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1. Background

1.A. Definitions

1. WFP’s Office of Evaluation uses the following working definition of ‘impact’: “Lasting and/or significant effects of the intervention – social, economic, environmental or technical – on individuals, gender and age-groups, households communities and institutions. Impact can be intended or unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household).”

2. For the purpose of this evaluation school feeding is understood as programmes that are implemented through schools as the food distribution point for school children and pre-school children. It can include wet and dry feeding distributed at any point in time during the school day (breakfast, mid-morning, lunch) and Take Home Rations. Operations which provide food-for-training outside a school context.

1.B. WFP’s Corporate Approach to School Feeding

3. Overview. The world community has regularly re-stated its commitment to education as a human right. Access to and quality of education are also regarded as an essential plank for poverty reduction: human capital – education, knowledge, skills, access to and understanding of information – is part of the livelihoods approach that recognizes poverty to go beyond a lack of income. Education is embedded in the Millennium Development Goals: MDG 2 (achieve universal primary education) and MDG 3 (promote gender equality and empower women, with targets for eliminating gender disparity in education). School feeding also relates to MDG 1 (eradicate poverty and hunger). A series of multilateral events since 1990 made explicit linkages between education, nutrition and health and have established action plans and special funds.

4. School feeding has been cited as one of WFP’s programme areas since its establishment in 1963. By 1993, pre-primary and primary school feeding accounted for more than half of WFP’s development commitments. Between 2006 and 2008, as the largest implementer of school feeding programmes in the world, WFP invested US$ 475 million (14% of total budget) in some 70 countries, reaching an average of 22 million children in school, about half of whom are girls. School feeding beneficiaries accounted for around 20% of total beneficiaries.

5. WFP’s School Feeding Handbook 1999 recognised that there was insufficient evidence that school feeding addresses malnutrition and therefore explicitly focused on educational outcomes: increasing enrolment and attendance, including reducing gender disparity, and improving learning outcomes through enhancing ability to concentrate). Take-Home Rations, particularly, aimed to reduce the opportunity cost of sending children to school. School feeding was at the core of strategic priority/objective 4 in WFP’s Strategic Plans 2004-2008 and 2006-2009 and was clearly aligned with MDG2 and MDG3.

6. New Strategic Plan: In the latest strategic plan (2008-2011), school feeding is embedded in a broadened Strategic Objective 4, which aims to reduce chronic hunger and under-nutrition. It sets a goal of increasing levels of education and foresees school feeding addressing short-term hunger, and thus improving learning abilities, providing a safety net by ensuring children attend school both through food in school and take-home

---

1 Based on definitions used by ALNAP, OECD/DAC and INTRAC.
3 Ibid.
4 Excluding pre-schoolers. WFP Annual Performance Reports 2006 through 2008
rations, and addressing micro-nutrient deficiencies. By using locally produced foods,
school feeding is also expected to have a positive impact on local markets. Through a
positive contribution to learning results and school completion, it may also have an effect
on the inter-generational cycle of hunger. The Strategic Results Framework (approved in
2009), flowing from the Strategic Plan, carries forward indicators from the Indicator
Compendium (above) and includes pass rate.

7. The WFP School Feeding Policy 2009 sets six objective areas, all within the
concept of safety nets as a sub-set of broader social protection systems. The six areas are:
education; nutrition; gender equality in education; value transfer to households; a
platform for wider socio-economic benefits; and capacity development for governments.
Key indicators are established for outcomes and impact in each of these areas.

8. The policy envisages various models for school feeding with different degrees of
(de)centralization. It introduces eight Standards Guiding Sustainable and Affordable
School Feeding Programmes, that guide phased transition from programmes that rely
mostly on external (WFP) funding and implementation to programmes to those that rely
on national funding and implementation. Côte d'Ivoire is a leader within Africa in terms
of national funding and implementation of school feeding in the south of the country
where the national government has had consistent presence. The picture is very
different in the north where rebel forces were in control from 2002 to 2007.

1. C. Country Context: School Feeding in Côte d'Ivoire

9. For three decades after independence (1960), Côte d'Ivoire was one of the most
prosperous countries in the region, attracting immigrants from neighbouring countries
and with a peak in its Human Development Index in 1985. After the military coup of
1999, it entered a period of political instability and economic weakness, resulting in the
partition of the country in 2002 into two zones and displacement of 700,000 people. The
South remained under government control and the north (above the ‘Green Line’)
occupied by the ex-rebel ‘Forces Nouvelles’. In March 2007, the Ouagadougou Peace
Accord (the first of 4) opened the pathway for peace, including reunification of the
country.

10. Côte d'Ivoire is now a low-income food-deficit country with a total population of 20.6
million. It ranks 163 out of 182 countries in the Human Development Index 2009.
According to the Human Development Reports, the percentage of people living below
US$2 per day fell from 49.4% in 2001 to 46.8% in 2007. However, the Survey on Living
Standards of Households 2008, quoted in the PRSP 2009, points out that only one out
of every ten people were classed as ‘poor’ in 1985, compared to one out of every two in
2008 (38.4% in 2002). Poverty is considerably more acute in rural than urban areas
(with the exception of Abidjan) and in the North of the country compared to the South.
In the north, poverty is high among female-headed households (70%). But in other
regions, the reverse is true, so that no significant gender difference shows nationally.
Between 2002 and 2008, inequality increased slightly in rural areas, but decreased in

---

5 WFP/EB.2/2009/4-A
6 Sources various
7 World Bank Quick Query
8 UNDP Human Development Reports 2003 and 2009
9 2009, République de Côte d'Ivoire, Stratégie de Relance du Développement et de Réduction dela Pauvreté
10 PRSP 2009
11 PRSP 2009
12 As measured by the Gini concentration index, UNDP World Development Report 2007-8
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urban areas, giving a positive national trend. Annex 1 gives a summary of core country indicators since 2000.

11. In 2008, 12.6% of rural households were food insecure, of which 2.5% severely so and 10.1% moderately. This comprises approximately 1.27 million rural residents. Casual labourers and those living from subsistence farming and animal husbandry are the groups most affected and above national average. Nationally, there is no significant difference between male- or female-headed households, but food insecurity is twice as high in households where the head of household is illiterate or has not gone beyond primary school than amongst households with secondary level (or higher) education. Essentially, food insecurity is linked to problems of access to food because of weak purchasing power and poverty. 47.4% of rural households were found to have debt and 20.3% of these were debts incurred in order to buy food. Hunger is categorised as ‘serious’ since 1988.

12. The national prevalence of stunting in children under 5 years increased from 25% in 2001 to 34% in 2006 and 2007. In the same period, prevalence of wasting and underweight in under-5’s were relatively stable and categorised as medium and high respectively. Severe chronic malnutrition rates were highest in the north-east (23.3%) and south-west (21.3%), but the highest prevalence rates of acute malnutrition are in the north and northwest.

13. From a bird’s eye perspective, the regions with the deepest areas of poverty, food insecurity and under-nutrition do not coincide precisely, although there is considerable overlap. While rural food insecurity is most severe in 4 regions in the West of the country plus Savanes in the centre North, the highest percentages of underweight under-5’s (over 30%) is in the North-west of the country, including in one region (Denguélé) that has lower levels of food insecurity. See maps in Annex 2.

14. Education: Gross enrolment has steadily increased since 1989, except for a hesitation at the height of the crisis (see Chart 118). Despite the crisis, net enrolment rates in the primary cycle remained stable at 55% between 2000 and 2008, but still below national targets of 60% in 2013 and 70% (2015). NER is considerably higher in urban areas than rural: 68.2%, as against 49.8% (2008). There was a 2 point gain in gender parity between 2000 and 2008, although as at 2008 the NER for boys is 61% compared to 49% for girls. The NER remains below averages for the West Africa region, but particularly for girls. In secondary education, the ratio is 63.9 and in higher education 56.1. Between 2000 and 2008, primary completion rates increased from 42% to 48%, approximately evenly for boys and girls. But the rate of transition to secondary school increased much more significantly for girls than boys - almost 12 percentage points for girls and 7 for boys, bringing girls to just one percentage point behind boys. Annex 3 shows education indicators nationally, regionally and for schools receiving school feeding via WFP.

15. Education’s share of public spending dropped from 27% in 1998 to 20.6% in 2006, though that still represents a larger share than any other sector. 46.5% of that budget
goes to primary education\textsuperscript{20}. Between 2001 and 2002, the number of primary schools in the country dropped from 8,975 to 5,784 during the crisis and revived to 9,106 in 2006.

16. A major review of the education sector was released in February 2010\textsuperscript{21}. It includes gender-disaggregated analysis of levels of primary education over time by region, rural-urban location and income level as well as analysis of the reasons behind children remaining out of school. It found that by far and away the most prevalent reason for remaining non-access to school is low demand.

17. \textbf{Government strategy}: The right to basic education (comprising pre-school, primary and the first cycle of general secondary education – Grades 1-9) is reaffirmed in a 1995 law\textsuperscript{22} and in the national education and vocational training development plan (PNDEF), 1998-2010, which also emphasises quality education and the need for special measures to enhance access for girls\textsuperscript{23}.

18. School canteens serving a hot lunch have been a core part of Government education strategy for many years. The PNDEF (1998-2010) names school canteens as one of three strategies to reduce the opportunity costs of attending school in disadvantaged areas, alongside adapting school calendars and hours to agricultural seasons and school libraries and the abolition of enrolment fees (\textit{frais d’inscription}) and \textit{côtsiations parallèles}. In a 1998 policy declaration, the Government of Côte d’Ivoire announced the Integrated Programme for Sustainable School Feeding\textsuperscript{24} (PIP/CS) under management of the national school feeding unit in the Ministry of Education - Direction Nationale des Cantines (DNC). This provided for gradual hand-over of school feeding to communities through village committees that would manage the programme on a Home-Grown

\begin{center}
\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart1.png}
\caption{Chart 1 School children in primary education 1989/1990 to 2006/2007}
\end{figure}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{20} Project Document Côte d’Ivoire 10759.0 (2009-2013) WFP/EB.2/2008/8-A
\textsuperscript{22} PRSP 2009
\textsuperscript{23} 1998, \textit{Plan National de Développement du secteur Educaiton/Formation} (PNDEF)
\textsuperscript{24} Programme Intégré de pérenisation des cantines scolaires, PIP/CS
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School Feeding (HGSF) model. The model is explicitly intended to play a social and economic role to contribute to poverty alleviation, especially food insecurity, and thereby to contribute to restoring the social fabric damaged by the crisis.

19. The consolidation of peace is a priority in the PRSP 2009. Various steps have been taken and institutions established to restore financial and basic services across the country, including a National Committee for Directing Redeployment of the Administration (CNPRA) to ensure restoration of public services with health and education at the forefront. Improving accessibility and quality of basic services (including education) is one of the 4 Outcomes/pillars of the PRSP 2009, as is re-launching agricultural production.

20. **Donor support:** In 2003, there were no donors for emergency education plans concerning the areas occupied by rebel forces or being won back by government. However, this changed.

21. Sources of donors to all categories of WFP project (development, emergency and PRRO) from 2001-2010 are shown in Annex 4. In 2009, the Gates Foundation made a substantial grant to the Partnership for Child Development to strengthen the HGSF programme based on purchase of food from local small-scale farmers.

### 1.D. WFP’s School Feeding Programme in Côte d’Ivoire

22. WFP has been operating in Côte d’Ivoire since 1989, mainly in support of the national School Feeding Programme. In the early 90’s WFP support was narrowed to focus on primary education, terminating support to ongoing secondary and boarding school feeding. From 1998 to 2002 WFP assistance to education was part of the PNDEF and the PIP/CS (above).

23. During the crisis, the regular School Feeding Programme implemented by DNC with WFP support was restricted to schools south of the Green Line. In addition, WFP initiated Emergency School Feeding (ESF) under two emergency operations (EMOP 10244.0 and 10244.1). The overall objective was to protect human and productive assets while political and security solutions to the crisis are being sought. The intention was to provide an emergency school feeding snack. North of the Green Line (see Map 2 in Annex 3) the specific objective was to serve as an incentive to re-open schools and thereby re-establish a sense of normalcy and provide a minimum of structured activities for the psychosocial development of children (and an alternative to child soldiering). In the South, it was to encourage IDP families to register and keep their children in school. In practice, it appears that no ‘snack’ was ever served, but a standard light school meal for 100 days. ‘Food assistance’ was also planned for teachers not receiving salaries in rebel-held areas, but does not appear to have been implemented. *(To be confirmed during Inception Mission)*.

24. DNC/DREN was involved in implementation, where possible. Where not possible (in rebel-held areas), WFP was directly implementing and/or in partnership with CARE and CARITAS. From 2005 to mid-2009, this dual implementation arrangement was continued under two PRRO’s, aimed at mitigating the effects of the crisis across the whole country (PRRO 10672.0) and sub-region (10372.0) – see Table 1. A total of

---

25 PRSP 2009  
26 CFSVA 2009  
28 Project Document EMOP 10244.1  
29 Direction Nationale des Cantines and Direction Regionale de l’Education Nationale  
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115,000 MT of food worth US$86 million was distributed between 2002 and 2007, of which half went to the education sector.

25. In principle, a hot cooked meal was provided for the 120 days of the school year. During 2007, where regular teachers had fled from the North, PRRO 10672.0 supplied volunteer teachers with Take Home Rations (THR). In 2007 and 2008, THR were also provided as an extra incentive to girls in Grades 4-6 in the areas with lowest enrolment rates during 2007 (15,000 girls) and 2008 (60,000). THR were then suspended for lack of resources.

26. **Geographic coverage**: The Development Project 3358.02 planned phase out of WFP food assistance by September 2003. to concentrate in the North of the country, but schools were never reached because of the crisis. After the partition of the country in 2002, the DEV 3358.02 focused on the South, while EMOP 10244.0 covered schools in the North. The regional PRRO 10372.0 and (national) PRRO 10672.0 comprised Emergency School Feeding in the North and support to regular school feeding implemented by the DNC in the South. As at 2010, WFP is engaged in two operations, DEV 10759.0 (2009-2013) in the South of the country and PRRO 10672.0 (July 2007, extended to June 2010) in the North. In terms of beneficiary numbers, 100% of the former concerns school feeding and approximately 80-85% of the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Food Cost US$</th>
<th>Total cost US$</th>
<th>Food Cost $ (rev)</th>
<th>Total Budget $ (rev)</th>
<th>MT $ (rev)</th>
<th>% funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10244.0</td>
<td>EMOP</td>
<td>Nov 2002</td>
<td>Jan 2003</td>
<td>Jan 2004</td>
<td>Civil strife in Côte d'Ivoire and regional implications</td>
<td>1,033,800</td>
<td>3,020,824</td>
<td>2,969,573</td>
<td>6,894,969</td>
<td>8,882</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10244.1</td>
<td>Regional EMOP</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Dec 2003</td>
<td>Feb 2005</td>
<td>Targeted food assistance to people affected by the Côte d'Ivoire crisis</td>
<td>6,675,715</td>
<td>14,243,061</td>
<td>13,490,920</td>
<td>34,269,136</td>
<td>48,070</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10372.0</td>
<td>Regional PRRO</td>
<td>Jan 2005</td>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
<td>Jul 2007</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire Crisis and Regional Impact (covering Côte d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Mali and Ghana)</td>
<td>8,696,546</td>
<td>21,096,618</td>
<td>25,116,764</td>
<td>60,578,459</td>
<td>72,102</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10672.0</td>
<td>PRRO</td>
<td>Jul-07 Dec-08</td>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance to populations affected by the Côte d'Ivoire protracted crisis</td>
<td>14,753,385</td>
<td>41,239,517</td>
<td>36,251,033</td>
<td>78,407,798</td>
<td>78,677</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10759</td>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>Jan 2009</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Support to Sustainable School Feeding</td>
<td>6,870,021</td>
<td>9,999,615</td>
<td>6,870,021</td>
<td>11,617,439</td>
<td>12,240</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual and re-planned start date: October 1999
I Figure calculated pro rata from Project Document which is 91%
II Figure calculated pro rata from SPR 2005 which is 79%
III Figure calculated pro rata from Project Document which is 77%
IV Figure calculated pro rata from SPR 2007 which is 87%

30 Project Document Côte d'Ivoire 10759.0 (2009-2013) WFP/EB.2/2008/8-A
31 Source: Standard Project Reports
32 WFP Standardized Project Report 2001 adn CIV DEV 3358.02, Budget Revision No.004
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27. Table 2 shows reported beneficiary numbers rising from 254,133 in 2001 (the earliest data for which SPR’s are available) to a peak of 661,087 in 2008 with consistently between 42% and 45% girls. According to the WFP Standardized School Feeding Survey 2005, WFP’s contribution was benefitting 545,058 primary school children out of a total 2.65 million primary school age children\textsuperscript{33}, constituting approximately 20% of the school age population. On the other hand, in almost all years WFP operation reported to have reached 100% or more of intended beneficiaries (see Table 2). With Table 3, this raises questions of coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 - Children Receiving School Meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 3358.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 3358.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 3358.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOP 10244.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 3358.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOP 10244.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10372.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10372.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10372.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10672.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10672.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10672.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 10759.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 - Number of schools assisted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 3358.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOP 10244.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOP 10244.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV 10759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRRO 10672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Table 3 shows the total number of schools assisted by WFP. As at 2009, out of approximately 9,000 schools nationwide, approximately 5,259 have a school canteen. There are currently 3 implementation models for school canteens: (1) DNC-led with WFP

\textsuperscript{33}WFP DOMUS Côte d’Ivoire Country Profile 2005, Report 2006
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assistance, mainly in the south of the country; (2) WFP-led with collaboration with NGO partners, mainly in the north of the country; (3) implemented by DNC alone with no WFP involvement, using locally sourced food grown by small-scale farmers (approximately 900 schools). This last is the full PIP/CS model. As at 2009, approximately 400 of these are fully self-sufficient.

29. Using Model (1), WFP was assisting 84.8% of the 2250 schools in the northern zone in the school year 2006-7, dropping to 82.9% in 2007-8 as the number of schools rose to 2,353 and WFP resources decreased. Between regions, the percentage of schools assisted was between 70% and 90%. The DNC-implemented programme (Models (2) and (3) reached 35% of the 6187 schools in 2006-7 and 2007-8.

30. One key characteristic of the programme is that from 1997\textsuperscript{35}, WFP, UNDP and Government planned investment in \textbf{building the capacity} of the School Feeding Unit (DNC) to manage the programme, aiming to complete hand-over of the entire school feeding programme from WFP to the Government by 2003. Activities included embedding management and monitoring systems, computerisation of the distribution system, and staff training. After the 1999 coup d'état, a pilot project in collaboration with UNDP was run from 2000-2002. The 2002 crisis interrupted the hand-over process, but the objective of sustainability based on the PIP/CS model continued and is the foundation of the current project in the South (DEV 10759.0 2009-2013). The Project Document details gradual WFP phase-down from 120 to 30 ration days and complete hand-over to DNC of certain schools by 2013. However, there appears to be no provision in the project logical framework or budget for capacity development support from WFP.

31. The 2009 evaluation of PRRO 10672.0 recommended that capacity development support should be extended to the North, including the development of local planning, management and monitoring skills 'according to existing local conditions and opportunities'. It also recommended strengthening DNC skills in planning M&E and logistics coordination.

32. Under the PIP/CS model, the Government provides rice and oil, purchased from local small-scale farmers, predominantly women. Communities provide fresh vegetables (sometimes from school gardens) and groundnuts. The programme is implemented by the DNC in collaboration with ANADER\textsuperscript{36}, which provides technical support to farmers. It is recognised that success will depend upon (i) ensuring that school feeding functions normally during the transition period and (ii) on stimulating local production and basic community development by financing micro-projects.

33. Nutritional objectives have not featured in school feeding programmes to date. However, in the areas where WFP has been managing the school feeding programme, the WFP food basket has developed as follows:

\textsuperscript{34} 2009, \textit{Evaluation of PRRO 10672.0}
\textsuperscript{35} DEV3358.02, budget revision 004, p.2
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Agence Nationale d’Appui au Développement Rurale}
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### Food Basket in grams/child/day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>DEV 10759 2009</th>
<th>PRRO 10672 2009</th>
<th>EMOP 10244</th>
<th>1989 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice/maize meal</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat/fish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified vegetable oil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable oil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iodised salt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended kcal</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. **Targeting**: In the early 1990’s (Operation 3358) schools were selected for participation by distance from school (and therefore feasibility for students to return home for lunch), following WFP Operational Guidelines. Family need was not used as a criterion in order to avoid introducing an element of social discrimination.

35. Since the 1980’s, one core element of the sustainability strategy has been to charge students. In 1989, this was standardized at CFA25 (US$0.09, 1992). The funds thus raised were to be divided as follows: 50% to the canteen (e.g. to equip the canteen, pay the cooks38), 25% to the regional directorate and 25% to the national directorate. A 1992 evaluation of Operation 3358 Primary School Canteen Programme (1989-1993) found that this charge was **de facto** the main selection criterion accepted by all. However, it raised three issues: not always the same children receive rations; the neediest tended to be excluded; third, the funds were in fact being used to defray certain operation costs that should have been paid from the Government’s budget (e.g. port demurrage, transport to the regions etc). While recognising the importance of the principle, the evaluation recommended reducing the level of the contribution uniformly in the poorest regions to CFA 15 (US$0.05). However, the 2009 evaluation of PRRO 10672.0 found schools still charging parents CFA25 for the meal (as well as other fees).

36. A comparative cost analysis carried out by Boston Consulting Group in 2009 found that the cost of the on-site school meal provided by the PRRO was just above the average cost of US$44 per year across all ‘meals only’ WFP programmes and ranked 25th least costly out of 42 countries.

2. **Reason for the Evaluation**

2.A. **Evaluation Rationale**

37. Systematic analysis of the WFP school feeding portfolio globally and application of the following criteria led to selection of Côte d’Ivoire as one of four countries selected for impact evaluation of school feeding in 2010. The criteria were: i) minimum 7 years duration and still ongoing in 2009; ii) more than 300,000 beneficiaries per year; iii) a sample of different feeding modalities; iv) relative priority in the light of other planned WFP evaluations (8/ or recently conducted ones) in the country; v) timeliness for corporate learning – maximising synergy with WFP/World Bank initiative on ‘sustainable school feeding’, integrating school meals into a larger context of education and social

---

38 Who also received a daily wage
safety nets; and vi) Country Office and Regional Bureau interest in the evaluation being conducted.

38. This is a timely moment to evaluate past experience to inform planning of WFP support to school feeding for the coming years. The PRRO 10672 (covering school feeding in the North) is drawing to a close and stability appears to be returning to the country, although a large part of the country is not under the control of the national government. At the same time, the Government is requesting WFP assistance to develop further its capacity to implement its policy of 'one school, one canteen'.

2.B. Evaluation Objectives & Users

39. Like all evaluations at WFP, this evaluation serves accountability and learning purposes. However, this evaluation will be primarily 'formative', rather than 'summative'. The evaluation will:

(i) evaluate the outcomes and impact achieved so far from the various modalities that have been used in relation to intended educational, gender, and capacity development objectives stated in project documents; and
(ii) evaluate outcomes and impact achieved in relation to WFP's new nutrition and value transfer policy objectives (even though these were not explicitly included in the programme design) and assess the extent to which the programme has met, or has the potential to meet, these;
(iii) evaluate outcomes and impacts that were not explicitly intended on each of the above dimensions; and
(iv) identify changes needed to WFP operations in order to fulfil potential to contribute optimally to development objectives in Côte d'Ivoire and the objectives of the current WFP Strategic Plan and School Feeding Policy 2009.

40. The programmes cannot be held accountable on point (ii) for achievement of objectives that were not included in the programme design. However, some unexpected and/or less explicit outcomes may already have been achieved towards these objectives. These should be recorded for learning purposes, especially as part of the baseline assessment upon which future strategy and new programme can be designed, in Côte d'Ivoire and possibly more widely.

41. The main intended users of the evaluation are the WFP Country Office and the core implementing partners, DNC (and its decentralized offices, DREN) and ANADER. As co-implementing partners of certain aspects of the programme, UNDP (capacity development) and UNICEF (concerning the Essential Package) are expected to find the evaluation useful.

42. Since Côte d'Ivoire implements the earliest example of a Home-Grown School Feeding model and capacity development has been an explicit part of the strategy for a decade, the evaluation is likely also to provide valuable information and learning concerning WFP's role in capacity development and its importance as a factor in enabling outcomes and impacts (in line with the new School Feeding Policy 2009).

2.C. Key Questions

43. Related to MDG's 1, 2 and 3, what outcomes and impact has WFP's work on school feeding in Côte d'Ivoire contributed over time concerning:

a) the efficiency of the education sector (enrolment, attendance, drop-out and completion) and longer-term impacts;

b) nutritional objectives in the WFP School Feeding Policy 2009, even though these were not intended at the outset;

c) social safety nets in terms of economic, food security or physical protection for the
most vulnerable, even though these objectives were not intended at the outset?

44. How do overall outcomes and impacts (intended and unintended) compare across the country, North and South? What lessons can be drawn from the findings?

45. To what extent have outcomes and impacts been affected by differences in the following variables:
   i) different school feeding modalities (full meal, light meal, THR) used in the different contexts (development, emergency and recovery), as reflected in the different programme categories (PRRO, EMOP, and DEV);
   ii) different management models
   iii) extent of provision of the Essential Package?
   iv) extent of parental/community involvement in education or school feeding or both?
   v) levels of conflict
   vi) quality of learning environment (beyond infrastructure)?
   What other factors explain significant differences over time?

46. To what extent has WFP’s targeting strategy and modalities for school feeding been aligned with Government policy priorities in the education sector (and others) and the needs of the people? What have been the consequences of WFP’s choices in this regard for the outcomes and impact of the school feeding programmes? What have been the main factors influencing WFP programme choices in practice?

47. To what extent has WFP been successful in developing capacity of Government to take over management of the entire school feeding programme? What factors have played a role in the level of success observed? What lessons can be drawn for the future?

48. Did the observed outcomes and impacts warrant the overall costs incurred?

49. What lessons can be drawn from the results found and the factors that explain the results that can ensure relevance, impact, effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency?

3. Parameters of the Evaluation

3.A. Scope & Limitations

50. The evaluation will cover the school feeding component of all operations from 1999 (the actual start of DEV 3358.02) to end 2009 – emergency operations, protracted relief and recovery operations and development operations. It will focus primarily on assessing effectiveness (extent to which objectives were achieved) and impact (intended and unintended) and sustainability. In assessing effectiveness and sustainability, the evaluation will consider information over the 11-year period from 1999 through 2009. Information for assessing longer-term outcomes and impacts, however, may concern pre-1999 operations as well.

51. Education outcomes and impacts will be compared between the three different school feeding management models across the country. However, field work will focus primarily (but not exclusively) on operations in the North of the country, where WFP has had a larger management role and where secondary data appears to be less available and/or reliable. Evaluation of capacity development and sustainability outcomes will be assessed across the country.
52. Given the emergency nature of a substantial part of the operations and unstable environment in which they were implemented, **efficiency** of the operations (ratio of inputs to outputs) will be assessed in broad terms only.

3.B. Stakeholders in the Evaluation

53. There is a fairly large and diverse group, who have an **interest in the education sector** and the actual and potential contribution of school feeding as one tool (amongst many) to contribute to the efficiency of the education sector as well as to **nutrition, food security and social protection**. They have an interest in evidence from this evaluation about the impact and outcomes of school feeding to inform future policy and strategy. There is also a smaller group – largely within the wider group - who also have a **direct interest** in the WFP school feeding programme itself (e.g. programme partners).

54. Representatives of all stakeholders in the narrower group and a selection of stakeholders from the wider group will contribute to the evaluation as key informants. A detailed list of stakeholders in each category will be drawn up during the Inception Phase with the assistance of the Country Office. Nevertheless, the following are already evident:

a) **School children and their families/households**, who receive or have been receiving school feeding. Their primary interest in school feeding is whether it addresses the hunger needs of pupils and/or the opportunity cost of children attending school. Improvements to operational design and implementation would benefit them directly.

b) **Parents and teachers**, who participate in the management of school feeding programmes through school committees. Changes resulting from the evaluation would affect them directly.

Together (a) and (b) will also be able to reflect on the indirect effects of receiving school feeding and thus inform the evaluation about unintended and unexpected impact and outcomes (positive or negative).

c) **The Direction Nationale des Cantines (DNC) within the Ministry of Education and Direction Regionale de l’Education Nationale (DREN)** as the government units responsible for implementation of school feeding and the policy of “one school; one canteen”. Their interest lies in the efficiency and effectiveness of the school feeding programmes so that they best serve the country’s needs, the accuracy and fairness of targeting, and the extent to which national capacities have been developed for running school feeding programmes without external technical assistance.

d) **ANADER (Agence Nationale de Developpement Rurale)** as the technical arm of the Ministry for Rural Development responsible for technical support to the farmer’ groups providing food inputs to the school feeding programme under the PIP/CS.

e) **Private non-profit organisations.** Both CARE and CARITAS have an interest as implementing partners for the EMOP and PRRO operations in the North.

f) **Multilateral agencies.** UNICEF has had direct collaboration agreements with WFP on the school feeding programme. UNDP (and UNOPS) collaborated in and later managed capacity development aspects of the programme. UNESCO and the World Bank have strong interests in the education sector and Cote d’Ivoire is one of the pilot countries for the global level partnership between WFP and World Bank on school feeding.
4. Evaluation approach

4.A. Evaluability Assessment

**Evaluability** is the extent to which an activity or a programme can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. It necessitates that a policy, intervention or operation provides: (a) a clear description of the situation before or at its start that can be used as reference point to determine or measure change; (b) a clear statement of intended outcomes, i.e. the desired changes that should be observable once implementation is under way or completed; (c) a set of clearly defined and appropriate indicators with which to measure changes; and (d) a defined timeframe by which outcomes should be occurring.

55. Until 2009, WFP did not have a formally adopted “logical framework for school feeding” presented in one document. However, the WFP Strategic Results Framework gives important guidance under Strategic Objective 4 Reduce Chronic Hunger and Undernutrition, for which Outcome 4.2 concerns school feeding directly. The 2009 WFP School Feeding Policy includes a logical framework which carries forward indicators previously used for education and nutrition outcomes and adds more - see Annex 4 of these TOR.

56. Educational Outcomes.
Systematic data on WFP project intervention areas is only available from 2001, the start of Standard Project Reports. However, some national figures and various other reports are available from 1999 onwards. WFP Standard School Feeding Surveys were conducted in 2005 and 2006. National education statistics and regional (within the country) are available for the entire period as well as comparative analysis between West African countries from 2003 (UNESCO and WFP) and 2009 (UNESCO, UNICEF and WFP).

57. Nutritional Outcomes.
The past school feeding programmes have not had nutritional objectives and so outcomes are not systematically reported on in SPR’s and WFP cannot be held accountable on this subject. However, WFP’s new School Feeding Policy 2009 does have

39 In the Indicator Compendium (2006-7), 2005, and the 2007 study Food for Education Works: A Review of FFE Programme Monitoring and Evaluation 2002-2006, Aulo Gelli for WFP. The latter was commissioned by WFP, although never formally adopted. It also presented a logic model and programme theory.
nutritional objectives and the current situation will be assessed for learning purposes and to inform future programme design (see para.39 above). Detailed data is available from UNICEF Multi-Indicator Cluster Surveys conducted in 2000 and 2006. Standardised Monitoring and Assessment of Relief and Transition (SMART) surveys were conducted by WFP/UNICEF/PNN in 2008 and 2009. Other national surveys for earlier years are also available. Breakdowns by region and district should be available from the National Institute of Statistics (INS, Institut Nationale de Statistiques).

58. Value transfer Outcomes.
The value transfer outcomes provide a challenge in that WFP has only very recently adopted this objective for school feeding. The team will use the new logic model in the new WFP School Feeding Policy (2009) as far as possible to guide the evaluation in generating evidence of unplanned results already achieved and assessment of future potential. This is not for accountability purposes, but can be used for learning purposes.

59. Capacity development outcomes.
Although capacity development is explicitly mentioned in the development and PRRO operations as a key goal, it is rarely included in the project logical framework and has no specific line item in project budgets, so it is unclear how it was supposed to be achieved. There is very little data already available on capacity development outputs and outcomes, although there is some in SPR’s. The approach will follow the indicators from the PIP/CS, the joint project with UNDP, relevant parts of the 8 Guiding Quality Standards of the WFP School Feeding Policy 2009 and relevant parts of the Capacity Development Policy 2009. During the Inception Mission, the team will develop the approach to this part of the evaluation. Where expected outcomes are not explicit, the team will consider to what extent national capacity has been a key factor determining the results and the contribution made by WFP.

60. Data on school infrastructure and other elements of the Essential Package is available in WFP and UNICEF activity reports and past evaluations. This will need to be gathered systematically prior to the Inception Mission.

4.B. Methodology

61. Mixed Methods. This impact evaluation takes a mixed methods approach, which makes optimum use of evaluation resources and possibilities to support evaluative assessments and show developments over time in order to provide evidence for well-informed decision making in as timely a manner as possible. It will draw on the body of existing data and research as far as possible.

62. The approach has four ‘legs’ (main methods), which complement each other. Data from the ‘legs’ will be systematically triangulated to verify and deepen insights. The combination and balance between these four different methods will be decided by the Evaluation Team in the Inception Phase, selected as appropriate to purpose and context. They are: desk review of existing literature and secondary data to establish and assess the institutional logic of the programme, implementation strategies and allocations of resources, and relevant results; quantitative survey(s) among school-age children and their households and schools, as necessary to complement existing data and ensure the evaluation team can answer the evaluation questions; qualitative field interviews among beneficiaries and all key stakeholders; and tracing of previous beneficiaries from different age cohorts.

63. Quantitative survey sampling will be representative and randomised. The evaluation will seek comparative data with schools in similar settings, which have not received school feeding (a control/comparator group). As far as possible, the evaluation will also compare ‘before and after intervention’ data and/or data over long periods of time. Appropriate comparison groups will be defined during the Inception Phase, based
on stratification by nature of the school feeding programme and possibly also agro-
ecological zones.

64. The qualitative and tracer interviews seek to deepen the understanding of the data
generated by the other methods and to enable a retrospective longitudinal perspective. Qualitative methods will include semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and
observation. Participatory methods will be used with those intended to benefit from the
programme (school children and their households) and with those most closely involved
in implementation (e.g. in schools and WFP staff).

65. The quantitative field work should be completed in advance of the qualitative field
work to allow time for preliminary analysis of the former according to all key variables. In
this way, the qualitative work can seek to probe and explain findings from the
quantitative work.

66. The focus for qualitative field work will be carefully selected during the Inception
Phase by the team in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and Country Office,
based on the most important data gaps undermining the team’s ability to answer the
evaluation questions.

67. Using Standards. The evaluation will use established standards to assess WFP’s
performance. In some areas, the standards may have been set by WFP, as it is the
largest player in the school feeding area. In other areas, standards are not yet defined
and the evaluation team will analyze and evaluate the working tools that WFP has
developed to determine whether these tools meet professional standards.

68. Evaluation Matrix. In the inception phase the evaluation team will develop an
evaluation matrix that expands the key questions and articulates sub-questions,
verifiable indicators to respond to these, and means of verification/data collection. As far
as possible, common indicators identified at the briefing workshop held in Rome 26-29
April will be used, adapted as necessary to the specific country context.

4.C. Evaluation Quality Assurance

69. WFP has developed an Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) based on
international good evaluation practice. It sets out templates for evaluation products as
well as checklists for feedback on quality for each of the evaluation products. This quality
assurance does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team,
but ensures that the evaluation is systematically based on clear and convincing evidence
and presented clearly and logically.

70. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data used in the
evaluation report is checked for validity, accuracy and reliability. The evaluation report
will clearly indicate limitations to the conclusions that can be drawn from the evidence.

71. In addition, the evaluation will benefit from external expert review, which will
review and comment on the core elements of the evaluation methodology as laid out in
the Inception Report and on the draft Evaluation Report. The expert reviewers will be
composed of professionals with experience in school feeding within the context of social
safety nets/social protection.

4.D. Phases and Deliverables

73. The evaluation will take place in five phases with timing as shown in Table 3 below:

   (i) Design phase is to establish and agree on the terms of reference, identify
       the evaluation team leader and team members, establish the reference group
and expert reviewers, and compile background information and relevant documents for easy access of the evaluation team during the next phase.

(ii) **Inception phase** is for the evaluation team to arrive at a common understanding of the terms of reference, review documentation, develop an evaluation matrix accordingly, decide on the methodologies to be used during the evaluation and site selection for field work, assign division of responsibilities in the team and determine the logistics arrangements for field work and the timetable for delivery of the evaluation report. This will be captured in a brief inception report. This will be in effect the operational plan for the evaluation. As such it remains a working document.

(iii) **Evaluation phase** is to compile the evidence from documents and field work. This phase will take place in two parts: first, finalising desk review in preparation for fieldwork, so that the evaluation team goes to the field as prepared as possible; and, second, field work at community/school/and household levels, at sub-national levels, and with stakeholders in capitals. At the end of this phase the Team Leader will de brief key stakeholders at the Country Office, Regional Bureau & Headquarters on progress (subject to triangulation of all evidence).

(iv) **Reporting phase** is to present the findings of the evaluation in a concise and well-substantiated evaluation report, including the quality assurance process. The draft report will be shared with key stakeholders and the expert reviewers for comments and revised in as much as comments are justified. Key findings and evidence may be presented to any forthcoming planning meetings (to be identified).

(v) **Presentation to the WFP Executive Board and follow-up**, with the purpose of reacting to and implementing recommendations that the evaluation will make.

### Table 4: Phases and Deliverables for the Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Timing 2010</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Design Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of TOR &amp; collection of background data (by OE with inputs CO)</td>
<td>By 12 April</td>
<td>Draft TOR Background data collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Team Leader</td>
<td>By 12 April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation of TOR for review</td>
<td>By 12 April</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forum on SF</td>
<td>Late April 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Briefing of team leaders for 4 Impact Evaluations of School Feeding</td>
<td>26-29 April, Rome</td>
<td>Team Leaders briefed Best approaches identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of TOR by Dir, OE</td>
<td>By 15/5/10</td>
<td>FINAL TOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification, selection contracting team members &amp; survey enumerators</td>
<td>By 31/5/10</td>
<td>Team assembled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Inception Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary desk review of literature and secondary data by team</td>
<td>24 May to 14 June 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Mission</td>
<td>14-24 June, Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Team formed Operational Plan made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Inception Report</td>
<td>By 30 June</td>
<td>Draft Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE quality assurance &amp; report revisions</td>
<td>By 4 July</td>
<td>Inception Report (working document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versions in English &amp; French</td>
<td>By 10 July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. Evaluation Phase

### 3a. Field work not requiring school access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing 2010</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation of IR to Reference Group &amp; expert reviewers</td>
<td>5-21 July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of relevant data from FSMS 2010</td>
<td>5-12 July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing of field instruments &amp; training enumerators for quantitative surveys</td>
<td>26-31 July</td>
<td>Field Guides prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct quantitative surveys &amp; some qualitative interviews</td>
<td>1-21 August</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of surveys</td>
<td>22 August-12 Sept.</td>
<td>Survey Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3b. Field work not requiring school access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing 2010</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team analysis of 1st survey report &amp; preparation of field instruments</td>
<td>13-26 September</td>
<td>Field Guides prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td>27 Sept to 17 Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader debriefs Country Office and core stakeholders on progress</td>
<td>18 October</td>
<td>Aide memoire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Reporting Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing 2010</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data &amp; report drafting</td>
<td>18-31 October</td>
<td>Evaluation Report (Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Workshop for Team Leaders of 4 Impact Evaluations of school feeding with expert reviewers (provisional)</td>
<td>1-4 November</td>
<td>Comments Matrix EB Summary Report (Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL completes drafting evaluation report</td>
<td>6-21 November</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE quality assurance &amp; report revision</td>
<td>22-30 November</td>
<td>Revised draft Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation of ER for review by Reference Group</td>
<td>1 -14 December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE consolidates comments</td>
<td>15-16 December</td>
<td>Comments matrix to TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader revises Evaluation Report</td>
<td>16-23 December</td>
<td>Final draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of ER by Dir, OE</td>
<td>31 December</td>
<td><strong>FINAL EVALUATION REPORT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5. Executive Board (EB) and Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing 2010</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Dates to be agreed</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Management Response</td>
<td>Dates to be agreed</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Summary Evaluation Report &amp; Management Response to EB</td>
<td>Dates to be agreed</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Evaluation Brief &amp; dissemination of report</td>
<td>Dates to be agreed</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes: School holidays 1/7 to 30/9/10
5. Organisation of the evaluation

5.A. Evaluation Team

74. The team leader for the evaluation requires strong evaluation and leadership skills and technical expertise in one of the technical areas listed below. His/her primary responsibilities will be (a) setting out the methodology and approach in the inception report; (b) guiding and overseeing the design of data collection instruments; (c) guiding and managing the team during the inception and evaluation phase and overseeing the preparation of working papers; (d) consolidating team members’ inputs to the evaluation products; (e) representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders; (f) delivering the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports (including the Executive Board summary report) in line with agreed OE standards (EQAS) and agreed timelines. The full job description is provided separately.

75. The evaluation team members will bring together a complementary combination of technical expertise in the fields of education, nutrition, capacity development, food security, peace building, economics and gender. The team leader will be internationally recruited. The remaining team members will be a mix of international and national recruitment. The blend of technical areas across the team will depend on that of the team leader first. At least one team member should be familiar with WFP’s work in general.

76. The evaluation team members will contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise; undertake documentary review prior to fieldwork; conduct field work to generate additional evidence from a cross-section of stakeholders, including carrying out site visits, as necessary to collect information; participate in team meetings, including with stakeholders; prepare inputs in their technical area for the evaluation products; and contribute to the preparation of the evaluation report. The full job descriptions are provided separately.

77. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the Code of Conduct for evaluators (attached to individual contracts), ensuring they maintain impartiality and professionalism.

78. Research support will be provided to collect, compile, and undertake basic data analysis as requested by the evaluation team leader and evaluation manager. During the Design Phase the extent to which this should be provided in the WFP Country Office or at WFP headquarters will be defined.

5.B. Roles and Responsibilities

79. Reference Group. The evaluation manager will liaise with an advisory reference group composed of WFP stakeholders (from the technical units at WFP Headquarters in the Policy and Programme Support Division and Programme Support Division, the regional bureau and key staff in the country office). The purpose of the reference group is to serve as a sounding board for early feedback on key evaluation products (e.g. the TOR and evaluation report), according to the communication milestones shown above.

80. WFP Country Office will also (i) provide access to information that is necessary to prepare and conduct the evaluation; (ii) be available to the evaluation team to discuss all aspects of the school feeding programme that the evaluation team considers relevant; (iii) facilitate the evaluation team’s contacts with stakeholders; (iv) administratively support the contracting of Ivorian consultants selected by OE for the evaluation team and/or to conduct tracer studies, who will report to the Team Leader
and OE; and (v) arrange in-country meetings and field visits, and provide logistical support during the fieldwork.

81. **WFP HQ and Regional Bureau staff** will also be available for discussion with the evaluation team and to provide information.

82. **Expert Reviewers.** Two recognised experts in the field of school feeding will provide the evaluation manager with feedback on the technical validity and soundness of the methodology (as described in the Inception Report) and Evaluation Report.

83. **Evaluation Manager.** The evaluation will be managed by Sally Burrows in the Office of Evaluation (OE) of WFP. The evaluation team leader reports to the evaluation manager, who has the following responsibilities: (a) manage the process of sharing the draft terms of reference with stakeholders to obtain comments and revise the terms of reference; (b) identify and recruit the evaluation team leader and in consultation with him/her identify and recruit evaluation team members; (c) identify and set up the reference group and peer review panel; (d) organize all communications between the evaluation team and other stakeholders (WFP, reference group, etc.); (e) manage collection of documentation from within and outside WFP and make this information available to the evaluation team in an organized way (see Bibliography at Annex 5); (f) review and exercise first level quality assurance on the evaluation products (inception report, tracer impact study reports, evaluation, and EB summary report); (g) manage the evaluation within the given budget and time.

84. **Director, OE.** The evaluation manager reports directly to the Director, OE, who will provide second level quality assurance and guidance on evaluation or technical issues, as required.

5.C. **Communication**

85. The evaluation will ensure communications at several milestones in the form of distributing and discussing: (a) the draft terms of reference; (b) the draft inception report; (c) briefing for the WFP Country Office and key partners at the beginning and end of the fieldwork; (d) the evaluation report. All main outputs will be in French, including draft evaluation report for comment.

86. In addition, the evaluation results will be incorporated into OE’s new lessons’ sharing system, once it is established (to come on-stream in 2009) to ensure lessons will be accessible to users in and outside WFP.

5.D. **Budget**

87. The evaluation will be funded from OE’s Programme Support Budget. The overall budget figure is US$200,000. Details are in development pending final agreement on methodology.
### Annex 1 - Core Standard Indicators for COTE D’IVOIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Benchmark/MDG status</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1990-95) 2.9 (2005-10) 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP HDR 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Food trade (food exp-food imp) as % of GDP</strong></td>
<td>(2000-02) 13.8 (2004-06) 11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of population living below $2 a day</strong></td>
<td>(2001) 49.4 (2007) 46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income/food deficit status (LIFDC: Yes or No)</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalence of anaemia (%) in &lt; 5</strong></td>
<td>year not specified 69.0 (Hb &lt;110g/L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Severe { ≥ 40.0} WHO “Prevalence of anaemia “93-’05”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public expenditures on health (% of government expenditures)</strong></td>
<td>(2006) 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy Rate Youth (15-24 years) (%)</strong></td>
<td>(2000) Male: 71 Female: 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
- All data presented are the latest available
- For sources and definitions see links available in the technical notes
Annex 2 – Maps

Source: CFSVA 2009

Carte 3: Prévalence de l’insécurité alimentaire globale (sèvere et modérée) par région
Distribution of school feeding programmes supported by WFP and the Government in Côte d’Ivoire

Legend
- Regional boundary
- Departmental boundary
- Direct WFP Assistance
- WFP Assistance through the DNC

Scale: 1 cm = 41 km
## Côte D'Ivoire - Education Indicators (Primary School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa Region&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte D'Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (2000)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Nord</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord Est</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Est</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sud (sans Abidjan)</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sud Ouest</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Ouest</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouest</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord Ouest</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville Abidjan</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In schools without school feeding (to be completed)

All schools

By region

---


45 Net Attendance Ratio (Côte d’Ivoire is included in the West Africa), for the other indicators it is included in the Sub-Saharan Africa. GER, NER and Completion rate year of reference: 2008
### Outcome Indicator Data from Standard Project Reports (SPRs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute Enrolment</th>
<th>Attendance rate</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
<th>Transition to secondary school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOP 10244.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 200247</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>97.31⁴⁶</td>
<td>98.2⁶⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOP 10244.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98.2⁴⁷</td>
<td>97.31⁴⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEV 3358.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2002</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98.2⁴⁸</td>
<td>97.3⁴⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRRO 10372.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2005</td>
<td>574.93⁵⁰</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2006</td>
<td>580.68⁵¹</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2007</td>
<td>213.00⁵²</td>
<td>96.30</td>
<td>95.70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRRO 10672.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2007</td>
<td>106.00⁵³</td>
<td>86.00⁵⁴</td>
<td>96.30</td>
<td>95.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2008</td>
<td>209.00⁵⁵</td>
<td>97.90</td>
<td>97.60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>97.60</td>
<td>97.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEV 10759.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR 2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>97.40</td>
<td>97.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = not available

---

46 Absolute Enrolment: total number of children enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools
47 SF not yet launched
48 percentage of school days that have been attended by boys in WFP-assisted primary schools
49 percentage of school days that have been attended by girls in WFP-assisted primary schools
50 percentage of school days that have been attended by boys in WFP-assisted primary schools
51 percentage of school days that have been attended by girls in WFP-assisted primary schools
52 percentage of school days that have been attended by boys in WFP-assisted primary schools
53 percentage of school days that have been attended by girls in WFP-assisted primary schools
54 Absolute enrolment of children enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools-total (No)-
55 Absolute enrolment of children enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools-total (No)-
56 Median or average number of children enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools
57 Median or average number of boys enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools
58 Median or average number of girls enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools
59 Median or average number of children enrolled in all WFP-assisted primary schools
Cote d'Ivoire - Attainment Profiles of Age Cohorts

Cote d'Ivoire 2008
Attainment profile, ages 15-19

Cote d'Ivoire 2006
Attainment profile, ages 20-20

Based on analysis of data from MICS3
econ.worldbank.org/projects/edattain

Cote d'Ivoire 2006
Attainment profile, ages 30-30

Based on analysis of data from MICS3
econ.worldbank.org/projects/edattain
## Annex 4  2001-2010 Directed Multilateral Contributions to Côte D'Ivoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33582</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>254,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>267,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>1,136,912</td>
<td>1,276,670</td>
<td>86,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100613</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102440</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>991,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>991,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>198,216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>104,384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>488,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>488,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>735,571</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>783,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>982,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>982,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102441</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOR Impact Evaluation School Feeding Côte d'Ivoire 2010
OE 250510
| 103720 | Austria       | 7,362 | 7,362 |
|        | Canada       | 1,715,343 | 1,315,790 | 3,031,133 |
|        | European Commission | 2,412,545 | 2,442,211 | 666,666 | 5,521,422 |
|        | France       | 2,513,462 | 1,604,446 | 4,117,908 |
|        | Japan        | 3,711,659 | 1,818,181 | 5,529,840 |
|        | Luxembourg   | 3,345 | 3,345 |
|        | Switzerland  | 26,073 | 26,073 |
|        | USA          | 7,687,870 | 4,609,746 | 313,082 | 12,610,698 |
|        | Private Donors | 63,001 | 160,489 | 223,490 |
|        | Multilateral | 3,974,350 |

<p>| 106720 | African Dev Bank | 500,000 | 500,000 |
|        | Czech Republic | 29,220 | 29,220 |
|        | European Commission | 70,351 |
|        | Greece | 73,747 | 73,747 |
|        | Japan | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
|        | Netherlands | 624,000 | 624,000 |
|        | Republic of Korea | 200,000 | 400,000 | 600,000 |
|        | Switzerland | 458,715 | 430,663 | 889,378 |
|        | UN CERF | 500,272 | 4,727,860 | 400,000 | 5,628,132 |
|        | Common Funds and Agencies | 4,247,900 | 6,247,900 | 6,247,900 |
|        | USA | 1,095,000 | 1,095,000 |
|        | Private Donors | 1,095,000 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Multilateral</th>
<th>4,613,847</th>
<th>10,870,862</th>
<th>1,177,281</th>
<th>16,661,990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107200</td>
<td>UN CERF Common Funds and Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>190,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107590</td>
<td>Private Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164,073</td>
<td></td>
<td>164,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541,919</td>
<td></td>
<td>541,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,136,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,427,814</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,529,432</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,809,384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5  Logical Framework for School Feeding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
<th>TYPE OF OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAFETY NET**

**NUMERICAL INFORMATION**

- Improved micronutrient status of school children
- Increased enrolment
- Increased attendance
- Increased retention
- Improved school achievement
- Increased gender equality

**INDICATORS**

- Indicator: Prevalence of iron deficiency anemia
- Indicator: Attendance Rate
- Indicator: Retention rate
- Indicator: Promotion rate
- Indicator: Gender ratio of girls to boys enrolled

**OUTCOMES**

- Improved learning
- Increased household income
- Increased life expectancy of targeted children
- Increased access to education for girls and OVCs
- Decrease in maternal and infant mortality rates
- Increased awareness on family planning, fewer and healthier children
- Decreased HIV/AIDS prevalence

**IMPACTS**

- Enhanced nutrition and child health
- Increased learning
- Decreased mortality

*Note: Specific indicators not currently appearing in the Strategic Results Framework.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFETY NET</th>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MICRO-NUTRIENT FORCITED IMPACTS, SNACKS, TAKE-HOME RATIONS WITH DEWORMING** | **NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS BENEFICIARY FROM SCHOOL FEEDING** | **Value Transfer** | Increased household income  
Indicator: Monetary value of food transferred  
**Indicator:** Household food consumption score | **Improved household food consumption**  
Indicators: Household food consumption score | **Improved food security**  
Indicators: Improved household nutrition status  
Indicators: Improved health status of household members  
**Decrease in reliance on negative coping mechanisms**  
**Decrease in child labor participation** |
| **POLICY, PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ADVICE TO GOVERNMENTS** | **PROVISION OF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRY ENTITIES INVOLVED IN SCHOOL FEEDING** | **Capacity Development** | Strengthen government capacity to plan for and implement school feeding  
Indicator: Action plans and milestones to reach the 8 school feeding quality standards  
2) sound alignment with national policy frameworks; ii) stable funding and budgeting; iii) feedback mechanisms to programme design; iv) strong institutional and implementation arrangements; v) local production and sourcing; vi) strong partnerships and inter-sectoral coordination; vii) strong community participation and ownership | **Improved effectiveness of school feeding policies and programmes to reduce hunger** | **Improved effectiveness of school feeding policies and programmes to reduce hunger** |
| **LOCAL PROCUREMENT** | **ESSENTIAL PACKAGE** | **School Feeding as a Platform for Complementary Activities** | Increased farmer income and marketing opportunities with local procurement and processing  
**Indicator: Food for school feeding purchased locally, as % of food distributed for school feeding in-country** | **Food assistance transformed into a productive investment in local communities - Improved local economies**  
**Wider socio-economic benefits (reduced fuelwood consumption and carbon footprint, improved school infrastructure, improved education outcomes)** | **Food assistance transformed into a productive investment in local communities - Improved local economies**  
**Wider socio-economic benefits (reduced fuelwood consumption and carbon footprint, improved school infrastructure, improved education outcomes)** |
| **SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE** | | **School Infrastructure** | Increased procurement of schools, school buildings, access to water  
**Indicator: Proportion of schools with school assets in place** | | |
I. Background Information – Context

a) WFP Corporate Strategy & Results Framework  [Ref. ER Section 1.C]

Current

Previous

b) WFP Corporate School Feeding Policy & Approach  [Ref. ER Section 1.C]

School Feeding policy related (Those in bold are essential reading)

- WFP. 2009. Learning from Experience- Good Practises from 45 Years of School Feeding. Rome, WFP.
- WFP. School Feeding Global Atlas. Rome, WFP.

School Feeding guidelines
• WFP and UNICEF. 2005. The Essential Package of school based interventions. Rome, WFP.
• WFP. 2004. Improving Food and Nutrition Security through Food for Education Programs in Africa. Rome, WFP.

c) Cote D'Ivoire Country Context  [Ref. ER Section 1.B]

National Development Planning
• Ministere du Plan et du Developpement – Situation du developpement economique et sociale en Cote D'Ivoire. Cote D'Ivoire.

UN, MDB's and Other Donor Assistance Strategies in Cote D'Ivoire
• UNDAF. 2008. UNDAF for Cote D'Ivoire 2009-2013. Cote d'Ivoire.
• UNICEF. 2000. Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys 2000 + Dataset. Cote D'Ivoire, UNICEF.
• PNUD. Plan d’Action du Programme Pays 2009-2013. Cote D'Ivoire, PNUD.
• PNUD. 2008. Programme de Pays pour la Cote D'Ivoire (2009-2013). Cote D'Ivoire, PNUD.

Education

Food Security
• WFP. 2009 Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis. Rome, WFP.

School Feeding
• WFP. School Feeding Strategy Meeting. Cape Town, WFP.

Nutrition and Health
• WFP. Improved Nutrition and Health Status of People Affected by HIV/AIDS and Support Rehabilitation of Productive Assets (ppt). Rome, WFP.

d) Various global documents on school feeding
• Partnership for Child Development available at: http://www.schoolsandhealth.org
• UNESCO. 2010. Education for all: Reaching the Marginalized. France, UNESCO.
• UNESCO. 2010. Education for all: Reaching the Marginalized. Summary. France, UNESCO.

II. WFP Cote D'Ivoire Operations with School Feeding Component from 1998 to 2008
[Ref. ER Section 1.C]

a) Emergency Operations – EMOP
• EMOP 10244.0
  Project Document, Budget, Budget Revision n.001
• EMOP 10244.1
  Project Document, Budget, Budget Revision n. 005/n.006/n.007/n.010/n.011, Notes for the Record

b) Development Programmes – DEV
• DEV 3358.2
  Project Document, Budget Revision n. 004
• DEV 10759.0
  Project Document, Budget, Resource Updates

c) PRRO
• PRRO 10372.0
  Project Document, Budget, Notes for the Record
• PRRO 10672.0
III. Performance Data on School Feeding  

a) Standard Projects Reports
- 10244.0
  2002, 2003, 2004
- 10244.1
- 3358.2
- 10372.0
- 10672.0
- 10759.0
  2009

b) Standardized School Feeding Survey (SSFS)
  School Feeding Standardized Survey: Primary School 2005

c) BGC, 2008. Presentation of cost analysis of school feeding 2008 (draft for discussion only)


IV. Relevant Past Evaluations  

a) Of WFP's School Feeding Work
  Data from this evaluation is also made available.

b) Of Other Agencies’ Work in the Sector
• Finan, Tim. 2009. An Assessment of School Feeding Programmes: programming food for
• IFPRI. 2008. How Effective are Food for Education Programs? A critical assessment of the
Evidence from Developing Countries. USA, IFPRI.
• DFID. 2002. From Projects to SWAPs: An Evaluation of British Aid to Primary
Educational and Health Impacts of Two School Feeding Schemes. World Bank.*
• Adelman, S. et All. 2008. The Impact of Alternative Food for Education Programs
on Child Nutrition in Northern Uganda.*
Program. US, USDA.*
US, IFPRI.*
• Vermeersch, C. and Kremer, M. 2004. School Meals, Educational Achievement
and School Competition: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation.*

V. Evaluation Quality Assurance Standards – Impact Evaluation

Template Inception Report
Template Evaluation Report

* Background reference at discretion of the evaluation teams