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1. **Introduction**

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) are for the evaluation of the Haiti Development project (DEV) 200150 “Support for the National School Meals Programme”. This evaluation is commissioned by the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV) and will take place between August and December 2014. In line with WFP’s outsourced approach for operations evaluations (OpEvs), the evaluation will be managed and conducted by an external evaluation company amongst those having a long-term agreement with WFP for single-operation evaluations.

2. These TOR were prepared by the OEV focal point based on an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders and following a standard template. The purpose of the TOR is twofold: 1) to provide key information to the company selected for the evaluation and to guide the company’s Evaluation Manager and Team throughout the evaluation process; and 2) to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation.

3. The TOR will be finalised based on comments received on the draft version and on the agreement reached with the selected company. The evaluation shall be conducted in conformity with the TOR.

2. **Reasons for the Evaluation**

2.1. **Rationale**

4. In the context of renewed corporate emphasis on providing evidence and accountability for results, WFP has committed to increase evaluation coverage of operations and mandated OEV to commission a series of Operations Evaluations (OpEvs) worldwide in 2013-2015.

5. Operations to be evaluated are selected based on utility and risk criteria. From a shortlist of operations meeting these criteria prepared by OEV, the Regional Bureau (RB) has selected, in consultation with the Country Office (CO), the Haiti DEV 200150 “Support for the National School Meals Programme” for an independent evaluation. In particular, the evaluation has been timed to ensure that findings can feed into future decisions on programme design. As DEV 200150 (currently scheduled to end in December 2014) will be extended until June 2015, evaluation findings will be needed by end-2014 in order to formulate a new DEV project, which will start in July 2015.

2.2. **Objectives**

6. This evaluation serves the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning:

- **Accountability** – The evaluation will assess and report on the performance and results of the operation. A management response to the evaluation recommendations will be prepared.

- **Learning** – The evaluation will determine the reasons why certain results occurred or not to draw lessons, derive good practices and pointers for learning. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making. Findings will be actively disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson sharing systems.

---

1 The utility criteria looked both at the timeliness of the evaluation given the operation’s cycle and the coverage of recent/planned evaluations. The risk criteria was based on a classification and risk ranking of WFP COs taking into consideration a wide range of risk factors, including operational and external factors as well as COs’ internal control self-assessments.
2.3. Stakeholders and Users

7. **Stakeholders.** A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of WFP have interests in the results of the evaluation and many of these will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process. Table one below provides a preliminary stakeholders’ analysis, which will be deepened by the evaluation team in the inception package.

**Table 1: Preliminary stakeholders’ analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Interest in the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Office (CO)</td>
<td>Responsible for the country level planning and operations implementation, the CO is the primary stakeholder of this evaluation. It has a direct stake in the evaluation and an interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries, partners for the performance and results of its operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bureau (RB) in Panama</td>
<td>Responsible for both oversight of COs and technical guidance and support, the RB management has an interest in an independent account of the operational performance as well as in learning from the evaluation findings to apply this learning to other country offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Evaluation (OEV)</td>
<td>OEV is responsible for commissioning OpEvs over 2013-2015. As these evaluations follow a new outsourced approach, OEV has a stake in ensuring that this approach is effective in delivering quality, useful and credible evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP Executive Board (EB)</td>
<td>The WFP governing body has an interest in being informed about the effectiveness of WFP operations. This evaluation will not be presented to the EB but its findings will feed into an annual synthesis report of all OpEvs, which will be presented to the EB at its November session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>As the ultimate recipients of food assistance, beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>The Government has a direct interest in knowing whether WFP activities in the country are aligned with its priorities, harmonised with the action of other partners and meet the expected results. Issues related to capacity development, handover and sustainability will be of particular interest. Various Ministries are partners in the design and implementation of WFP activities, including the Ministry of National Education and Vocational Training (MENFP), the National School Meals Programme (NSMP) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development (MANRRD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Country team</td>
<td>The UNCT’s harmonized action should contribute to the realisation of the government developmental objectives. It has therefore an interest in ensuring that WFP operation is effective in contributing to the UN concerted efforts. Various agencies are also direct partners of WFP at policy and activity level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>NGOs are WFP’s partners for the implementation of some activities while at the same time having their own interventions. The results of the evaluation might affect future implementation modalities, strategic orientations and partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>WFP operations are voluntarily funded by a number of donors. They have an interest in knowing whether their funds have been spent efficiently and if WFP’s work has been effective and contributed to their own strategies and programmes. Main donors include among others Canada, USA and France.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Users.** The primary users of this evaluation will be:

- The CO and its partners in decision-making related notably to programme implementation and/or design, country strategy and partnerships.
- The Government will use the evaluation findings to guide the strengthening of the National School Meals Programme and inform the transition process toward a nationally owned school feeding programme. In particular, nutrition recommendations may help the Government to choose the appropriate and cost-efficient nutrition modalities for their programme.
- Given RB’s core functions of strategic guidance, programme support and oversight, the RB is also expected to use the evaluation findings as well as the office responsible for support to RBs under the Chief Operating Officer.
- OEV will use the evaluation findings to feed into an annual synthesis report of all OpEvs and will reflect upon the evaluation process to refine its OpEv approach, as required.

### 3. Subject of the Evaluation

#### 3.1 WFP Operation

9. Haiti is ranked 161 of 187 countries on the 2012 UNDP Human Development Index. It is the poorest country in the western hemisphere with 75 percent of its population living below the poverty line, or less than US$2 a day. Extreme poverty is mainly concentrated in rural areas where 58 percent of the population live in poverty compared to 20 percent in the Port-au-Prince Metropolitan Area. Haiti is a food-deficit country. Agricultural production covers only half of the nutritional needs of its 10 million inhabitants. It is estimated that some 1.52 million people are living in severe food insecurity in rural communes. A National Nutritional Study led by the Ministry of Health in March 2012, using the Standardized Monitoring and Assessment of Relief and Transitions methodology determined that 4.1 percent of children under 5 suffer from global acute malnutrition and 23.4 percent suffer from chronic malnutrition. In addition, anaemia prevalence among children is 65 percent, and 49.4 percent among pregnant and lactating women.

10. WFP country strategy in Haiti is structured around three main areas: emergency preparedness and response, food and nutrition security, and the support to the transfer to the national institutions of the coordination and responses capacities in food security, nutrition, logistic and emergency telecommunication. WFP implements a protracted relief and recovery operation (PRRO 108440) meeting the urgent needs of shock-affected populations, while supporting sustained recovery by addressing the destructive cycle of vulnerability and food insecurity.

11. DEV 200150 responds to the Government’s request for support in establishing, by 2030, a viable, sustainable, nationally-owned and funded school meals programme, supported primarily through local products purchased from small producers, and consistent with the Government’s efforts to guarantee basic education for all children. In addition to providing school meals to students enrolled in the first and second cycles of fundamental education (corresponding respectively to primary and lower secondary schools), WFP implements capacity development activities with government actors and integrates local purchases into school meals programming. Through a trust fund, a bilateral donor supports local food purchases applied toward school feeding programmes, whereby WFP carries out procurement functions on behalf of the Government and supervises the process.


---

2 In view of the success of this initiative, additional financial support was provided for the purchase of LetAgogo milk for the school feeding programme as well as technical and institutional training for the Government for the implementation of a national local food purchase programme.
and three PRROs 103820, 106740 and 108440. Since April 2014, WFP assistance has also been delivered under PRRO 200618 “Strengthening Emergency Preparedness and Resilience”, aiming to support the Government to save lives, rebuild livelihoods and enhance resilience to shocks and targeting 600,000 severely food-insecure people.

13. The project document including the project logframe, related amendments (Budget revisions) and the latest resource situation are available by clicking here. The key characteristics of the operation are outlined in table two below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Duration</th>
<th>The operation was approved by the Executive Board in November 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial: 3 years (1 January 2012 - 31 December 2014)</td>
<td>Revised: 2 years and 3 months (15 September 2012 to 31 December 2014). An additional 6-month extension until June 2015 is planned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amendments**

The actual start of the operation was delayed by 8.5 months due to a delayed start of the school year, funding constraints and other operational challenges. There have been four budget revisions or amendments to the initial project document:

- **Budget revision # 1 (March 2013)** slightly reduced the landside transport, storage and handling (LTSH) costs, resulting in an overall reduction of US$76,266.

- **Budget revision #2 (August 2013)** adjusted the geographical coverage of the operation from the initial five departments to the entire country following the discontinuation of school feeding under PRRO 108440. Priority is given to the most vulnerable areas as per the latest vulnerability analysis. The total number of beneficiaries remains at 485,000 children. The food requirements, budget and timeframe of the DEV 200150 project are not modified.

- **Budget revision #3 (December 2013)** increased the beneficiary number from 485,000 to 685,000 starting from the new school year 2013/2014, allowing for the inclusion of primary schools previously supported by PRRO 108440. Beneficiary numbers are expected to revert back to the initial planned figure of 485,000 as the Government is expected to take over the additional caseload. The BR also realigned the project to WFP Strategic Plan and Strategic Results Framework (2014-17).

- **Budget revision #4 (February 2014)** aligned the budget with WFP new financial framework, adjusted downwards the ODOC and increased budget for capacity development activities.

A fifth budget revision is planned to extend the operation until June 2015. Given that the budget revision was not approved at the time the TORs were finalized, the data presented below does not take it into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned beneficiaries</th>
<th>Initial: 485,000</th>
<th>Revised: 685,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned tonnage</td>
<td>Initial: In-kind: 45,753 mt of food</td>
<td>Revised: In-kind: 51,363 mt of food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 From WFP.org – Countries – Haiti – Operations or http://www.wfp.org/node/3478/4337/124466
% of planned beneficiaries by activity | School meals: 685,000 students (100 percent of planned beneficiaries)  
Capacity development: Individuals benefiting from WFP capacity development efforts are not accounted for as beneficiaries.

Main Partners | Government:  
Ministry of National Education and Vocational Training (MENFP)  
National School Meals Programme (NSMP)  
Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development (MANRRD)  
UN agencies:  
FAO  
UNESCO  
UNICEF  
Others:  
World Bank  
NGOs:  
17 NGOs

US$ requirements | Initial: US$63.24 million  
Revised: US$70.5 million

Contribution level (as of 21 Aug 2014) | The operation received 71% (US$49.9 million) of the total project requirements.

Top five donors (as of 21 Aug 2014) | Canada (44% of total contributions); USA (34%); Multilateral (8%); France (3.6%) and Union of South American Nations (2.5%)

14. Table three below summarizes the operation’s specific objectives and corresponding activities:

### Table 3: Objectives and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Strategic Objectives*</th>
<th>Operation specific objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MDG4 and 5; United Nations Integrated Strategic Framework for Haiti – Strategic Objective: Disparities are reduced and there is equitable access to social services | Strategic Objective 4  
Maintain enrolled children in targeted schools | • School meals |
| | Improve the nutritional status of targeted school children and reduce micronutrient deficiencies, particularly anaemia | |
| | Strategic Objective 5  
Enhance the capacities of the Government and other stakeholders with a view to sustainable expansion of the national school meals programme | • Government/national staff assisted or trained to develop policies/strategies or legislation  
• Support the development of trade between small local producers and schools |

* As per WFP Strategic Plan (2008-2013). The logframe has been realigned to WFP new Strategic Plan (2014-2017), more specifically to Strategic Objective 4.
4. Evaluation Approach

4.1. Scope

15. **Scope.** The evaluation will cover DEV 200150 including all activities and processes related to its formulation, implementation, resourcing, monitoring, evaluation and reporting relevant to answer the evaluation questions. The period covered by this evaluation captures the time from the development of the operation (January-October 2011) and the period from the beginning of the operation until the start of the evaluation (January 2012-August 2014).

16. Given that the geographical coverage of the development project evolved during the course of the implementation, the evaluation should cover both areas originally and newly targeted by the operation.

4.2. Evaluation Questions

17. The evaluation will address the following three questions:

**Question 1: How appropriate is the operation?** Areas for analysis will include the extent to which the objectives, targeting, choice of activities and of transfer modalities:

- Are appropriate to the needs of the food insecure population.
- Are coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector policies and strategies and seek complementarity with the interventions of relevant humanitarian and development partners as well as with other CO interventions in the country, mainly the PRRO.
- Are coherent with WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance.

In addition to assessing the appropriateness of the school meals and micronutrient supplementation activities, the evaluation will also review the appropriateness of WFP’s technical and policy support aiming to support the Government in continuing and expanding a sustainable school meals programme.

**Question 2: What are the results of the operation?** While ensuring that differences in benefits between women, men, boys and girls from different groups are considered, the evaluation will analyse:

- the level of attainment of the planned outputs;
- the extent to which the outputs led to the realisation of the operation objectives as well as to unintended effects; in particular, the evaluation will assess whether the operation has contributed to enhance opportunities for local purchases from small farmers.
- how different activities of the operation dovetail and are synergetic with other CO interventions in the country, mainly the PRRO and separate trust funds as well as with what other actors are doing to contribute to the overriding WFP objective in the country.
- The efficiency of the operation and the likelihood that the benefits will continue after the end of the operation.

**Question 3: Why and how has the operation produced the observed results?** The evaluation should generate insights into the main internal and external factors that caused the observed changes and affected how results were achieved. The inquiry is likely to focus, amongst others, on:

- Internally (factors within WFP’s control): the processes, systems and tools in place to support the operation design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation and reporting; the governance structure and institutional arrangements (including issues related to staffing, capacity and technical backstopping from RB/HQ); the partnership and coordination arrangements; etc.
• Externally (factors outside WFP’s control): the external operating environment; the funding climate; external incentives and pressures; etc.

Throughout the evaluation and in making recommendations, the team should make forward considerations and identify best practices to inform the design of the next operation giving due consideration to the principles and objectives laid down in WFP’s 2013 Revised School Feeding Policy.

### 4.3 Evaluability Assessment

18. Evaluability is the extent to which an activity or a programme can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. The below provides a preliminary evaluability assessment, which will be deepened by the evaluation team in the inception package. The team will notably critically assess data availability and take evaluability limitations into consideration in its choice of evaluation methods.

19. In answering question one, the team will be able to rely on assessment reports, minutes from the project review committee, the project document and logframe, a country portfolio evaluation covering the period 2005-2010, which was conducted in 2011 as well as documents related to government and interventions from other actors. In addition, the team will review relevant WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance. It should be noted, however, that there is no documentation about the history of school feeding in the country as many documents were destroyed or disappeared during the earthquake.

20. For question two the operation has been designed in line with the corporate strategic results framework (SRF) and selected outputs, outcomes and targets are recorded in the logframe. Monitoring reports as well as annual standard project reports (SPRs) detail achievement of outputs and outcomes thus making them evaluable against the stated objectives.

21. However, answering question two is likely to pose some challenges owing in part to: i) the absence of baseline data for the activities, which will need to be reconstructed using findings from various assessment reports and ii) data gaps in relation to efficiency.

22. For question three, the team will have access to some institutional planning documents and are likely to elicit further information from key informant interviews.

23. Other evaluability challenges include a recent rotation of staff within the government counterparts (NSMP).

### 4.4. Methodology

24. The methodology will be designed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria including those of relevance, coherence (internal and external), coverage, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability (or connectedness for emergency operations);
- Use applicable standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards);
- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using mixed methods (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means. In particular, the sampling technique to select field visit sites will need to demonstrate impartiality and participatory methods will be emphasised with the main stakeholders, including the CO.
- Be geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the evaluability challenges, the budget and timing constraints;
• Be based on an analysis of the logic model of the operation and on a thorough stakeholders analysis;
• Be synthesised in an evaluation matrix, which should be used as the key organizing tool for the evaluation.

4.5. Quality Assurance

25. OEV’s Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS) defines the quality standards expected from this evaluation and sets out processes with in-built steps for quality assurance, templates for evaluation products and checklists for the review thereof. It is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (DAC and ALNAP) and aims to ensure that the evaluation process and products conform to best practice and meet OEV’s quality standards. EQAS does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team.

26. At the start of the evaluation, OEV will orient the evaluation manager on EQAS and share related documents. EQAS should be systematically applied to this evaluation and the evaluation manager will be responsible to ensure that the evaluation progresses in line with its process steps and to conduct a rigorous quality control of the evaluation products ahead of their submission to WFP.

27. The evaluation company is ultimately responsible for the quality of the evaluation products. If the expected standards are not met, the evaluation company will, at its own expense, make the necessary amendments to bring the evaluation products to the required quality level.

28. OEV will also the evaluation report to an external post-hoc quality assurance review to report independently on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation in line with evaluation norms and standards.

5. Phases and deliverables

29. The evaluation will proceed through five phases. Annex two provides details of the activities and the related timeline of activities and deliverables.

30. Preparation phase (Oct-Nov 2013): The OEV focal point will conduct background research and consultation to frame the evaluation; prepare the TOR; select the evaluation team and contract the company for the management and conduct of the evaluation.

31. Inception phase (August-September 2014): This phase aims to prepare the evaluation team for the evaluation phase by ensuring that it has a good grasp of the expectations for the evaluation and a clear plan for conducting it. The inception phase will include a desk review of secondary data and initial interaction with the main stakeholders.

• Deliverable: Inception Package. The Inception Package details how the team intends to conduct the evaluation with an emphasis on methodological and planning aspects. The package will be approved by OEV and shared with the CO/RB for information. It will present an analysis of the context and of the operation, the evaluation methodology articulated around a deepened evaluability and stakeholders’ analysis; an evaluation matrix; and the sampling technique and data collection tools. It will also present the division of tasks amongst team members as well as a detailed schedule for stakeholders’ consultation. For more details, refer to the content guide for the inception package.

32. Evaluation phase (29 Sept-14 October 2014): The fieldwork will span over three weeks and will include visits to project sites and primary and secondary data collection from local stakeholders. Two debriefing sessions will be held upon completion of the field work. The first one will involve
the country office (relevant RB and HQ colleagues will be invited to participate through a teleconference) and the second one will be held with external stakeholders.

- **Deliverable: Aide memoire.** An aide memoire of preliminary findings and conclusions (powerpoint presentation) will be prepared to support the de-briefings.

33. **Reporting phase** (October-December 2014): The evaluation team will analyse the data collected during the desk review and the field work, conduct additional consultations with stakeholders, as required, and draft the evaluation report. It will be submitted to the evaluation manager for quality assurance. Stakeholders will be invited to provide comments, which will be recorded in a matrix by the evaluation manager and provided to the evaluation team for their consideration before report finalisation.

- **Deliverable: Evaluation report.** The evaluation report will present the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation in a concise report of 40 pages maximum. Findings should be evidence-based and relevant to the evaluation questions. Data will be disaggregated by sex and the evaluation findings and conclusions will highlight differences in performance and results of the operation for different beneficiary groups as appropriate. There should be a logical flow from findings to conclusions and from conclusions to recommendations. Recommendations will be limited in number, actionable and targeted to the relevant users. These will form the basis of the WFP management response to the evaluation. For more details, refer to the [content guide for the evaluation report](#).

34. **Follow-up and dissemination phase:** OEV will share the final evaluation report with the CO and RB. The CO management will respond to the evaluation recommendations by providing actions that will be taken to address each recommendation and estimated timelines for taking those actions. The RB will coordinate WFP’s management response to the evaluation, including following up with country offices on status of implementation of the actions. OEV will also subject the evaluation report to an external post-hoc quality review to report independently on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation in line with evaluation norms and standards. A feedback online survey on the evaluation will also be completed by all stakeholders. The final evaluation report will be published on the WFP public website, and findings incorporated into an annual synthesis report, which will be presented to WFP’s Executive Board for consideration. Findings will be disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into other relevant lesson sharing systems.

**Notes on the deliverables:**

The inception package and evaluation reports shall be written in French and follow the EQAS templates.

The evaluation team is expected to produce written work that is of very high standard, evidence-based, and free of errors. The evaluation company is ultimately responsible for the timeliness and quality of the evaluation products. If the expected standards are not met, the evaluation company will, at its own expense, make the necessary amendments to bring the evaluation products to the required quality level.

The evaluation TOR, report and management response will be public and posted on the WFP External Website (wfp.org/evaluation). The other evaluation products will be kept internal.

**Table 4: Key dates for field mission and deliverables**
### 6. Organization of the Evaluation

#### 6.1 Outsourced approach

35. Under the outsourced approach to OpEvs, the evaluation is commissioned by OEV but will be managed and conducted by an external evaluation company having a long-term agreement (LTA) with WFP for operations evaluation services.

36. The company will provide an evaluation manager (EM) and an independent evaluation team (ET) in line with the LTA. To ensure a rigorous review of evaluation deliverables, the evaluation manager should in no circumstances be part of the evaluation team.

37. The company, the evaluation manager and the evaluation team members will not have been involved in the design, implementation or M&E of the operation nor have other conflicts of interest or bias on the subject. They will act impartially and respect the [code of conduct of the profession](#).

38. Given the evaluation learning objective, the evaluation manager and team will promote stakeholders’ participation throughout the evaluation process. Yet, to safeguard the independence of the evaluation, WFP staff will not be part of the evaluation team or participate in meetings with external stakeholders if the evaluation team deems that their presence could bias the responses.

#### 6.2 Evaluation Management

39. The evaluation will be managed by the company’s Evaluation Manager for OpEvs (as per LTA). The EM will be responsible to manage within the given budget the evaluation process in line with EQAS and the expectations spelt out in these TOR and to deliver timely evaluation products meeting the OEV standards. In particular, the EM will:

- Mobilise and hire the evaluation team and provide administrative backstopping (contracts, visas, travel arrangements, consultants’ payments, invoices to WFP, etc).
- Act as the main interlocutor between WFP stakeholders and the ET throughout the evaluation and generally facilitate communication and promote stakeholders’ participation throughout the evaluation process.
- Support the evaluation team by orienting members on WFP, EQAS and the evaluation requirements; providing them with relevant documentation and generally advising on all aspects of the evaluation to ensure that the evaluation team is able to conduct its work.
- Ensure that the evaluation proceeds in line with EQAS, the norms and standards and code of conduct of the profession and that quality standards and deadlines are met.
- Ensure that a rigorous and objective quality check of all evaluation products is conducted ahead of submission to WFP. This quality check will be documented and an assessment of the extent to which quality standards are met will be provided to WFP.
- Provide feedback on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity responsible</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Key dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>Final Inception Package</td>
<td>1 Sept. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Aide memoire</td>
<td>12 Oct 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>18 Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td>15 Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO/RB</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
<td>12 Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Evaluation Conduct

40. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of the evaluation manager. The team will be hired by the company following agreement with OEV on its composition.

41. Team composition. The evaluation team is expected to include 2 members, including an international evaluator who will be the team leader and one or two national evaluator(s). It should include women and men of mixed cultural backgrounds.

42. The estimated number of days is expected to be in the range of 40-50 for the team leader; 30-40 for the second international evaluator.

43. Team competencies. The team will be multi-disciplinary and include members who together include an appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in:

- Education and in particular school feeding programmes
- Nutrition
- Capacity development/institutional capacity (preferably in the context of low-income countries).

44. All team members should have strong analytical and communication skills; evaluation experience and familiarity with the country or region.

45. While documents produced by the Government and related to the education sector are in French, documents from donors such as the World Bank can be found in English. Hence, all team members should speak fluently and write in both English and French (to work in the field and be able to read/understand all the documentation and write the evaluation report).

46. The Team leader will have technical expertise in one of the technical areas listed above as well as expertise in designing methodology and data collection tools and demonstrated experience in leading similar evaluations. She/he will also have leadership and communication skills, including a track record of excellent French and English writing and presentation skills.

47. Her/his primary responsibilities will be: i) defining the evaluation approach and methodology; ii) guiding and managing the team during the evaluation process; iii) leading the evaluation mission and representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders; iv) drafting and revising, as required, the inception package, aide memoire and evaluation report in line with EQAS; and v) provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

48. The team members will bring together a complementary combination of the technical expertise required and have a track record of written work on similar assignments.

49. Team members will: i) contribute to the design of the evaluation methodology in their area of expertise based on a document review; ii) conduct field work; iii) participate in team meetings and meetings with stakeholders; iv) contribute to the drafting and revision of the evaluation products in their technical area(s) and v) provide feedback on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

7. Roles and Responsibilities of WFP Stakeholders

50. The Country Office. The CO management will be responsible to:

- Assign a focal point for the evaluation to liaise with the OEV focal point during the preparation phase and with the company evaluation manager thereafter. Antoine Renard (Head of Programme) and Alphonsine Bouya (Programme Officer, responsible for capacity development) will be the CO focal points for this evaluation.
- Provide the evaluation manager and team with documentation and information necessary to the evaluation; facilitate the team’s contacts with local stakeholders; set up meetings, field visits and the exit briefing; provide logistic support during the fieldwork; and arrange for interpretation, if required.
• Participate in a number of discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results. In particular, the CO should participate in the evaluation team briefing and debriefing (possibly done in the form of a workshop) and in various teleconferences with the evaluation manager and team on the evaluation products.
• Comment on the TORs and the evaluation report.
• Prepare a management response to the evaluation.
• Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

51. **The Regional Bureau.** The RB management will be responsible to:

- Assign a focal point for the evaluation to liaise with the OEV focal point during the preparation phase and with the company evaluation manager thereafter, as required. Jacqueline Flentge, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, OMP will be the RB focal point for this evaluation.
- Participate in a number of discussions with the evaluation team on the evaluation design and on the operation, its performance and results and/or facilitate to ensure that RB stakeholders/experts input in the discussions, process and findings. In particular, the RB should participate in the evaluation team briefing and debriefing (possibly done in the form of a workshop) and in various teleconferences with the evaluation manager and team on the evaluation products.
- Provide comments on the TORs and the evaluation report.
- Coordinate the management response to the evaluation and track the implementation of the recommendations.
- Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process as part of a 360 assessment of the evaluation.

52. **Headquarters.** Some HQ divisions might, as relevant, be asked to discuss WFP strategies, policies or systems in their area of responsibility and to comment on the evaluation TOR and report. These include: Operations Department (OS), Policy, Programme and Innovation Division (OSZ), Emergency Preparedness (OME), Procurement Division (OSP), Logistics Division (OSL), Government Partnerships Division (PGG).

53. **The Office of Evaluation.** OEV is responsible for commissioning the evaluation and Julie Thoulouzan, Evaluation Officer is the OEV focal point. OEV’s responsibilities include to:

- Set up the evaluation including drafting the TOR in consultation with concerned stakeholders; select and contract the external evaluation company; and facilitate the initial communications between the WFP stakeholders and the external evaluation company.
- Enable the company to deliver a quality process and report by providing them with the EQAS documents including process guidance and quality checklists as well as orient the evaluation manager on WFP policies, strategies, processes and systems as they relate to the operation being evaluated.
- Comment on, and approve, the evaluation report.
- Submit the evaluation report to an external post-hoc quality assurance process to independently report on the quality, credibility and utility of the evaluation and provide feedback to the evaluation company accordingly.
- Publish the final evaluation report (together with its quality assessment) on the WFP public website and incorporate findings into an annual synthesis report, which will be presented to WFP’s Executive Board for consideration as well as in other lessons-learning platforms, as relevant.
- Conduct a 360 assessment (based on an e-survey) to gather perceptions about the evaluation process and the quality of the report to be used to revise the approach, as required.
8. Communication and budget

8.1. Communication

54. Issues related to language of the evaluation are noted in sections 6.3 and 5, which also specifies which evaluation products will be made public and how and provides the schedule of debriefing with key stakeholders. Section 7 (paragraph 53) describes how findings will be disseminated.

55. To enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation manager and team will emphasize transparent and open communication with WFP stakeholders. Regular teleconferences and one-on-one telephone conversations between the evaluation manager, team and country office focal point will assist in discussing any arising issues and ensuring a participatory process.

8.2. Budget

56. Funding source: The evaluation will be funded in line with the WFP special funding mechanism for Operations Evaluations (Executive Director memo dated October 2012). The cost to be borne by the CO, if applicable, will be established by the WFP Budget and Programming Division (RMB).

57. Budget. The budget will be prepared by the company (using the rates established in the LTA and the corresponding template) and approved by OEV. For the purpose of this evaluation the company will:

- Use the management fee corresponding to a small operation.
- Take into account the planned number of days per function noted in section 6.3.
- Budget for economy international travel.
- Not budget for domestic travel.

Please send queries to Julie Thoulouzan, Evaluation Officer:
Email: Julie.thoulouzan@wfp.org
Phone number: + 39 06 65 13 35 04
Annex 1: WFP programme areas in Haiti (as per original document)

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Food Programme (WFP) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its frontiers or boundaries.
Annex 2: Evaluation timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Deliverables</th>
<th>Entity Responsible</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Operational documents consolidation and sharing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hand-over of eval management to EM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation team briefing - expectations, requirements, quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Desk review, Consultation with the CO/RB, drafting of the Inception Package</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality Assurance of the Inception Package</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comments on Inception Package</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Final Inception Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Eval mission preparation (setting up meetings, field visits, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Introductory briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Field work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Exit debriefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Aide memoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stakeholders comments on Evaluation Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Revision of the report + Evaluation matrix</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Preparation of the Management Response</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Management Response</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Post-hoc Quality Review and end of evaluation survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Report Publication + integration in lessons learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Budget Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>(WFP’s) Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQAS</td>
<td>Evaluation Quality Assurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inception Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Long-Term Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Metric Ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Office of Evaluation (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpEv</td>
<td>Operation Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Regional Bureau (WFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>