results of WFP's response to the EVD outbreak?

- i) How appropriate and relevant has WFP's response been over time (including positive/negative, and intended/unintended outcomes), considering the unpredicted and shifting nature of the EVD emergency? Explain what internal and external factors contributed to the successes and what factors inhibited WFP's efforts (including the factors beyond WFP's control).
- ii) To what extent were the affected population/communities adequately (identified and) reached by WFP in the Ebola affected countries, taking into account the dynamic and volatile nature of the outbreak?
- iii) To what extent WFP's response has been delivered in a timely, efficient and successful manner by consolidating and coordinating already implemented interventions, and by addressing/advocating to address critical gaps (including coverage, partnerships and access)? Explain the level of synergy and multiplying effect between the various activities regardless of the WFP operations.
- iv) To what extent were stakeholders/users "satisfied" and were their needs efficiently or effectively met?
- v) How well were WFP's human and financial resources managed to ensure the timeliest and most cost-effective and efficient response to the Ebola outbreak? Were the emergency preparedness measures cost-effective and efficient in helping the response?

### Methodology

Overall, the evaluators will use a mixed-method approach to collect information from reports, personal interviews, and other sources to document how WFP's response has contributed to collective and specific response outcomes and achievements. The methodology will demonstrate impartiality by relying on a cross-

section of information sources to ensure triangulation of information.

To mitigate limitations, the evaluation process will be flexible and participatory maximising the use of evidence through desk reviews; emphasizing coordination and information-sharing through iterative review processes and a stakeholders workshop; making use where appropriate of remote surveys; and using tailored information/communication products to disseminate the evaluation findings.

The evaluation will employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria including relevance, coherence, coverage, coordination, effectiveness, efficiency and connectedness. The evaluation will give attention to gender, protection and AAP of the WFP's response, and to differential effects on specific groups.

### Roles and Responsibilities

**Evaluation Team:** an independent team with relevant expertise will be contracted to conduct the evaluation.

**OEV Evaluation Manager:** Miranda Sende is responsible for the design, follow-up and quality assurance following WFP OEV's evaluation quality assurance system.

**Stakeholders:** WFP stakeholders at CO, RB Dakar and HQ levels are expected to provide information necessary to the evaluation and facilitate the evaluation team's contacts with external stakeholders in countries; and where appropriate, set-up meetings and field visits and provide logistic support during the fieldwork.

### Communications

Two advisory panels will be established for the evaluation in order to ensure appropriate technical and strategic input, review and follow-up: (a) an *internal reference group* with key representatives from relevant technical units of WFP HQ, RB Dakar and CO (Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone); (b) an *internal advisory group* with executive managers of relevant divisions and offices involved in the L3 Ebola response.

Interactive briefs will be organised and communication products designed throughout the evaluation process:

- *exit brief at the end of the inception mission* with the key stakeholders in Dakar [March 2016]
- *exit briefs at the end of the field/data collection mission* [June 2016]
- *Stakeholders workshop* in Dakar on preliminary conclusions and potential areas of recommendations [End September 2016]
- A special *communication strategy* will focus on: developing products that enable learning; communicating the evaluation's story and; producing outcome stories to illustrate how WFP's response has contributed to these outcomes.

### Timing and Key Milestones

**Inception:** March 2016  
**Fieldwork:** May/June 2016  
**Reporting:** July/ November 2016. Summary evaluation report to be presented to the Executive Board of February 2017 (EB.1/2017).



Full Terms of Reference are available at: <http://www.wfp.org/evaluation> as are all Evaluation Reports and Management Responses.

For more information please contact WFP Office of Evaluation at: [WFP.evaluation@wfp.org](mailto:WFP.evaluation@wfp.org)