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1. Background

1.1. Introduction

1. Strategic Evaluations focus on strategic and systemic issues of corporate relevance, including new WFP strategic direction and associated policy, operations and activities. They evaluate the quality of the work being done related to the new strategic direction, its results, and seek to explain why and how these results occurred.

2. This evaluation is considered strategic because of the Purchase for Progress (P4P) pilot initiative’s pivotal and transformational profile in the World Food Programme’s (WFP) shift from Food Aid to Food Assistance including enhanced development impact, capacity and market developments as envisaged in the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan (SP). It is the most comprehensive pilot initiative carried out by WFP with ramifications for many parts of the organisation: ranging from policy to all aspects of programme support. The expected results of this initiative should inform the operationalization of the new 2014-2017 SP, in particular, the second goal of the third Strategic Objective related to leveraging purchasing power to connect smallholder farmers to markets, reduce post-harvest losses, support economic empowerment of women and men and transform food assistance into a productive investment in local communities. It should contribute to clarify WFP’s future role in this area by identifying the priorities, the approach and the tools required to mainstream results within the organisation.

3. The Terms of Reference (TOR) were prepared by the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV) evaluation manager Anne-Claire Luzot, Senior Evaluation Officer, based on a documents’ review and discussions with stakeholders.

4. The purpose of these TOR is to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and specify expectations that the evaluation team should fulfil. The TOR are structured as follows: Chapter 1 provides information on the context; Chapter 2 includes the rationale, objectives, stakeholders and main users of the evaluation; Chapter 3 presents an overview of the P4P initiative and defines the scope of the evaluation; Chapter 4 deals with the evaluation questions, approach, and methodology; and Chapter 5 indicates how the evaluation will be organized.

5. The nine annexes include the list of people met, the bibliography, the logical framework, key P4P facts and figures, preliminary list of country selection criteria, the reference groups’ membership and other key information.

1.2. Context

6. Improving linkages between smallholder farmers and markets has long been part of the growth and equity agenda of governments and development partners. Over the last few years, this agenda led to strategic development partner initiatives and academic research. Many studies have shown the need for production to be linked to market demand. For instance, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) commissioned in 2007 a strategic paper on linkages between producers and markets. Recognizing the value added of the linkages it draws lessons from experiences with different approaches taken to establish these linkages. It also identifies key problems observed and makes several practical recommendations to
improve the likelihood of success when engaging in this area. Among others, it highlights the need to position the linkages with the market within the overall chain approach, as all elements of the chain need to be operational for the linkages with the markets to be successful and sustainable. Understanding of and collaboration with the private sector are highlighted. Similarly, the role of the Governments responsible for enabling the environment is underlined. Finally it highlights the need to quantify the associated costs to strengthen these linkages and to assess ways of scaling up.

7. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) Strategic Framework 2011-2015 includes the integration of poor rural people in value chains as a key focus. Presently about half of IFAD’s projects include components strengthening the value chain.

8. In 2013 the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) released a major study on linking smallholders to markets based on literature review and on case studies in various African countries. The literature review confirms once again the relevance of improving the linkages between farmers and markets. It stated that ‘developing smallholder agriculture can be effective in reducing poverty and hunger in low income countries but only through sustainable access to markets can poor farmers increase the income from their labour and lift themselves and their families out of poverty’. The study concluded, among others, that ‘if successful cases of linkages were to be scaled up, to increase their reach and impact then a variety of models and processes should be considered’. Interestingly this study comes back on issues already raised in the 2007 FAO paper such as: the key role of governments in ensuring an enabling environment; the issues of sustainability; costing and scaling up. The study found that investment in innovation, learning and dissemination of experience remains overall very limited when compared with the extent of experiences happening in the field. The study also recognizes that most schemes reviewed were not aimed at improving equity in general and gender in particular.

9. Overall in 2008, staple food commodity prices were generally above their five-year seasonal averages. While this was a major threat on household food security it was also perceived as an opportunity for smallholder farmers to increase their revenues. Since then, though food commodity prices have been decreasing they remain on average higher than before the peak of 2008.

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1. Rationale

10. The P4P’s wide operational reach, the innovative approach of building on existing WFP operations for enhanced developmental impact and the high profile given to leveraging purchasing power to connect smallholder farmers to markets in the 2014-2017 SP, call for a strategic final summative evaluation of this pilot initiative.

11. The evaluation is timed to coincide with the end of the P4P pilot initiative in December 2013. This evaluation is also a contractual obligation with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and an integral element of the P4P M&E system.

---

2 ODI, 2013, ‘Leaping and Learning, Linking smallholders to markets’.
3 WFP, Market monitor, various issues between 2008 and 2013.
2.2. Objectives

12. All evaluations serve the dual objectives of accountability and learning. The weight of each objective varies from evaluation to evaluation. Usually summative evaluations emphasize accountability and the evaluations of pilots, learning.

13. Acknowledging that for this specific evaluation both dimensions are mutually reinforcing and should be given equal attention, the evaluation will:
   - Assess and report on the quality and results achieved by the P4P pilot initiative at its closure. The evaluation will determine, to the extent possible, the reasons for the performance or lack thereof, of the different approaches developed according to the context; and
   - Assess the extent to which the results and learning can be used to inform the implementation of the next SP, the development of relevant policies, strategies, guidance and tools to mainstream the relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable approaches (with highest potential impact) identified within the course of the pilot initiative.

14. These two objectives will be pursued when addressing the evaluation questions detailed in section 4.2 around the five evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

15. An important element to take into consideration within a pilot initiative which by nature intends to test different approaches is to assess the extent to which the initiative has been able to learn from both its successes and its failures and has integrated the lessons learned in subsequent activities.

2.3. Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

16. There are two main groups of stakeholders who play a key role in P4P and will be participating in the evaluation process in various degrees. A more detailed stakeholders’ analysis will be conducted at the inception stage. Members of various stakeholders groups will also be part of the evaluation reference and advisory groups (for further details see section 5.3 and Annex 8)

17. **Internal stakeholders.** The P4P Coordination Unit (CU) (reporting to the Director of the Policy, Programme and Innovation Division) at Headquarters (HQ) was created in December 2007 to design the overall strategy and approach, manage the trust funds, oversee the partnerships and spearhead advocacy, communication, policy and guidance development, monitoring and knowledge sharing as well as support country-level implementation. The P4P CU integrated within the WFP CO have been set up in the pilot countries to design, manage, implement monitor and report on country level activities. The RBs have assigned focal points to support the implementation of P4P.

18. In order to ensure appropriate inter-divisional arrangements, the main following groups have been set up:
   - **Steering Committee**: ‘strategic oversight’, at executive staff level, is acting in an advisory capacity on strategy, policy operational and partnership issues. It ensures appropriate linkages with external and internal parties and advises on issues to raise with the Regional Directors and Country Directors.

---

4. Chaired by the Assistant Executive Director Operations Services, its members include Directors from Policy, Planning, and strategy; Government Donor Relations; Programming; Procurement, Communication and Public Policy Strategy; Finance and Treasury; Liaison office and P4P Coordinator.
- **Stakeholder group**: ‘operational focus and information sharing’ at working level, is providing a forum for discussion on programme and implementation concerns.

19. The steering committee and the stakeholder group are the primary internal stakeholders and key informants to the evaluation. They will play a key role to inform on the achievements, underlying causes as well as potential way forward within the organisation.

20. Managers of WFP Policy, Programme and Innovation, in particular, nutrition, school feeding, Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM) resilience and the Brazil Center of Excellence, Procurement, Logistics, Budget and Programming, and Human Resources Divisions have a stake in the initiative whose results will inform new WFP practices on local procurement, logistics as well as new programme design. These stakeholders will be consulted on issues of relevance, performance and possible side-effects on other WFP programmes.

21. WFP Management and Executive Board are key stakeholders as they decide on the organisation’s policies and strategic directions. The new SP demonstrates a clear strategic intent when it comes to connecting smallholder farmers to the markets which will have to be translated in new policies, strategies and guidances.

22. **External stakeholders.** Smallholder farmers, in particular women, as ultimate beneficiaries have a very high stake in the initiative increasing their capacity to produce and competitively sell their products on the markets. They are key to assessing which approaches succeeded. They should be consulted in the evaluation process and provide feedback on their experience both in terms of success and challenges as well as on possible way forward. Farmers associations are the beneficiaries of the capacity development activities undertaken within the initiative.

23. The private sector in particular (small, medium and big) traders as well as other key actors (warehouse owners, banks, processors, etc.) supporting linkages between farmers and markets should be consulted during the course of the evaluation in order to assess the results in terms of market developments, value added for all (for instance in terms of purchases beyond WFP) and possible side-effects on those not included in the initiative.

24. Governments, national public agencies and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) are critical actors of P4P results and are ultimately those who will be adopting the approaches that prove to be effective. Their implication in the evaluation process and sharing of their experience with various approaches will be instrumental to generate lessons learned. These stakeholders will be consulted on: effectiveness of the approaches developed; their comparative advantages within specific contexts; and on partnerships.

25. Without the involvement of the donors it would not have been possible for WFP to test and research to the extent it happened over the last 5 years in the 20 pilot countries. Agricultural market development remains a priority for all these development partners and donors and now that the pilot initiative is ending, they

---

5 Chaired by the P4P Global Coordinator, its members include, among others, colleagues from Policy, Programme and Innovation (cash and voucher, country capacity strengthening, agricultural markets, VAM, nutrition and HIV/AIDS, school feeding, resilience and prevention); Gender; Human Resources; Procurement; Logistics and Transport; Legal; Communication; Evaluation; Treasury and Risk Management, Government and Partnership; Liaison Offices; and Regional and Country Offices.

6 There were initially 21 pilot countries but Laos was dropped early on in the process.
have legitimate expectations in finding out what worked, what did not and what WFP will be mainstreaming in the next SP implementation. The Rome-Based Agencies (RBA) are also important stakeholders of this evaluation considering their long term investments and research in this area.

26. Finally the initiative has been supported since the start by a Technical Review Panel (TRP)\(^7\) composed of reputed members of the academia, research institutes, UN agencies, NGOs, etc. It provides an external forum for expert discussion and engagement on implementation of P4P, supporting the P4P learning and sharing pillar. It provides a mechanism for external review of the results of P4P monitoring activities.

27. **Expected Users.** The primary audience for this evaluation is threefold:

- WFP management (supported by the P4P CU) who will be responsible for deciding, on the basis of the evidence provided by the evaluation, which strategic and sustainable way forward to adopt, and possibly developing corresponding policies, strategies and guidance.
- The donors and development partners who supported the pilot phase will be informed in a transparent and credible manner on the results achieved with their support. This evaluation will also provide them with independent evidence on whether and how to support the way forward to be formulated by WFP.
- The Executive Board who will have the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation conclusions and recommendations as well as the corresponding Management Response. Any new policy that WFP would decide to develop based on the evaluation results, will also be discussed at the Executive Board.

28. Another important audience for this evaluation are the Governments and national partners in recipient countries, the development partners and NGOs involved in agricultural market development are also expected to use the evaluation findings to inform their work in this area. Considering the need for evidence identified earlier, the results of the evaluation should be of interest to the wider development community active in this area.

### 3. Subject of the Evaluation

#### 3.1. Overview of the Purchase for Progress Pilot Initiative \(^8\)

29. The SP 2008-2013 confirmed WFP's commitment to utilizing its purchasing power to develop suppliers' capacities by purchasing food locally thereby supporting national agricultural sectors with a special focus on smallholder farming. It is within this dynamic framework that the P4P pilot initiative was launched in September 2008 for a period of five years ending in 2013. Continued funding is available for 2014 thereby ensuring smooth running of activities during what the P4P CU calls the post pilot period.

30. The theory of change underlying the initiative has been summarized within a comprehensive logical framework\(^9\) at the inception stage. According to the logical

---

\(^7\) For further details on membership see Annex 8.

\(^8\) WFP, 2012, 'P4P a Primer' serves largely as the main reference to this section.

\(^9\) Available in Annex 5.
framework, the goal of the P4P pilot initiative is to facilitate increased agricultural production and sustained market engagement and thus increased incomes and livelihoods for participating low income smallholder farmers, the majority of whom are women.

31. The ultimate pilot initiative beneficiaries are low-income smallholder farmers and the initiative aims to achieve a level of direct procurement from smallholder farmers that impact 500,000 smallholder farmers overall and aims for a US$50 annual smallholder farmer income gain. Women feature prominently amongst these in an attempt to redress gender inequalities affecting women’s role as agricultural producers\(^\text{10}\).

32. As detailed in the logical framework, the objectives of the pilot initiative are:
- To identify and share best practices for WFP, NGOs, governments and agricultural markets stakeholders to increase profitable smallholder/ low income farmer engagement in markets;
- To increase smallholder/low income farmers’ capacities for agricultural production and market engagement in order to raise their income from agricultural markets;
- To identify and implement best practices for increasing sales to WFP and others with a particular focus on smallholder/low income farmers;
- To transform WFP food purchase programmes so that they better support sustainable small-scale production and address the root causes of hunger.

33. While the first three objectives are focused on expected external changes, the fourth one is about expected changes within the organisation required to support the realization of the first three objectives.

34. The initiative relies on the following development hypothesis: “Increased income for the smallholder farmers is to be achieved through a combination of increased productivity, capacity for aggregation and quality assurance, market development and enabling environment. It also assumes that smallholder farmers generally fare better when acting together to deliver a large quantity of improved quality to market”\(^\text{11}\).

35. To achieve the above, the initiative includes seven activities organised around three pillars. The latter three activities are cross-cutting:
- Procurement pillar (demand): 1. Enhancing and expanding pro-smallholder competitive tendering practices; 2. Purchasing directly from smallholder groups (associations or cooperatives); 3. Contracting for risk reduction in smallholder areas to create greater certainty for smallholder farmers in their planning decisions; 4. Developing pro-smallholder processing options.
- Partnership pillar (supply): 5. Partnership and training.
- Learning and sharing pillar: 6. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E); and 7. Policy advice and advocacy.

36. The logical framework also identifies for each expected outcome and output the associated risks and assumptions which will also have to be reviewed during the course of the evaluation. The pilot initiative is based on a certain number of explicit and implicit assumptions, especially related to the agricultural markets.

---

\(^{10}\) According to P4P CU these targets have been nuanced over time to allow the pilot nature of the initiative to follow its course, through the testing of different approaches producing different level of results for the smallholder farmers.

\(^{11}\) WFP, 2012, ‘P4P a Primer’.
At the start of the project, 10 countries were funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and 7 by the Howard G. Buffett Foundation (HGBF). Inclusion of countries in the pilot spanned from 2008 until early 2009. No pilot countries were added after February 2009. Pilot countries have been selected in various areas of interventions of WFP. They are low income, lower-middle income or post-conflict countries. 

15 donors are now supporting this pilot initiative for a total of 159 million US$ with 42% provided by the BMGF, 18% from HGBF and another 18% from Canada. The funds are meant for the technical assistance of the P4P units in HQ and at CO levels including capacity building, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and grants for supply-side partnerships. Contributions are extra-budgetary and managed through one dedicated trust fund managed by the global P4P coordinator. Except for less than 300,000 USD allocated to Senegal, Mozambique and Niger, these funds do not cover the purchase of food, which is paid for by the cash contributions – sometimes specifically earmarked for P4P purchases – to the regular WFP emergency, recovery or development operations implemented in the pilot countries. It also means that actual purchases are contingent to available funding at country level. Continuing funding from previous years will ensure running of activities in 2014 at least. There are negotiations on-going with the major donors regarding a possible second phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 - P4P facts and figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4P Pilot Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Confirmed Contributions (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships</strong>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of signed agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluded agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement</strong> (2008-2012) (in MT)16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% contracted versus planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contracted (includes only contracts closed as at March 2013)17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total defaulted (from all closed contracts as at March 2013)18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% confirmed default rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnership pillar (supply) is at the core of the P4P pilot initiative. On the supply side its main objective is to strengthen organizations, ensure availability of inputs, improve farming technology and techniques, reduce post-harvest losses and improve farm storage. In the area of markets, partners support capacity building of

---

12 P4P Data covering the period 2008 - October 2013.
13 Further facts and figures are available in Annex 6.
14 P4P Unit.
18 Ibidem.
smallholder farmers in 7 critical areas relevant to marketing: production negotiation expanding business, capital and assets, building relationships, aggregation and quality. Presently, a total of 302 partnership agreements have been signed.

40. **Procurement pillar (demand).** Each pilot country has defined its approach and plans including expected procurement in a Country Implementation Plan. According to P4P CU data about 293,369 MT have been contracted from Farmers’ Organizations (FO) since the start of the initiative until December 2012. About 46% were contracted through competitive processes: 31% through direct contracts, 16% using forward delivery contract; and 6% of the contracts were processed commodities.

41. As indicated in the table above, overall the contracted amounts represent about 51% of aggregated corresponding plans of all pilot countries. On average the default rate amounts to 22% of total amounts contracted. According to the P4P summary procurement report19, Kenya, Mozambique, Uganda, Guatemala and Tanzania have high default rates in both absolute and relative terms. They contract relatively large quantities and have consistently defaulted more than other countries since the start of the initiative. P4P purchases in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda were severely impacted by the drought in the Horn of Africa while high levels of aflatoxin have been another recurrent reason for default in both Kenya and Uganda. Poor food quality was also a problem in Mozambique. Other reasons for default in Mozambique which also apply to Guatemala were tropical storms and high price fluctuations which led to side-selling. However, both countries were able to reduce their default rates over the period of implementation. An additional challenge with procurement are delays (on average 28 days) in delivery especially from medium and low capacity FOs due to reasons such as lack of experience to execute WFP contracts, recurrent appearance of live insects, lack of experience on re-bagging activity, shortage of storage space, high moisture content, etc.

42. **Learning and sharing pillar.** Considering the pilot nature of the P4P initiative, a lot of attention has been given from the start to the following questions: what procurement modalities/platforms are most effective for building the capacities of smallholder farmers and FOs and for creating an enabling environment conducive to the sustainable and profitable engagement of smallholders in markets? The second question asks how WFP can optimize its local food procurement activities to achieve the dual purpose of maximizing benefits to smallholder farmers while providing safe food in a timely and efficient manner. This pillar also includes a strong M&E component. Sharing the learning including informing the external audience through the partnerships established during the course of implementation as well through the internet, newsletters, publications, workshops, international and national consultations, participation in international forum, etc.

43. **Implementation approach.** P4P identified 4 main approaches to take advantage of opportunities and constraints specific to each pilot country: 1) FOs and capacity building partnerships; 2) Support to emerging structured demand platforms which includes warehouse receipt systems and purchases through commodity exchanges; 3) Purchase from emerging traders through modified tendering; and 4) Developing local food processing capacity. These 4 approaches are not mutually exclusive and all procure from smallholder farmers using various marketing channels. Also all approaches include some capacity building partnership and all

---

countries have tested the first approach and might have combined it with one or several of the other three approaches.

**The mid-term evaluation (MTE)**

44. The MTE took place in 2011 to provide a balanced assessment of the initiative strengths, weaknesses and potential side-effects. It mainly concluded the following:

- Impressive scale and diversity of P4P activities;
- High relevance of the initiative;
- Weaknesses in the design requiring testing and reviewing of the intervention logic’s assumptions;
- Despite various degree of results, importance of maintaining the diversity of modalities to generate learning;
- Market development and learning dimensions given less attention than the other activities at mid-point.

45. The MTE made the following three main recommendations:

- P4P must remain a pilot initiative until the end of year five;
- P4P should prioritize market development objectives;
- P4P should adapt the M&E system to encourage research and development.

46. WFP in its management response\(^{20}\) confirmed its overall agreement to the recommendations. The Executive Board when discussing the evaluation results highlighted the following\(^{21}\):

- Importance of improved dissemination of lessons learned;
- Need to increasing emphasis on gender objectives even if it meant diversifying the acquisition strategy from mainly maize to include such crops as legumes;
- Need to identifying qualitative indicators with a view to accurate and realistic assessments of benefits to farmers before scaling up (environment and political perspectives);
- Support to recommendation to review and renegotiate P4P targets;
- Need for WFP to ensure that any negative outcomes are recognized and analysed;
- Need to extensively review the role of partnership stressing that it is vital to involve the FAO, IFAD and other international organisations;
- The importance of maximizing efficiency in paying farmers and ensuring alignment with Cash and Voucher (C&V) projects before expansion.

**Latest developments**

47. The MTE had identified four linked/overlapping facets in P4P, reflecting the complexity of the pilot initiative: 1) P4P as a food assistance procurement modality; 2) P4P as a Development initiative; 3) P4P as a Market development initiative; and 4) P4P as a Research & Development (Pilot) initiative. In May 2013 the P4P initiative organised a workshop bringing together a large group of stakeholders to review these overlapping objectives which concluded that while all 4 objectives were valid, market development was the primary objective of P4P. Following that workshop the P4PCU

---


has developed an impact pathway\textsuperscript{22} articulating how WFP should engage in the area of market development based on lessons learned through P4P so far.

### 3.2. Scope of the Evaluation

48. This final evaluation will focus on the P4P pilot initiative since its conception in December 2007 and official launch in September 2008. It covers the entire initiative period until December 2013, the pilot initiative end date. It will also pay specific attention to the 2011 MTE recommendations and to the corresponding management response. On the basis of the evidence generated, it will identify lessons and recommendations to inform the next phase.

49. The evaluation will assess the results against objectives making a clear distinction between the external and internal objectives. When it comes to external objectives the evaluation will focus on the extent to which best practices have been identified and shared, the extent to which these practices led to increased farmers income and sustained market engagement. In terms of internal objective the evaluation will assess the extent to which WFP purchase programme was transformed to support sustainable small scale procurement. Finally the evaluation will assess how the pilot initiative multi-level organisational framework and the systems put in place to support the implementation contributed to the results achieved, intended and unintended.

50. The evaluation will focus on the 20 pilot countries and support provided by HQ and RBs to reach the initiative objectives. It will take into consideration the evolution in implementation of the pilot when analysing achievements and realization of assumptions made at the time of the pilot design and assess the extent these evolutions were informed by documented evidence gained from first results.

51. P4P “like” activities undertaken in non-pilot countries are not directly part of the evaluation scope except possibly (to be decided during the inception phase) to assess the spill over effects of results achieved in pilot countries and the potential these represent for sustainable benefits.

### 4. Evaluation Approach, Questions and Methodology

#### 4.1 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.

52. A preliminary evaluability assessment informs the TOR. At the inception stage, the evaluation team will have to review this preliminary assessment and critically

\textsuperscript{22} Oxu Solutions, 2013, ‘P4P Workshop Report. Impact Pathways’.
assess data availability and quality to inform its choice of evaluation methods to address each of the evaluation questions developed in section 4.2.

53. A logical framework has been developed at the start of the pilot initiative with clear outcomes and desired changes. All 55 indicators of the logical framework have been inventoried and detailed in a reference document. Following the MTE recommendations related to the initiative’s objectives, the objective of market development has been prioritized and this change has been reflected in an impact pathway (report under preparation). The evaluation team will have to assess the appropriateness of the initial logical framework and review carefully the changes introduced with the impact pathways. Risks and assumptions made in the logical framework will have to be carefully reviewed.

54. The pilot nature of P4P means a unique emphasis on M&E and on documenting and sharing knowledge. This led to a vast amount of documents produced across the 5 years of implementation and the 20 countries.

55. The original initiative proposal included a very strong evaluation component composed of yearly real-time evaluations, interim and final evaluations. The proposal expected the final evaluation to be “based on a panel dataset, including four survey rounds in each country and the information derived from real-time evaluations. Based on analysis of this dataset, this evaluation will yield a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which the programme has met its stated objectives, quantified with respect to the baseline, It will also allow a final assessment of value for money and form the principal vehicle through which best practices for scaling up and replication are finalised for distribution”.

56. According to information provided by the P4P CU, baselines were undertaken in 18 countries. 3 baselines are presently available, 3 baselines are unusable (Uganda, Nicaragua and Honduras). Two countries (Afghanistan and South Sudan) did not undertake any survey through the pilot duration. The other 12 baselines will be available between November 2013 and February 2014 (at the latest). A quick review of one of the baseline survey shows that data collection covers most outputs and outcomes of the logical framework and that some of the indicators are disaggregated by sex.

57. Follow-up (yearly for FOs and every other year for households) data collection took place in 14 countries and reports will be available between December 2013 and March 2014 at the latest. 17 country level P4P stories and studies on quality market will also be available at the latest by March 2014. Four impact assessments will take place but only three will be accessible to the evaluation (the fourth one is due in 2015). One will be available end February 2014 (Tanzania) while the impact assessments for El Salvador and Ethiopia will be available in June 2014. P4P has contracted the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) in Kenya to support data collection by pilot countries and to report on the results. As part of their agreement with WFP, AERC is expected to share all the data files (this will be extensively discussed during the inception mission in January 2014). Their timely (no later than report release and to the extent possible prior to report finalisation) release to the Evaluation Team will be critical for them to proceed to their own analysis of the data collected. The absence or limited availability of data will not

---

25 Further details available in Annex 9
prevent the evaluation proceeding and will be systematically recorded and assessed under the learning and sharing pillar.

58. There are other documents, critically important to the evaluation, which are due to be released during the first quarter of 2014 such as an investment analysis undertaken by FAO. In addition, each CO prepares quarterly reports, occasional cases studies as well as annual lessons learned. Finally as part of the learning pillar, P4P has developed a global learning agenda divided in 17 themes. Documents and reports are being produced for each of these themes.

59. In order to ensure that the evaluation team have all the documents required no later than the desk review it has been decided jointly with the P4P CU to have the data and document review timed for April 2014. There is a commitment on the part of the P4P CU to ensure that all documents included in Annex 9 will be available at the identified dates and not later than the start of the data and documents review phase except for the two impact assessments to be released in June 2014. The evaluation team will ensure to keep some time in June 2014 to analyse the results of these assessments and include their findings in the draft evaluation report.

4.2 Evaluation Questions

60. Considering the summative aspect of the evaluation, the evaluation questions are framed around the internationally agreed evaluation criteria\(^26\) as specified for each evaluation question.

61. The P4P pilot initiative development hypothesis according to which ‘**increased income for the smallholder farmers is be achieved through a combination of increased productivity, capacity for aggregation and quality assurance, market development and enabling environment**’ will be taken into consideration as relevant across all the evaluation questions. Similarly the gender dimension which was emphasized in the initial logical framework and whose importance was again highlighted in the MTE will be addressed wherever meaningful.

**Question 1: Relevance**

*Relevance* assesses the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

62. To assess the relevance of the P4P pilot initiative, the evaluation will review the:

- Extent to which the goal and objectives, as formulated initially and especially as refined over the course of implementation, were and continued to be coherent with policies of national governments and of national and international partners (in particular the other RBAs) in the pilot countries.
- Relevance for smallholder/low income farmers in particular for women in view of their specific context.
- Coherence with agricultural markets in pilot countries.
- Coherence with WFP mandate, SPs and related policies.
- Appropriateness of the design in view of the objectives pursued and validity of the initial assumptions and appropriateness of the theory of change (impact pathways) developed later on in light of the emerging learning.

\(^{26}\) For further details see: [http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)
63. Considering that the relevance of the initiative has extensively been analysed and discussed in the MTE, it is not expected that the evaluation team would have to invest a lot of time on this evaluation criteria.

**Question 2: Effectiveness**

**Effectiveness** is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.

64. To assess the effectiveness of the P4P pilot initiative, the evaluation will review the extent to which the initiative:

- Identified and shared best practices for WFP, NGOs, governments and agricultural market stakeholders to increase profitable smallholder/low income farmers’ engagement in markets.
- Increased smallholder/low income farmers’ capacities (ownership) for agricultural production and market engagement in order to raise their incomes from agricultural markets.
- Identified and implemented best practices for increasing sales to WFP and others with a particular focus on smallholder/low income farmers’.
- Transformed WFP food purchase programmes so that they better support sustainable small-scale production and address the root causes of hunger.

65. Given that majority of smallholder farmers are women, the evaluation will assess the extent to the project results specifically affected them.

66. The evaluation will keep in mind the pilot nature of the initiative when assessing the results. Various approaches have been tested with various levels of results. The evaluation will also assess how the changes in implementation contributed to effectiveness. The extent to which these results have been documented in their successes and in their limitations and how these lessons have been integrated within the implementation of the initiative, will be given due attention. Finally it will look into the risks and assumptions made and the extent to which they affected the achievements of the objectives.

**Question 3: Efficiency**

**Efficiency** measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

67. While keeping clearly in mind that P4P is a pilot initiative, elements of efficiency are critically important to inform the way forward. Therefore, the evaluation will review:

- The overall efficiency compared with the results achieved taking into consideration the magnitude of the initiative and the multilevel organisational framework put in place to support implementation which includes: HQ, RBs, COS\(^{27}\), and the various stakeholder groups.
- The cost-benefit analysis of the various approaches tested within the initiative.

\(^{27}\) The evaluation should consider the extent to which the way P4P has been embedded into the CO organizational structure affected efficiency of implementation.
Efficiency of each pillar of the initiative implementation taking into account the 4 approaches as presented in section 3.1:

**Procurement/demand**: analysis of plans versus deliveries, quality and timeliness of deliveries, timeliness of payments to the smallholder farmers. Within the 4 approaches various procurement modalities have been explored. Their respective efficiency should be assessed by the evaluation team to the extent possible.

**Learning and sharing**: cost-efficiency of smallholder farmers and FOs capacity building across the various approaches; value added of the important investments in documenting and sharing knowledge and in M&E system.

**Partnership/supply**: The role played by partnerships in developing the various approaches. Efficiency of large amount of partnerships agreements. Value added of various types of partnerships developed with the national and international partners (including the RBAs).

- The timeliness of the overall initiative implementation including support of WFP various services.

**Question 4: Impact**

**Impact** assesses the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions.

68. To assess the impact of the P4P pilot initiative the evaluation will review, to the extent possible:

- The overall intended and un-intended effects of the P4P initiative within and outside WFP.
- The livelihood changes for smallholders and in particular women that can be attributed to the pilot initiative (this element is particularly important to inform any scale up and mainstreaming decision within the organisation).
- The effects of risks, assumptions and other external factors such as changes in the terms of trade, financial conditions, policies (regulations, tariffs, etc.), interest of big traders to purchase from smallholder farmers, and production levels on the results achieved.
- The impact of the P4P pilot initiative on participating smallholder farmers’ sales and on corresponding markets.
- The spill over effects of the pilot initiative on non-participating farmer organisations and their communities, on the governments, and on WFP.

**Question 5: Sustainability**

**Sustainability** is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable. When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions: i) To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased? and ii) What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
69. Here what is important is not the sustainability of the initiative but the expected sustainability of each approach tested as it will influence the way forward and inform WFP’s future policies and strategies in this area. Therefore the evaluation will assess:

- The extent to which learning and sharing will be sustained within and beyond WFP and in particular how the knowledge generated by P4P has contributed to inform how WFP can use its procurement demand to build the sustainable capacity of smallholder farmers to engage in markets.
- Which approaches tested should be the most likely to continue to be implemented by WFP as well as by partners, governments and FOs.
- The various elements of the organisational framework which are critically important to maintain during the scaling up of the relevant results and implications (including risks and assumptions) for various parts of the organisation.
- The likelihood for smallholder farmers, in particular women, to remain connected to the markets after completion of the pilot initiative. The conditions and contextual factors enhancing prospects for sustainability.
- The potential of strengthened partnerships with the RBAs and with partners at national and international levels to ensure sustained engagement of the smallholder farmers in the markets.

70. Considering the unique dimension of this pilot initiative, the evaluation will also generate some lessons learned for the pilot projects WFP will initiative in the future.

### 4.3 Methodology

71. **Evaluation criteria.** The evaluation will employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria such as relevance, coherence (internal and external), efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability as described in the previous section.

72. **Participation.** The approach followed from the onset of the evaluation will be as participative as possible. Stakeholders will participate to the evaluation through discussions, consultations and opportunity to comment draft documents. Some stakeholders will also reply to the recommendations made by the evaluation in the management response to be presented to the Executive Board at the same time than the evaluation report. In gathering data and views from stakeholders, the evaluation team will ensure that it considers a cross-section of stakeholders with potentially diverse views to ensure that the evaluation findings are as impartial/representative as possible.

73. **Programme Theory.** This summative evaluation will use the programme theory in order to assess whether or not the expected results have been achieved and recommend whether, where and how the pilot initiative could be scaled up or applied in other settings.

74. **Methodology.** The evaluation team at the inception stage will develop the most rigorous and transparent methodology to address the evaluation questions in a way that serves the dual objectives of accountability and learning. The methodology should:

- Be geared towards addressing the evaluation questions presented in section 4.2.

---

28 For further details on programme theory see, Bamberger, Rugh and Mabry, 2006, ‘Real World Evaluation’.
• Address gender issues and include to the extent possible disaggregated data and information.
• Take into account the limitations to evaluability pointed out in 4.1 as well as budget and timing constraints.

75. The methodology should demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using a mixed methodological approach (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.

76. Data and document analysis. Considering the vast amount of documentation generated by the pilot initiative during its implementation and also that a lot more key documents are still expected (see section 4.1 and Annex 9), the evaluation will ensure that all available documents are analysed and relevant information extracted before conducting any primary data collection. Primary data collection (to be sex disaggregated whenever relevant) will be guided by potential gaps in the information available to address the evaluation questions, triangulation purposes as well as by budget and time limitations.

77. Country visits. The evaluation process will include a certain number of country visits. The possibility of a pilot visit should be envisaged to ensure that all the country visits follow the same approach validated at the conclusion of the pilot mission. Some of the selection criteria to be taken into account have been identified in the Annexes 6 and 7. These include, among others, size of the CO’s and geographic coverage, type of countries (low-income, low-medium income and post conflict), availability of baseline data and impact assessments, countries visited during the MTE, the approaches tested, the type of activities (mode of procurement) undertaken, FO sales beyond P4P, etc. Using all these criteria will lead to various possible combinations of countries to be visited. The final list of countries to be visited will be finalised jointly with OEV during the inception phase based on transparent criteria and consultations ensuring that diversity of experience is well captured.

4.4 Quality Assurance

78. WFP’s evaluation quality assurance system (EQAS) is based on the UNEG norms and standards and good practice of the international evaluation community (ALNAP and DAC). It sets out processes with in-built steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products. It also includes quality assurance of evaluation reports (inception, full and summary reports) based on standardised checklists. EQAS will be systematically applied during the course of this evaluation and relevant documents provided to the evaluation team. The evaluation manager will conduct the first level quality assurance, while the OEV Director will conduct the second level review. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team, but ensures the report provides the necessary evidence in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.

79. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.

80. To enhance the quality and credibility of this evaluation, an external advisory group has been created. It is composed of members of the technical review panel who provided advice during the course of the initiative implementation and additional experts, mainly from UN agencies active on the evaluation subject. This external
advisory group will comment on the draft TOR, inception and evaluation reports. Similarly, the main donors to this initiative will be shared key documents for their views from the TOR onwards.

5. Organization of the Evaluation

5.1. Phases and Deliverables

Preparation

These TOR are prepared following the EQAS templates. The final version of the TOR takes into consideration results of consultations with key internal and external stakeholders (for further details see section 5.3).

⇒ Final TOR

Inception phase

The inception phase will start by a first review of key documents prior to a one-week Briefing mission to HQ. The mission to HQ will be completed by a joint inception mission by the Team Leader (TL) and Evaluation Manager EM. At this stage it is proposed to undertake the inception mission in Kenya mainly because in addition to all the initiative activities undertaken there, AERC which is contracted to undertake the baselines, follow up surveys and impact assessment is located in Nairobi. One of the key challenges of this mission will be to understand the data collection methodology adopted and to have early access to the data generated for the baselines, follow up studies and understanding. This will allow the evaluation team to assess their reliability and utility for the evaluation. During the inception phase the evaluation team will assess the logical framework and its underlying theory of change. The inception report will close this phase. Its draft will be quality assured by OEV and shared with the Internal Reference Group (IRG), internal stakeholders and with the External Advisory Group (EAG) for their feedback. The inception report has to be approved by OEV prior to starting the next phase of the evaluation.

⇒ Inception Report (IR) to be prepared according to EQAS template, it focuses on methodological and planning elements. It will present, taking into account the original logical framework and the impact pathways, a detailed evaluation framework and the evaluation matrix. The evaluation team will also strengthen the stakeholder analysis and include an assessment of the reliability of the data generated through the M&E system. It will identify the countries to be visited with corresponding criteria and justification used for their selection[29]. Data collection tools and approaches to be used for the desk review and field visits will be clearly identified and related to the evaluation matrix.

Data and Documents Review

Considering the amount of documentation already available as well as the quantity of data generated through the M&E system, the evaluation team will dedicate a substantial amount of time in order to analyse these documents, to provide preliminary inputs, to start responding to the evaluation questions. As mentioned in the evaluability section, two impact assessments will only be available

[29] A primary list of selection criteria is available in Annex 7.
in June 2014. The evaluation team will have to take this element into account when planning the time allocated for each steps of the evaluation process. The analysis will also be informed by a literature review. The possibility of undertaking a mission to HQ during this phase is included in the timeline.

84. A data and documents review report will close this phase. Its draft will be commented on by OEV and the internal reference group. This report is not meant to be finalised. Rather it will serve as inputs to the evaluation report (ER).

 **Data and documents review report (DDRR):** in order to facilitate the work of the evaluation team it will be drafted following the template of the evaluation report. This report will include preliminary findings based on in-depth analysis of the data and documents. It will also include, whenever relevant to the field work, refined lines of questioning to be addressed during the field missions.

**Field work**

85. The evaluation team will conduct visits of about 10 days in 6 pilot countries in teams of two. The team might consider starting with a joint /pilot mission (presently foreseen in the timeline) and/or have an internal workshop at the end of the pilot mission to ensure that all members do apply the methodology in a similar way. Each mission will start with a briefing and end with a debriefing with the CO and key stakeholders on the key findings. The evaluation manager (EM) and members of the internal reference group may connect via teleconference. The country missions will include meetings with key partners, FOs, private sector partners such as traders and visit to initiative sites to meet smallholder farmers (especially women). While recognizing the limited participatory dimension of the evaluation at this stage, the evaluation team will be requested to pay particular attention when engaging with beneficiaries and provide them with feedback on their observations.

 **Aide memoire** of key findings to be prepared at the end of each country mission to be used to support the debriefing with the stakeholders.

86. Depending on the methodology proposed in the inception report this phase might also include additional data collection through web-based survey (spill over effects) additional interviews with development partners, other UN agencies, members of the technical reference group, etc.

87. The field work phase will conclude with an overall debriefing at Headquarters.

**Reporting and communicating**

88. This phase is dedicated to the in-depth analysis of the results of the data and documents review and of the data collected through the field work. The results of this analysis will be presented in the evaluation report.

89. Pending availability of funding, this phase will include one or two workshops in WFP HQ:

- Workshop with the internal reference group, the external advisory group and other key internal stakeholders (for instance representatives from pilot countries). This will be the opportunity for the stakeholders to have an exchange around the main findings, conclusions and preliminary recommendations

---

30 The evaluation team should budget the cost of their participation to the workshop (to be held in Rome) in their proposal.
presented by the evaluation team. It will take place once these stakeholders will have seen a first draft of the evaluation report.

- Workshop with P4P key donors and P4P steering committee. The objective of this workshop will be to share, with these key stakeholders, the key results of the evaluation and engage with them on the achievements and lessons learned to inform the way forward. This workshop will take place once the summary evaluation report has been circulated to the Executive Management Group (EMG).

90. Draft 1 evaluation report will be cleared by OEV/D before being circulated with internal stakeholders. Draft 1.1 of the evaluation report will be circulated to the EAG before the first workshop takes place. Draft 2 of the ER and draft 1 of the summary evaluation report will be cleared by OEV/D before being shared with the Executive Management Group (EMG). The OEV/D does the final approval of both the ER and the SER following final revisions of both documents by the evaluation team

- **Evaluation report** will build on the data and document review report. It will be prepared according to the EQAS template; it will provide an assessment of the results according to the evaluation criteria. It will include conclusions based on the evidence generated in the findings, identify clear lessons learned and draw actionable recommendations.

- **Summary evaluation report** will be based on the executive summary of the evaluation report and will follow the relevant EQAS template.

91. **To be noted:** Submission of revised versions of any of the deliverables by the evaluation team will be accompanied by a feedback on each comment provided. **This feedback will succinctly summarize if and how comments were addressed and if they were not it will justify why.**

**Follow up for EB 1 / 2015**

92. This will mainly include the summary evaluation report and the finalisation of the Management Response to the evaluation recommendations, initiated as soon as the recommendations become available.

**Table 2: Timeline summary of the key evaluation milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Phases</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Tasks and Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparatory</td>
<td>Sept – Nov 13</td>
<td>• Last draft and Final TOR following consultations with various stakeholders as described in 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation Team and/or firm selection &amp; contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inception</td>
<td>Jan - March 14</td>
<td>• Briefing at HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inception Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data and documents review</td>
<td>April – May 14</td>
<td>• Extensive desk review prior to interviews and field visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Data and documents review report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fieldwork</td>
<td>June - July 14</td>
<td>• Evaluation missions including pilot mission (HQ, RB and Cos) and data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Exit debriefing after each mission and after completion of field work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table notes:**

31 Detailed timeline available in Annex 1.
### 5.2. Evaluation Team

93. To ensure the independence of the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, the evaluation will be conducted by a team of external consultants identified through a transparent selection process. The team will include 5/6 members with an appropriate balance of expertise in evaluation methodologies and relevant technical skills as detailed below.

94. The team leader will report to the evaluation manager. S/he will have strong evaluation experience in international development, a good understanding of agricultural development and market support theories and programmes as well as excellent analytical, communication, management and communication skills. S/he must have demonstrated experience in designing and leading strategic evaluations as well as strong evidence synthesis and report writing skills.

95. His/her primary responsibility will be: setting out the methodology and approach, guiding and managing the team during each phase of the evaluation process; consolidate and quality assurance team members contribution to the evaluation deliverables; representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders and delivering the reports aligned to EQAS.

96. Team members report to the team leader. They should collectively have strong expertise in:
   - Agricultural markets development: markets analysis and commodity pricing; supply chain;
   - Economic analysis: cost benefit analysis, value for money;
   - Local procurement preferably in the context of food assistance and logistics;
   - Organizational change management; knowledge management;
   - Gender equality and women empowerment;
   - Ability to process large amount of qualitative and quantitative data (SPSS).

97. Team members should have good interpersonal skills, ability to work effectively as part of a team and good analytical and writing skills. The team as whole needs skills in Spanish and French to allow effective communication during field visits. National experts to facilitate country visits will have to be identified at the inception phase. To the extent possible the team need to be gender balanced. The report will be written in English.

98. Members of the team will not have been involved in the P4P pilot initiative or have other conflict of interest or bias on the initiative. They will act impartially and respect the code of conduct of the profession notably the 2005 UNEG norms and Standards and the 2007 UNEG ethical guidelines.

### 5.3. Roles and Responsibilities

99. This evaluation is managed by OEV. Anne-Claire Luzot, Senior Evaluation Officer, has been appointed as evaluation manager. The Evaluation manager has not
worked on issues associated with the subject of evaluation in the past. S/he is responsible for drafting the TOR; selecting and contracting the evaluation team; preparing and managing the budget; setting up the reference groups; organizing the team briefing in HQ; assisting in the preparation of the field missions; conducting the first level quality assurance of the evaluation products and consolidating comments from stakeholders on the various evaluation products. S/he will also be the main interlocutor between the evaluation team, represented by the team leader, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process.

100. Three key stakeholders groups are constituted for the purpose of this evaluation.32

- **Internal Reference Group (IRG):** composed of key stakeholders to the P4P initiative in WFP they will be the first line of consultations on all draft documents (TOR, IR, preliminary findings note and ER).

- **External Advisory Group (AEG)** composed of members of the technical review panel and additional experts from the Rome based agencies they will be consulted on the TOR33, the IR and the ER.

- **Donors Group:** will be consulted from the preparation of the TOR onwards and at key stages of the evaluation process (see detailed timeline in Annex 1 for further information).

101. WFP stakeholders at CO, RB and HQ levels are expected to provide information necessary to the evaluation; be available to the evaluation team to discuss the programme, its performance and results; facilitate the evaluation team’s contacts with stakeholders for country visits; set up meetings and field visits, organise for interpretation if required and provide logistic support during the fieldwork. A detailed consultation schedule will be presented by the evaluation team in the Inception Report.

102. The Performance Management and Monitoring Division (RMP) will be responsible for coordinating the Management Response to the evaluation and concerned stakeholders will be required to provide inputs.

103. The COs selected for country visits will also be responsible to set up meetings, assist in the identification of sites to visit, provide administrative support, facilitate logistics of the field work and to identify a translator if required. To ensure the independence of the evaluation, WFP staff will not be part of the evaluation team or participate in meetings where their presence could bias the responses of the stakeholders.

5.4. Communication

104. A communication plan will be developed during the inception phase and articulated around the following elements:

105. **Briefs.** To facilitate communication about the evaluation process, the evaluation manager will prepare briefs on the TOR and inception report to be shared with relevant stakeholders for information prior to visits or interviews.

106. **Briefings and debriefings.** These will be organised all along the evaluation process especially at the inception stage as well as at the start and end of each country visit.

---

32 See Annex 8 for membership of each groups.
33 Participation of the Evaluation Manager to the TRP meeting in Washington when TRP members will have received draft TOR for comments.
107. **Workshops.** In order to elicit feedback on the findings and exchanges around the conclusions emerging from the data analysis a first workshop will be organised with the internal reference group and the external advisory group. Once a revised draft of the evaluation report is available, a second workshop will be organised with key expected users of the evaluation in particular the donors and key WFP stakeholders to discuss more specifically the recommendation and possible way forward for various stakeholder groups. An evaluation update will be made at the global P4P consultation in January 2014.

108. **Dissemination of the findings.** As mentioned earlier, a SER and an evaluation brief will be prepared by the evaluation manager to enhance the dissemination of the findings, The ER, SER, the Management Response and the evaluation brief will be public and posted on the WFP external website ([www.wfp.org/evaluation](http://www.wfp.org/evaluation)).

5.5. **Budget**

109. The evaluation will be financed from OEV’s Programme Support and Administrative budget. Based on the team composition presented in section 5.2, and travels and timeline available above and in Annex 1 the total cost of the evaluation will not exceed US$ 600,000 USD.
# Annex 1: Detailed Timeline

## P4P Pilot initiative evaluation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Nr of weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1 - Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 0 TOR shared with OEV/D</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>31/07/2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback OEV/D</td>
<td>OEV/D</td>
<td>23/08/2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1 TOR shared with P4P team</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>30/08/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from P4P unit</td>
<td>P4P</td>
<td>13/09/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2 TOR shared with internal ref group (IRG) and steering committee</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>23/09/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from IRG</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>04/10/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 3 TOR shared with External Advisory Group (EAG) &amp; donors</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>11/10/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP consultation</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>17-18/10/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from external stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>25/10/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 4 TOR sent to OEV/D for clearance</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>05/11/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final TOR cleared by OEV/D</strong></td>
<td>OEV/D</td>
<td>12/11/2013</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final TOR Shared</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>15/11/2013</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting evaluation team/firm</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>15/11/2013</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 - Inception</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team preparation prior to HQ briefing</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ briefing (WFP Rome)</td>
<td>EM &amp; Team</td>
<td>6 to 10 Jan 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Mission - Kenya</td>
<td>EM + OEV/D?+</td>
<td>TL 20 to 24 Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4P Global consultation</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>28 to 31 Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 0 Inception Report (IR) to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>07/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft 0</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>14/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 1 Inception Report (IR) to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>21/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft 1 from IRG and EAG + consultation with OEV/D</td>
<td>Stakeholders+ OEV/D</td>
<td>07/03/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 2 Inception Report (IR) to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>14/03/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of draft 2 + consultation with OEV/D</td>
<td>EM+ OEV/D</td>
<td>28/03/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final IR shared with IRG and AEG</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>04/04/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 - Data and Document Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 0 Findings based on desk review</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>02/05/2014</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft 0</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>09/05/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 1 Findings to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>16/05/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission to HQ</td>
<td>team</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft 1 from IRG</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>30/05/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 3 - Fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot field mission</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>10/06/2014</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team internal workshop</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>12-13/06/2014</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits RB and COs</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>18/07/2014</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit debrief for each visit</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final debriefings after all missions in HQ</td>
<td>EM&amp;TL</td>
<td>21-22/07/2014</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 4 - Reporting and Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 0 Evaluation Report (ER) to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>22/08/2014</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft 0</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>28/08/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 0.1 ER to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>05/09/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV/D clearance of draft for comments</td>
<td>OEV/D</td>
<td>12/09/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft 1 ER from IRG</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>26/09/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 1.1 ER to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>03/10/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing draft 1.1 ER to EAG</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>10/10/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 1 with IRG and EAG</td>
<td>Stakeholders +team +EM</td>
<td>Week oct 13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 1.2 ER and draft 0 Summary Evaluation Report (SER) to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>24/10/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review draft 1.2 ER and draft 0 SER</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>31/10/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV/D clearance to issue SER for EMG comments</td>
<td>OEV/D</td>
<td>07/11/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMG comments on SER</td>
<td>EMG</td>
<td>14/11/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop 2 with donors and steering committee</td>
<td>Stakeholders +team +EM</td>
<td>17-18/11/2014</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft 2.1 ER (with the revised SER) to OEV</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>21/11/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval by OEV/D</td>
<td>OEV/D</td>
<td>28/11/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 5 - Executive Board (EB) and follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft SER/recommendations to RMP for management response</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>07/11/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit SER to ERBT for editing and translation</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Deadline EB</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail end actions, OEV websites posting, EB Round Table Etc.</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Summary Evaluation Report to the EB</td>
<td>D/OEV</td>
<td>EB1/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of management response to the EB</td>
<td>D/RMP</td>
<td>EB1/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: List of people met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batamaka Some</td>
<td>Gender Consultant (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhai Thapa</td>
<td>Finance Officer (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigitte Labbe</td>
<td>Procurement Officer (OSPFF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Feeney</td>
<td>Sr. Programme Adviser (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Mbizule</td>
<td>Sr. Programme Adviser (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Fleischer</td>
<td>Director, Food Procurement Service (OSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damien Fontaine</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edouard Nizeyimana</td>
<td>Sr. Programme Adviser (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Davies</td>
<td>Global Coordinator (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahadevan Ramachandran</td>
<td>Procurement Officer (OSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramiro Lopez Da Silva</td>
<td>Assistant Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain Sirois</td>
<td>Sr. Programme Adviser (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Lovisa Lyons</td>
<td>M&amp;E Consultant (OSZF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanlake Samkange</td>
<td>Director, Policy, Programme and Innovation (OSZ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition attendance to the meetings below provided opportunities to engage with a number of P4P stakeholders:
- P4P Annual Consultation, internal segment (Jan 2013) – attended by many P4P country coordinators, CD’s, DCD’s, AED OS, and HQ tech divisions (e.g. Procurement, Cash for Change).
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Annex 4: Key food procurement trends

Globally, WFP is the largest single procurer of food assistance for all its operations in emergency recovery and development contexts. WFP aims to balance its main procurement objective of “ensuring that appropriate commodities are available to WFP beneficiaries in a timely and cost-effective manner” with a more programmatic objective of promoting developing country food markets and food and nutrition security or recipient countries. Consequently, “when conditions are equal, preference should be given to purchasing from developing countries, while avoiding to cause negative effects on local markets and prices” 34.

Long term trends show regular increase in total amount of food purchased with peaks during specific emergencies and in proportion amount of food procured from developing countries. Over the last five years an annual average of 2.6 million Metric Tons (MT) were procured for an average value US$ 1.9 million from about 75 developing countries. The proportion of food procured from developing countries has been regularly increasing over that period to reach 86% of all food procured in 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key figures on WFP’s outputs, contributions and procurement 2008-2012</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFP Country Offices (COs)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries (in million)</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnage distributed (in million MT)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions (US$ billion)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total purchases (in million MT)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total purchases (in million US$)</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of tonnage purchased from developing countries</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of tonnage purchased from LDCs and LICs</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following research on Local and Regional Purchase (LRP), WFP issued in 2006 a Policy on food procurement in developing countries 38, confirming the considerable comparative advantage of LRP to provide the food closer to the beneficiaries thereby reducing transport costs and improving delivery timeliness. Locally produced food also generally matches local taste preferences better.

The policy recognized the role WFP should place in advocating for national policies that promote effective functioning of food markets. It identified market development as an implicit objective for WFP and encouraged WFP to support small traders and farmers’ groups that can trade competitively in the formal sector. It also recognized that, at the time, WFP was not well-placed to use procurement as a mean to support farmers and farmers’ groups in entering the market place, due, among others, to high administrative costs.

---

37 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) AND Low Income Countries (LICs) based on OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list.
38 WFP, 2006, ‘Food Procurement in Developing Countries’, WFP/EB.1/2006/5-C.
More recently, WFP established the Forward Purchase Facility (FPF) with the objective to reduce supply lead time; to buy when market conditions are more favourable (including developing countries markets); and to shorten response time during emergencies\textsuperscript{39}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{food-procurement-origin-tonnage.png}
\caption{Food Procurement by Origin & Tonnage}
\end{figure}

Source: WFP Procurement Unit. 2004 data includes 1,562,000 mt for Iraq.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{quantities-delivered-p4p.png}
\caption{Quantities delivered in P4P countries (LRP and P4P origin)}
\end{figure}

Source: WFP Procurement Unit

## Annex 5: P4P Logical framework (last update 10th September 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact: To facilitate increased agricultural production and sustained market engagement and thus increase incomes and livelihoods for participating smallholder/low income farmers, the majority of whom are women.</td>
<td>Participating smallholder/low income farmers' annual household incomes (relative to baseline and comparison groups, disaggregated by gender of household head)</td>
<td>Smallholder farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1. To identify and share best practices for WFP, NGOs, governments, and agricultural market stakeholders to increase profitable smallholder/low income farmer engagement in markets.</td>
<td>Number of completed compilations (by WFP) of best practice programming and policy recommendations on pro-smallholder local procurement</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Local procurement is an effective method for accomplishing development objectives without undue risk to WFP’s and other stakeholders’ core objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.1: WFP and other agricultural development stakeholders collaborate to identify procurement and market development best practices from P4P experience</td>
<td>Completed global level M&amp;E system including M&amp;E plan, implementation guidelines, M&amp;E manual, and analysis and reporting routines/templates</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>WFP, and particularly the country offices, embrace the learning objective and have the capacity and funding necessary to support country-level M&amp;E activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1.1: Mechanisms and procedures to collect and manage P4P performance data developed &amp; functioning</td>
<td>Number of P4P pilot countries implementing M&amp;E system (e.g., collecting data, producing required reports, etc.)</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1.2: Monitoring and evaluation results compiled, analysed, and disseminated.</td>
<td>Percentage of required M&amp;E reports delivered to, or developed by, P4P Unit (disaggregated by country/unit and report type)</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>P4P Unit reviews and assimilates country office M&amp;E reports and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1.3: Engagement of agricultural market stakeholders (e.g., governments, NGOs, partners, private sector, etc.) in dialogue to interpret findings and validate best practices facilitated</td>
<td>Average percentage of invited/expected organizations represented at event/meeting (disaggregated by event/meeting)</td>
<td>Meeting minutes or event attendance/participation records. Applicable events include country level action reviews, regional P4P meetings, global events, technical review panels, and lessons learnt events.</td>
<td>WFP is able to engage a sufficiently wide range of experts who actively participate in the learning process. Stakeholders are willing to participate in collaborative learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.2: By the end of the project, agricultural development stakeholders (e.g., governments, NGOs, private sector, donors, etc.) have integrated smallholder/low income farmer-focused market development and procurement best practices into their operations, procedures, or policies</td>
<td>Number of participating stakeholders that have incorporated best procurement and market development recommendations into their operations, procedures, or policy documents</td>
<td>Document review, P4P Unit staff, country-level P4P staff. Document evidence that a stakeholder has incorporated a specific recommendation arising from the P4P pilot into its operations, procedures, or policy documents.</td>
<td>Other agricultural development stakeholders have a large enough presence and can effectively manage the risks associated with local procurement (i.e., not disrupt markets) and retain a focus on smallholder/low income farmers and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2.1: Implications of lessons learned and best practices for programming or policy (including specific recommendations) documented and conveyed to agricultural market stakeholders and others</td>
<td>Number of publications, or other communications, produced by WFP that contain specific programming or policy recommendations (e.g., guidance to country offices, position papers, policy recommendations, etc.)</td>
<td>Review of documents and other communications (Country office quarterly reports, weekly not-for-the-record (NFR) papers from teleconferences between HQ and CO)</td>
<td>The appropriate stakeholders receive the message and are receptive to the policy recommendations arising from the P4P pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meetings of agricultural development stakeholders at which either policy or programming proposals are tabled by P4P implementers</td>
<td>Records of WFP, P4P Unit, country offices, and implementing partners documenting formal presentation of P4P programming or policy recommendations at meetings/conferences with other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Activity: Design, document, and implement a monitoring and evaluation system and plan for P4P including impact assessment models, baselines, data collection, sampling strategies, and training materials.</td>
<td>WFP is able to identify and engage the assistance of partners for data collection and develop the resources and capacities in country offices to manage the M&amp;E process at the country level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Develop and implement procedures to manage M&amp;E data at both the country office and headquarters levels</td>
<td>Obtain sufficient funding to manage country-level M&amp;E functions (e.g., data collection and analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Develop and implement training programs for country office staff in M&amp;E system management, implementation, analysis, and reporting</td>
<td>Training is effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Develop standardized routines (SPSS syntax) and reporting templates for country-level analysis and reporting of M&amp;E data</td>
<td>Country offices have the capacity and motivation to collect and analyze data and produce required reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Articulate country-specific criteria for selecting participating farmers organizations</td>
<td>Criteria identify farmers' organizations that have the capacity to benefit from supply-side interventions and ultimately sell to WFP but not so advanced that they will not benefit from supply-side interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Country offices and headquarters produce monthly and quarterly reports on P4P activities, issues, and lessons learned</td>
<td>P4P Unit and country offices have the capacity and motivation to collect and analyze data and produce required reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Country offices and headquarters produce biannual M&amp;E reports</td>
<td>Reports are a high enough priority given limited resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Country offices and P4P Unit produce annual reports drawing out implications for programming and policy</td>
<td>Reports are a high enough priority given limited resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: P4P Unit collaborates with WFP Evaluation Unit to facilitate external mid-term and final evaluations of P4P pilot</td>
<td>P4P Unit obtains the resources to support evaluations (if necessary) and the Evaluation Unit engages the appropriate expertise to conduct the evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: At mid-term and final evaluation points, conduct cost benefit/effectiveness analysis of P4P procurement modalities</td>
<td>Accounting and benefit data to support meaningful cost benefit analysis are available and WFP has access to the expertise necessary to conduct the analyses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: P4P Unit convenes annual global events in Rome to review P4P performance with country office staff, donors, partners, and other experts</td>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant individuals and organizations attend and participate in the events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: P4P Unit compiles materials to support review by Technical Review Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: P4P Unit convenes annual Technical Review Panel of experts in Rome to review M&amp;E procedures and findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Review Panel members have the necessary expertise, interest, and sustained engagement in the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Country offices convene quarterly or biannual Action Reviews to draw out lessons learned (based on quarterly reports and analysis of M&amp;E data) and validate P4P best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant country-level partners attend and actively participate in the events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Design and/or contribute to public forums to share knowledge about P4P best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledgeable individuals participate in the forums.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Develop and distribute/disseminate market development and procurement best practices guidelines to WFP, agricultural stakeholders, and partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Develop and distribute training materials for implementing market development and procurement best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Design and execute cost-effective advocacy campaigns to promote adoption of best practices among agricultural market stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity: Collaborate with the Institute for Development Studies (IDS) to develop and distribute/implement policy outreach and policy-level advocacy materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity: Develop and distribute policy briefs and position papers to highlight policy implications (including specific recommendations) of P4P market development and procurement best practices

Objective 2. To increase smallholder/low income farmers' capacities for agricultural production and market engagement in order to raise their income from agricultural markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.1: By the end of the project, participating smallholder/low income farmers have increased their marketable surpluses of staple commodities.</th>
<th>Average per farm marketable surplus of staple commodities produced by smallholder members of participating farmer organizations (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by commodity and gender of farmer)</th>
<th>Smallholder farmer household surveys</th>
<th>P4P is successful at building sustainable access to markets for smallholder/low income farmers at prices that reflect the cost of production.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average per farm quantity of staple commodities sold by participating smallholder/low income farmers (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by gender of household head)</td>
<td>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (per smallholder farm) post-harvest losses of staple commodities as a percentage of annual production (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by commodity and gender of household head)</td>
<td>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.1.1: Smallholder/low income farmers trained in improved agricultural production inputs and practices</td>
<td>Percentage of participating farmer organizations for which WFP has signed agreements with partners to improve agricultural productivity/production</td>
<td>Country office activity records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1.2: Participating smallholder/lowl income farmers trained in post-harvest handling</td>
<td>Number of smallholder farmer members of participating farmer organizations trained in improved agricultural productivity/production practices (disaggregated by gender of trainee)</td>
<td>Supply-side partner activity records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of participating farmer organizations for which WFP has signed agreements with partners to improve post-harvest handling facilities and practices</td>
<td>Country office activity records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training is effective, farmers have the resources and incentives to put the training into practice, and implementation is adequate to reduce post-harvest losses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.2: By the end of the project, participating smallholder/lowl income farmer organizations have increased their capacity to aggregate and market their smallholder members’ marketable surpluses of staple commodities</th>
<th>Number of smallholder farmer members of participating farmer organizations trained in improved post-harvest handling and storage practices (disaggregated by gender of trainee)</th>
<th>Supply-side partner or WFP activity records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average proportion of smallholder members’ staple commodities sold through participating farmer organizations (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by commodity and gender of registered farmer organization member)</td>
<td>Smallholder/lowl income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholder farmers have increased their production of staple commodities and are choosing to sell more of their surpluses through the farmer organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per registered member) quantity of staple commodities sold through participating farmer organizations (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by gender of registered farmer organization member)</td>
<td>Farmer organization records and surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (over participating smallholder farmer organizations) price received for commodities as a percentage of the highest price in that locality during the marketing season</td>
<td>Farmer organization survey and records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary market data (source varies by country)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2.1: Participating smallholder/low income farmer organization management staff trained in organizational management (e.g., governance, administration, financial)</td>
<td>Percentage of smallholder/low income farmer organization management staff who have completed training in governance, administration, or financial management of farmer organizations (disaggregated by gender)</td>
<td>Supply-side partner activity records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2.2: Participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations trained in contracting</td>
<td>Number of farmer organizations with at least one member of the management staff trained in organization management (i.e., governance, administration, or financial management of farmer organizations)</td>
<td>Farmer organization survey and records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (over farmer organizations) percentage of contracts successfully delivered. (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by country and primary reason for default)</td>
<td>Farmer organization surveys and records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations qualified to participate in WFP competitive tenders (relative to baseline)</td>
<td>WFP procurement data and records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2.3: Stability and representativeness (gender and smallholders) of participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations improved</td>
<td>Percentage of participating smallholder/low income farmer organization members who are women (disaggregated by country)</td>
<td>Farmer organization surveys and records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations’ elected leadership positions held by women (disaggregated by country)</td>
<td>Farmer organization surveys and records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participating smallholder/low income farmer organization members who are smallholder farmers (disaggregated by country)</td>
<td>Farmer organization surveys and records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average attrition (drop-out) rate of participating smallholder/low income farmer organization members (i.e., percentage of members at beginning of year who were not members at the end of the year) (disaggregated by gender of farmer organization member)</td>
<td>Farmer organization surveys and records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output 2.2.4: Mechanisms established to address participating smallholder/low income farmers’ cash flow constraints**

Number of participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations with ability to offer their members some form of financing for crops at harvest (e.g., by pre-purchase, credit, access to warehouse receipt systems, or other full or partial pre-payment for crops) (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by type of financing) | Farmer organization survey and records

Number of participating farmer organizations depositing commodities in a warehouse with a receipt system | Farmer organization survey and records

Addressing cash flow constraints is sufficient to provide smallholder farmers greater flexibility in how they sell commodities and they then choose to sell those commodities through the farmer organization.

**Outcome 2.3: By the end of the project, participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations have increased access to markets for staple commodities**

Average quantity of staple commodities sold by participating farmer organizations (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by commodity) | Farmer organization surveys and records

Smallholder farmer members increase production of staple commodities and choose to sell their surpluses through the farmer organization.
<p>| Output 2.3.1: Partnerships for addressing identified constraints facing smallholder/low income farmer organizations’ access to markets established and monitored | Percentage of participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations for which WFP has signed agreements with partners to provide market access support | WFP country office records | Partners are effective in working with farmer organizations to address the identified constraints to address market access. |
| Number of participating smallholder/low income farmer organizations offering post-harvest handling services to their members (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by service) | Farmer organization survey and records | Smallholder farmer surveys |
| Number of participating farmer organizations with access to warehouse storage capable of maintaining long-term quality of stored commodities. | Farmer organization surveys and records | Partner activity records Country office activity records | Markets exist for higher quality commodities, farmer organizations lack the capacity to produce the quality demanded, and addressing constraints to drying, cleaning, sorting, processing, and storage is sufficient to meet quality standards. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.4: By the end of the project, the sale of staple commodities is contributing to improved welfare for households of participating smallholder/low income farmers</th>
<th>Average percentage contribution of sale of staple commodities to household incomes of participating smallholder/low income farmers (relative to baseline and comparison groups, disaggregated by gender of household head)</th>
<th>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average food consumption score of participating smallholder/low income farmer households (relative to baseline and comparison groups, disaggregated by gender of farmer organization member)</td>
<td>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average household asset score (HAS) of participating smallholder/low income farmer households (relative to baseline and comparison groups, disaggregated by country and gender of farmer organization member)</td>
<td>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average annual household expenditure (food and non-food) by smallholder farmer households (relative to baseline and comparison groups, disaggregated by gender of household head)</td>
<td>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of participating smallholder/low income farmers who are net sellers of staple commodities (i.e., produce more than they consume) (relative to baseline and comparison group, disaggregated by commodity)</td>
<td>Smallholder/low income farmer household surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity:** Coordinate with partners to provide appropriate support (access to inputs and technical assistance) to increase productivity of smallholder/low income farmers.

**Activity:** Collaborate with partners to provide training in post-harvest handling and storage practices.
| Activity: Identify and sign agreements with appropriate supply-side partners to meet identified gaps in the capacities of smallholder/low income farmer organizations. |
| Activity: Monitor partners’ performance relative to agreements, desired P4P outputs, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation activity/milestones |
| Activity: Work with supply-side partners to facilitate access to credit for smallholder farmers |
| Activity: Facilitate access to cleaning, drying, and storage facilities (e.g., partners rehabilitate or build warehouses, provide cleaning and drying equipment, or link farmer organizations to certified warehouses, etc.) |

**Objective 3. To identify and implement best practices for increasing sales to WFP and others with a particular focus on smallholder/low income farmers.**

| Outcome 3.1: The quantity of WFP’s purchases from smallholder/low income farmer associations increases by 30% annually throughout the five-year P4P pilot phase |
| Quantity of food purchased annually by WFP from smallholder/low income farmer organizations (disaggregated by commodity, procurement modality, and country) |
| WFP procurement records |
| Farmers have sufficient surpluses and WFP has sufficient need and capacity to support the targeted increase in procurement. |

<p>| Output 3.1.1: A clear (country-specific) strategy for increasing procurement of staple commodities from smallholder/low income farmers documented |
| Number of P4P pilot countries with a documented plan for achieving the required growth increment |
| CIP, specific strategy for increasing local procurement to achieve the 30% growth target |
| External factors (i.e., production shocks, prices, etc.) do not curtail quantity available, WFP’s need for staple commodities, or ability to procure locally without disrupting markets (i.e., local price is below IPP). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 3.1.2: Country offices’ local procurement strategies explicitly document impacts on local markets and traders</th>
<th>Number of P4P pilot countries with documented local-specific decision rules to minimize/avoid market distortions</th>
<th>P4P country office records/documents</th>
<th>None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of P4P pilot countries producing timely market intelligence/impact reports</td>
<td>P4P country office records/documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1.3: Country office staff trained in P4P procurement</td>
<td>Percentage of country offices with at least one staff member trained in some aspect of local procurement specific to P4P.</td>
<td>WFP country offices, P4P Unit records</td>
<td>Training is effective and addresses a relevant constraint to P4P procurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1.4: WFP contracts for processed foods establish minimum requirements for smallholder/low income farmer content and means of verification</td>
<td>Average (over participating farmers’ organizations) sales of staple commodities to processors. (measured annually and disaggregated by commodity and country)</td>
<td>WFP’s P4P and Procurement Units</td>
<td>Processors represent a large enough market for commodities and farmers’ organizations can provide adequate quality of commodities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Activity: Country offices design and regularly review P4P procurement strategy |  |  |  |
| Activity: Country offices integrate purchases through P4P into food pipeline |  |  |  |
| Activity: Develop standard format for direct and forward delivery contracts |  |  |  |
| Activity: Conduct regular analyses of impacts of P4P procurement on local markets and traders |  |  |  |
| Activity: Develop locally applicable decision rules to guide the decision on the timing and quantity of purchase from farmers organizations |  |  |  |
| Activity: Develop guidance on price setting and contract negotiation for use by country offices. |  |  |  |
| Activity: Develop materials and train P4P country office staff in P4P procurement (e.g., price setting, contract negotiation, quality assurance, etc.) |
| Activity: WFP increases requirement for their suppliers of processed foods to procure from qualifying smallholder/low income farmer organizations |
| Activity: WFP assesses the potential for smallholder/low income farmers to contribute to WFP’s processed foods needs |
| Activity: Establish and apply clear criteria for selecting smallholder/low income farmer organizations to participate in P4P |

Objectives 4. To transform WFP food purchase programmes so they better support sustainable small-scale production and address the root causes of hunger.

| Outcome 4.1: By 2013, WFP has transformed its programming, policies, rules, and regulations to incorporate a strategic focus on local procurement with a focus on smallholder/low income farmers |
| Financial regulations and procedures revised to incorporate pro-smallholder procurement |
| Review of WFP financial regulations |
| The P4P pilot concludes that an increased focus on local procurement delivers the desired development impacts and that risks to markets and WFP’s core objectives are manageable. |

| Job descriptions reflect needs/skills required to effectively manage local procurement |
| Review HR job descriptions for relevant positions (country directors and procurement, logistics, finance, programming staff). Job descriptions need to include managing/implementing P4P. |
| Program guidance manual revised to reflect a strategic approach to Local Procurement. | Document review |
| Number of P4P pilot countries in which risk management strategies explicitly acknowledge risks associated with pro-smallholder procurement | Document review |
| Percentage of PRROs, EMOPs, and country programmess that incorporate pro-smallholder local procurement as a programme component (disaggregated by country) | Review of documents |
| Projects have sufficient untied funding to buy under P4P |
| **Output 4.1.1: WFP policies reflecting pro-smallholder procurement best practices endorsed by Executive Board** | Percentage of pro local procurement policy proposals presented to WFP’s Executive Board that are adopted. | P4P Unit documents and activity records | Local procurement serves WFP’s needs and remains a priority for the organization. |
| **Output 4.1.2: Integration and coordination across WFP operational units relevant to P4P implementation established** | Percentage of required Steering Committee and Stakeholder group meetings convened. | P4P Unit records | Local procurement accepted by all relevant units. |
| **Output 4.1.3: Country offices reliance on identified best procurement practices for local food procurement increased** | Percentage of total annual procurement from local sources (disaggregated by supplier, i.e., trader, farmer organization, etc.) | WFP procurement monitoring | WFP funding constraints (i.e., tied aid, timing of fund availability) and external factors (demand, availability, prices) do not constrain local procurement activities. |
| **Activity: Develop and package results of M&E and mid-term and final evaluations to illustrate impacts of P4P on WFP objectives** | Quantity of food procured locally (disaggregated by commodity, procurement modality, and country) | WFP procurement monitoring |
Activity: P4P Unit convenes monthly meetings with Steering Committee and Stakeholder group

Activity: Adapt existing WFP risk tool to manage risks to local markets and apply to assessing risk associated with P4P procurement.

Activity: Train country office staff to manage pro-smallholder local procurement activities

Activity: Country offices form steering committees to provide input on local procurement implementation
## Annex 6: P4P Trust Funds Facts and Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Pilot Country</th>
<th>Approval Date of the CIP</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Total Funding (US$)</th>
<th>Grand Total Funding (US$)</th>
<th>Contracted quantity by activity (mt)</th>
<th>Total contracted quantity (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>19-Jan-10</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>19,391,541.44</td>
<td>19,391,541.44</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>09-Dec-10</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6,558,275.65</td>
<td>8,482,615.42</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,767,797.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>05-Dec-09</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>3,226,098.00</td>
<td>3,648,297.90</td>
<td>14,554</td>
<td>27,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>249,221.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comitato Italiano WFP</td>
<td>52,978.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>05-Dec-09</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>4,988,035.00</td>
<td>5,111,352.00</td>
<td>14,405</td>
<td>4,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>23,317.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>20-Oct-10</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>2,767,464.00</td>
<td>2,767,464.00</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>6,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>29-Jan-10</td>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>2,533,979.44</td>
<td>2,623,979.44</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>90,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>4,737,830.00</td>
<td>4,837,490.00</td>
<td>12,015</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>99,660.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>22-Apr-09</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>4,998,811.00</td>
<td>5,091,588.00</td>
<td>11,497</td>
<td>8,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>92,777.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>5,121,919.06</td>
<td>5,121,919.06</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>5,150,317.76</td>
<td>7,046,537.01</td>
<td>19,708</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>1,896,219.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>3,728,554.05</td>
<td>10,062,299.82</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>17,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>6,333,745.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>4,736,149.53</td>
<td>4,736,149.53</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panama City Rb</td>
<td></td>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>1,755,645.65</td>
<td>1,755,645.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>4,245,175.00</td>
<td>4,608,175.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>263,000.00</td>
<td>37,450</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>249,221.18</td>
<td>202,375.00</td>
<td>131,832.00</td>
<td>249,221.18</td>
<td>202,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>30-Oct-08</td>
<td>3,451,076.00</td>
<td>4,034,504.18</td>
<td>5,818 5,818</td>
<td>4,034,504.18</td>
<td>5,818 5,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>05-Dec-09</td>
<td>4,320,824.00</td>
<td>4,420,824.00</td>
<td>12,587</td>
<td>4,420,824.00</td>
<td>12,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>4,619,968.00</td>
<td>4,653,618.00</td>
<td>315 315</td>
<td>4,653,618.00</td>
<td>315 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>29-Mar-11</td>
<td>Canada 5,069,364.16</td>
<td>5,069,364.16</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>5,069,364.16</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>HGBF 1,412,000.00</td>
<td>4,707,628.49</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>4,707,628.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>16-Feb-09</td>
<td>HGBF 345,628.49</td>
<td>950,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>345,628.49</td>
<td>950,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>23-Mar-09</td>
<td>BMGF 4,114,601.00</td>
<td>4,214,601.00</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>4,214,601.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal RB</td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID 30,150.52</td>
<td>30,150.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,150.52</td>
<td>30,150.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>12-Dec-09</td>
<td>HGBF 1,412,000.00</td>
<td>2,755,369.49</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2,755,369.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>12-Dec-09</td>
<td>HGBF 345,628.49</td>
<td>950,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>345,628.49</td>
<td>950,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>12-Dec-09</td>
<td>Sauda Arabia 950,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>950,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>12-Dec-09</td>
<td>Zynge USA 47,741.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,741.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium 246,596.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246,596.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>BMGF 21,197,945.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,197,945.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada 2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>France 14,334.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,334.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>HGBF 1,354,331.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,354,331.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sauda Arabia 3,100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4P UNIT &amp; Other allied units at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID 4,397,285.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,397,285.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP HQ</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>USAID 1,550,791.69</td>
<td>1,550,791.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,550,791.69</td>
<td>1,550,791.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149,143,024.86</td>
<td>149,143,024.86</td>
<td>147,841</td>
<td>93,418</td>
<td>149,143,024.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>310,651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source*: WFP P4P CU
NB: Niger and Senegal, OMD and the WFP Centre of Excellence received funding by Brazil and USAID for P4P activities. They are not part of the P4P pilot initiative and the amount received is not included in the grand total. The grand total does not include Indirect Support Costs and Forex loss. Funds for OMP as a Regional Coordinator Office have been included in the funding for WFP-HQ.
Donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>% donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>62,667,827</td>
<td>42.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGBF</td>
<td>27,204,896</td>
<td>18.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>26,460,906</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>8,856,147</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>8,432,340</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6,804,872</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,872,132</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>761,442</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>691,257</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS Foundation</td>
<td>156,542</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>110,627</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitato Italiano WFP</td>
<td>52,979</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZYNGA USA</td>
<td>47,741</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>23,317</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total confirmed contributions</td>
<td>149,143,025</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>10,414,557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159,557,582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: P4P CU (as at September 2013)

Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As at P4P Mid-term Evaluation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International NGO</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGO</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Institution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Institution</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Entity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO/Union/Federation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source**: WFP, April 2013 - P4P Partnerships Consolidated Report (Sept 2008- Dec 2012). For some categories, the source Summary P4P Partnerships Report shows percentage only. Therefore figures are rounded.
Procurement


Source: P4P CU (June 2013). 2012 data are subject to change

Source: P4P Consolidated Procurement Report (Sept 2008 - Mar 2013). The data for Liberia is under revision and the default rate may be significantly higher.
Average number of days of delays in delivery
(Sept 2008- March 2013)

Planned versus contracted quantities (mt)
(Sept 2008- Dec 2012)

Source: P4P Consolidated Procurement Report (Sep 2008-March 2013)

Source: Country Implementation Plans and P4P consolidated procurement report (Sep 2008-Dec 2012)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Quantity (MT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>8,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>5,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>31,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>9,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>14,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>10,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>25,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>144,045</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: P4P CU (July 2013)
### Annex 7: Preliminary list of country selection criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>P4P Country</th>
<th>WFP CO size&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Country Typology&lt;sup&gt;41&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Country visited (MTE)</th>
<th>The 6 most important development partners</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2010\2011 Low-income</td>
<td>Lower-middle income</td>
<td>Post Conflict&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>BMGF</td>
<td>HGBF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>14,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>14,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>19,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>37,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>12,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: P4P CU unless specified otherwise. Approaches and activities are detailed in section 3.2

<sup>40</sup> WFP RMBB Unit: The Categorisation is calculated on: 1. Average DSC availability from 2009-2012 and 2. Advice and Agreement with RBs on individual COs.

<sup>41</sup> World Bank classification: Economies are divided according to 2012 GNI per capita, calculated using the World Bank Atlas method. The groups are: low income, $1,035 or less; lower middle income, $1,036 - $4,085; upper middle income, $4,086 - $12,615; and high income, $12,616 or more.

<sup>42</sup> [http://usa.wfp.org/photo-gallery/wfp-post-conflict-countries](http://usa.wfp.org/photo-gallery/wfp-post-conflict-countries) (visited on 25\07\2013)
### Annex 8: Key stakeholder groups

#### Internal Reference Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burbano, Carmen</td>
<td>Policy Officer, School Feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denhere, Simon</td>
<td>Regional Procurement Officer - OMN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieng, Abdou</td>
<td>Country Director - Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Calum</td>
<td>Chief, Organizational Budgeting Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart, William</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Government Partnership Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain, Arif</td>
<td>Chief Economist, Strategic Planning Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, Frances</td>
<td>Public Information Officer, Communications Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford, Sarah</td>
<td>Sr. Regional Programme Adviser - OMJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Hebert</td>
<td>Regional P4P Advisor - OMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin-Daihirou, Alice</td>
<td>Country Director – Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashayo, Emmanuel</td>
<td>P4P Country Coordinator - South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mballa, Isabelle</td>
<td>Regional Programme Officer – OMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbizule, Clare</td>
<td>Sr. Programme Adviser P4P CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGroarty, Mary-Ellen</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaux, Stephane</td>
<td>Programme Officer, Food Safety and Quality Assurance CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milisic, Zlatan</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Policy, Programme and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruedas, Sonsoles</td>
<td>Director of Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanogo, Issa</td>
<td>Programme Adviser, Market Specialist, Analysis and Nutrition Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirois, Romain</td>
<td>Sr. Programme Adviser P4P CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Der Knaap, Adrian</td>
<td>Chief Logistics and Transport Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Der Zee, Robert</td>
<td>Chief Finance and Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vdovic, Djordje</td>
<td>P4P Country Coordinator - Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake, Sandra</td>
<td>Donor and Private Sector Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### P4P Steering Committee members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Denise</td>
<td>Regional Director, OMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauzy, Jean-Philippe</td>
<td>Director, Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curran, Finbarr</td>
<td>Director, Budget and Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darboe, Mustapha</td>
<td>Regional Director, OMJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Ken</td>
<td>P4P Global Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diop, Abdoulaye</td>
<td>Government Partnership Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleischer, Corinne</td>
<td>Director – Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarnieri, Valerie</td>
<td>Regional Director, OMN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbinge, Wolfgang</td>
<td>Director, Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodesani, Gemmo</td>
<td>Regional Director, OMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopesdasilva, Ramiro</td>
<td>Assistant Executive Director, Operation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshidari, Kenro</td>
<td>Regional Director, OMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samkange, Stanlake</td>
<td>Director, Policy, Programme and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Roehl, Claudia</td>
<td>Director, Government Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### External Advisory Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Shukri*</td>
<td>Senior Economist</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audinet Jean-Philippe</td>
<td>Sr. Technical Advisor, Policy and Technical Advisory Division</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Shaun*</td>
<td>Senior Technical Advisor for Agriculture and Environment</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia Miguel*</td>
<td>Director, Agribusiness and trade</td>
<td>Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia Valdes Marta</td>
<td>M&amp;E Specialist</td>
<td>Oxfam Intermon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizire Boaz*</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>African Union Commission (CAADP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbaabu Anne</td>
<td>Director, Market Access Program</td>
<td>Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rispoli Francesco*</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Rural Finance</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serova Eugenia</td>
<td>Director of Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Were Omamo</td>
<td>Director of Policy</td>
<td>Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torero Maximo*</td>
<td>Division Director of the Markets, Trade, and Institutions Division</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tschirley Dave*</td>
<td>Market Specialist</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* members of the TRP

### Donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Martin</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>Howard G Buffett Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alesha Black</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Kelly</td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>Howard G Buffett Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Mitchell</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Access &amp;</td>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gort</td>
<td>Deputy Permanent Representative</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence Argimon-Pistre</td>
<td>Head of Delegation, Rome</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aïcha Touré</td>
<td>Humanitarian Unit - Directorate of Development Cooperation</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tjada Mc Kenna</td>
<td>Deputy coordinator for</td>
<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 9: List of P4P documents essential to the evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Baseline Reports</th>
<th>Follow-up reports</th>
<th>Impact assessment</th>
<th>P4P Story</th>
<th>Study on quality market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>End Dec 2013</td>
<td>Feb 2014 (yrs 1-5)</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>End Dec 2013</td>
<td>End Dec 2013 (yrs 1-3)</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>End Dec 2013</td>
<td>Jan 2014 (yrs 1-4)</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Jan 2014 (yrs 1-4)</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Baseline unusable</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>End Dec 2013</td>
<td>Feb 2014 (yrs 1-4)</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Jan 2014 (poor quality)</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Feb 2014 (yrs 1-5)</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>End Dec 2013</td>
<td>Feb 2014 (yrs 1-5)</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
<td>FO report for yr 1</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Baseline unusable</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td>March 2014 (yrs 1-5)</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Jan 2014 (poor quality)</td>
<td>March 2014 (yrs 1-5)</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>End Dec 2013 (yrs 1-4)</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Baseline unusable</td>
<td>No report</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>End Dec 2013</td>
<td>Feb 2014 (yrs 1-4)</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of P4P key global documents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Time frame covered</th>
<th>To be completed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4P Primer</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Procurement Reports</td>
<td>Sept 2008-Dec 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Partnerships Reports</td>
<td>Sept 2008-Dec 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated FOs &amp; Trainings Reports</td>
<td>Sept 2008-Dec 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Annual Reviews</td>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP Summary Reports</td>
<td>2009-2013 (TRP 1)</td>
<td>2013 (Nov for TRP 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Analysis (FAO)</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Impact Pathways Report</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI analysis (5 reports)</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Gender Paper</td>
<td>November 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation on FO’s markets beyond WFP</td>
<td>End December 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU study</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As per latest dates provided by the P4P CU (Sep 11th 2013)
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