TERMS OF REFERENCE [FINAL]
EVALUATION OF WFP'S POLICIES ON HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES AND ACCESS IN HUMANITARIAN CONTEXTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Background

1.1. Introduction

1.   Policy Evaluations focus on a WFP policy, guidance, associated arrangements and activities that are in place to implement it. They evaluate the quality of the policy, its results, and seek to explain why and how these results occurred.

2.   The Office of Evaluation (OEV) is launching the evaluation of WFP's Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access at the same time as an evaluation of WFP's Protection Policy. In view of the potential thematic overlaps, OEV commissioned an external scoping exercise and evaluability assessment to clarify the scope of both evaluations, including a careful delineation of the respective evaluation questions.

3.   The Terms of Reference (TOR) were prepared by the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEV) evaluation manager, Gaby Duffy, based on a document review, consultations with key stakeholders and an independent scoping exercise and evaluability assessment.

4.   The purpose of these TOR is to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation, to guide the evaluation team (EvT) and specify expectations that the EvT should fulfil. The TOR are structured as follows: Section 1 provides information on the context; Section 2 presents the rationale, objectives, stakeholders and main users of the evaluation; Section 3 presents an overview of WFP's policy and its implementation, and defines the approach and scope of the evaluation; Section 4 spells out the evaluation questions and methodology; Section 5 indicates how the evaluation will be organized.

5.   The annexes provide additional information on the detailed evaluation timeline (Annex 1), the Evaluation Communication and Learning Plan (Annex 2), the delineation of the scope of the evaluation of WFP's Protection Policy and the evaluation of WFP's Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access (Annex 3), the definitions of core humanitarian principles in key UN Agencies (Annex 4), the composition of the Internal Reference Group (IRG) and External Advisory Group (EAG) (Annex 6), a risk analysis (Annex 7) and a list of references (Annex 8).

1.2. Context

6.   WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) approved by the Executive Board in November 2016 re-affirms the primacy of humanitarian principles stating that "WFP is committed to the highest standards of integrity and its actions will at all times be guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and operational independence" (see definition in section 3.1).[1] Humanitarian principles were first agreed upon by the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in 1965.[2] In 1991 (resolution 46/182), the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) agreed on a set of 12 principles that guide the United Nations in providing humanitarian assistance.[3] Those included the principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality. The principle of independence was added by UN General Assembly resolution 58/114 in 2004.[4] Consistent with the UNGA resolution 46/182, WFP Executive Board endorsed in 2004 a Statement of WFP's humanitarian principles as a framework to guide WFP's humanitarian action, which lists as core values the principles of humanity, impartiality and neutrality.[5] WFP 2004 statement also laid out seven standards as "Foundations of

---

[1] WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1
[2] 20th International Conference of the Red Cross. Vienna. October 1965
[3] UNGA A/RES/46/182. Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian emergency assistance of the United Nations. December 1991.
[4] UNGA A/RES/58/114. Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian emergency assistance of the United Nations. February 2004.
[5] WFP/EB.A/2004/5-C

effective humanitarian action" (see section 3 and annex 5). In its Strategic Plan (2014–2017), WFP adopted operational independence as another core principle.[6]

7.   More than a theoretical set of norms, humanitarian principles are meant to provide a framework guiding humanitarian agencies in their decision-making processes on a wide range of operational decisions. Humanitarian action should be motivated by the sole aim of helping other human beings affected by conflicts or disasters (humanity); exclusively based on people's needs and without discrimination (impartiality); without favouring any side in a conflict or engaging in controversies where assistance is deployed (neutrality); and free from any economic, political or military interest at stake (independence). Humanitarian principles are often invoked to build trust, create greater acceptance and secure access from both state and non-state actors. Agencies may also use the humanitarian principles to advocate against diversion of aid as well as provide a transparent criteria for geographical and individual targeting, the type of assistance to be delivered, the choice of partners to work with, the selection of staff.

8.   In practice, however, humanitarian organisations are frequently challenged in their adherence to the humanitarian principles both in sudden onset emergencies and protracted crisis. A study commissioned by the Norwegian Refugee Council and Handicap International identified a set of challenges that make principled humanitarian action difficult:[7]

- **Politicization**: the "politicization of aid" (i.e., the blurring of lines between political and humanitarian goals) can be observed notably on post-conflict settings, when there is a tendency to emphasise development and long-term issues (state building) at the expense of humanitarian. Integrated missions and agendas also pose constraints due to alignment between the political and humanitarian actors (notably on risk tolerance and risk mitigation measures), neutrality and coherence of messaging.

- **Donor pressures**: Often relying on voluntary contributions, the ability of humanitarian organizations to make independent decisions on the provision of assistance is undermined by the overall level of funding available as well as donors' conditions and earmarking.

- **Engagement with state and non-state actors**: State and non-state actors may reject humanitarian assistance denying the existence of needs or attempt to interfere with the implementation of humanitarian activities in areas under their control. In some instances, they may perceive humanitarian agencies as self-serving, importing 'foreign' values or as a threat to state sovereignty. To gain acceptance as well as contribute to a coordinated humanitarian response, humanitarian agencies attempt to maintain a constructive relationship with local actors; defining the right degree of cooperation with those actors is key to maintain humanitarian agencies' ability to deliver assistance in an impartial manner.

- **Counterterrorism clauses**: the counterterrorism clauses adopted by some donors to prevent the diversion of humanitarian assistance to groups designated as "terrorists" involves severe legal repercussions for humanitarian agencies and their staff. As a result, some agencies may choose not to operate in specific areas controlled by those groups.

- **Access – Insecurity and restrictions:** the multiple security restrictions to which humanitarian organizations are confronted to (ongoing hostilities between

---

[6] WFP/EB.A/2013/5-A/1

[7] NRC and Handicap International "Challenges to Principled Humanitarian Action: Perspectives from Four Countries", July 2016. P.9

warring parties, targeted or collateral violence against humanitarian workers, breakdown of law and presence of landmines and unexploded ordnance) represent a primary impediment to humanitarian presence and result in reduced access to populations in need. Humanitarian organizations perceived as abiding by humanitarian principles were found to have better access to affected populations.

9.   In light of those challenges, member states committed through the Agenda 2030 to "resolve to take further effective measures and actions, in conformity with international law, to remove obstacles and constraints, strengthen support and meet the special needs of people living in areas affected by complex humanitarian emergencies".[8] In his report for the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit "One humanity: shared responsibility", the Secretary General emphasized that "ensuring that all humanitarian assistance is impartial, neutral and independent from military interventions or political agendas is critical for humanitarian organizations to earn trust and acceptance among State and non-State armed groups and to gain and maintain access and operate in safety"[9]. The report of the Secretary General "Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit" calls on Member States, non-State armed groups and humanitarian organizations to ensure full respect for humanitarian principles.[10]

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

2.1. Rationale

10.   The WFP's Evaluation Policy (2016-2021) states that corporate policies relevant to the Strategic Plan should be evaluated between 4 and 6 years after start of implementation. Policies adopted before 2011, such as WFP's policies on humanitarian principles and access (respectively approved in 2004 and 2006), are progressively included in OEV's work plan based on assessment of their continued relevance to WFP's work or potential to contribute to new policy development. OEV included this evaluation in its work plan for 2016 based on a number of considerations.

11.   The critical importance of Humanitarian Principles as the foundational principles of effective humanitarian response was emphasized during the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. These issues are likely to remain high on the international agenda over the coming years as member states and humanitarian agencies focus on the implementation of commitments made. Recent studies called for further internal reflection by humanitarian agencies and for an inclusive exchange of good practices and lessons on the practical use of humanitarian principles in their decision making processes.[11]

12.   The inter-connectedness and relationships between humanitarian principles and access negotiations should also be noted. Applying humanitarian principles contributes to securing access; yet, some strategies to overcome access constraints and reach population in need may entail some trade-offs or prioritization between the humanitarian principles. As noted recently by the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation, "the highly contextual, confidential and personal nature of frontline negotiations limits opportunities to learn from the experience and perspective of other frontline negotiators".[12] In a period of increasing numbers of simultaneous humanitarian crises, the challenge linked to humanitarian principles

---

[8] UNGA A/RES/70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. 21 October 2015. para. 23
[9] UNGA A/70/709. Report of the Secretary General for the World Humanitarian Summit. One humanity: shared responsibility. 2 February 2016. p.15.
[10] UNGA A/71/353. Report of the Secretary General "Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit" 23 August 2016. p.6.
[11] NRC and Handicap International "Challenges to Principled Humanitarian Action: Perspectives from Four Countries", July 2016. P.9
[12] Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation. Concept Paper. 2016. p.1

and access is multiplied, while experienced staff are stretched even more thinly. In such a context, learning support becomes even more important.

13.   Despite their political and operational relevance, humanitarian principles and access have been very poorly reflected in the evaluation practice of the UN's humanitarian agencies to date. This was confirmed by the review done early 2016 by the Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group (HEIG) which concluded that "agencies are (...) rarely addressing evaluation against Humanitarian Principles"[13]. Reasons for this are multiple including the sensitivity of the topic, operational challenges in applying principles, methodological challenges and lack of guidance. Among the recommendations, individual agencies were encouraged to commission evaluations that specifically focus on humanitarian principles.

14.   Finally, as mentioned earlier, WFP has explicitly re-affirmed its commitment to the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and operational independence in its new Strategic Plan (2017-2021). The organization's willingness to reflect and learn through the sharing of experience around humanitarian negotiations (underpinned by humanitarian principles) was also recently evidenced by WFP's contribution to the establishment of a Center of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation (CoC) in collaboration with ICRC, UNHCR, MSF and the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in October 2016. Through the scoping exercise that preceded the development of this TOR, consulted WFP staff confirmed that humanitarian principles and access were of the utmost importance for WFP's operations and standing in the international system and identified a range of benefits and added values in conducting this evaluation contributing both to organizational learning and greater accountability (see section 2.2).

2.2. Objectives

15.   All evaluations serve the dual objectives of accountability and learning. As such, the evaluation will:

Accountability to affected populations, members states and donors

- Assess the level of awareness and understanding among staff members of WFP core humanitarian principles and principled access as well as determine whether WFP has appropriate capacities and processes for supporting complex decisions that may involve trade-offs or compromises; external perceptions of WFP's current commitment to humanitarian principles and ability to preserve a principled approach; and possible relationships between WFP's adherence to humanitarian principles, access level and staff and beneficiaries' exposure to security risks.

- Demonstrate whether and how WFP proactively addresses difficult and sensitive issues and follows up on its commitments to humanitarian principles.

- Assess the quality of WFP's policy framework relating to humanitarian principles and access and their adequacy taking into account changes in the humanitarian landscape.

Learning

- Strengthen WFP's ability to adhere to humanitarian principles and preserve principled action and access by enabling exchange and peer learning among field staff involved in critical decisions and frontline negotiations; by identifying internal enablers and constraints and suggesting measures to address them.

---

[13] UNEG. Reflecting Humanitarian Principles in Evaluation. April 2016. p.43

- Inform WFP's advocacy strategies by analysis of external enablers and constraints to principled humanitarian action and access.

- Refine operational guidance on humanitarian principles and access, training and corporate support processes.

- Geenerate contributions to inter-agency learning and global debates and the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiations.

2.3. Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

16.   A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of WFP have interests in the results of the evaluation and many of these will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process (see further details on the composition of evaluation reference and advisory groups in Annex 6). The evaluation team will undertake a full stakeholder analysis during the inception phase of the evaluation. Internal and external stakeholders have initially been identified as follows:

17.   **Internal stakeholders.** The Emergencies and Transitions Unit (OSZPH) within the Policy and Programme Division carries the main responsibility for designing the policies on humanitarian principles and access, supporting their operationalization and providing guidance to regional bureaux and country offices. In October 2015, an Advisory Group on Access was established to facilitate cross-divisional collaboration and promote a systematic and coherent approach to access. This group is composed of the Programme Policy Division, the Field Security Division, the Emergency Preparedness and Response Division and the Supply Chain Division. These groups will play a major role in the evaluation process in terms of helping to focus the evaluation, providing access to records and information, actively take part to and support the learning component and serving as key informants. Of paramount importance are country offices which are responsible for the country level planning and operations implementation, and are directly involved as frontline negotiators as well as the regional bureaux responsible for the oversight and support to country offices. Finally, WFP Management and the Executive Board are a key audience to the evaluation as key decision makers on risk management. They will be expected to inform the evaluation throughout its process.

18.   **External stakeholders.** At global level the Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC) Reference Group on Principled Humanitarian Action, the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) and OCHA are key stakeholders considering their roles in facilitating access on behalf of humanitarian organizations. In addition, other UN agencies facing similar challenges and constraints such as UNHCR and UNICEF are likely to be interested in this evaluation. The Center of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation jointly established by ICRC, MSF, UNHCR and WFP would have an interest in learning from the results of the evaluation to strengthen its efforts to capture the diversity of approaches and methods for negotiation and inform practice. The evaluation approach and deliverables have been conceived to be highly complementary with the activities planned by the Center. Similarly at country level the HC/RC, OCHA and the partner agencies in the humanitarian response are the key stakeholders. As the ultimate recipients, affected populations have a stake in the evaluation and their perspectives on WFP's ability to preserve a principled approach will be sought. WFP key donors will certainly have a keen interest in the evaluation findings. All these external stakeholders will also be key informants to the evaluation and will be expected to contribute their perspective on how they perceive WFP's commitment to humanitarian principles and its ability to preserve a principled approach compared to other organisations. Finally, the UNEG Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group (HEIG) may also contribute to and benefit from this

evaluation from a methodological point of view as it embarks on the development of guidance on the evaluation of humanitarian principles.

19. **Expected users.** The primary expected users are: i) WFP management, Advisory Group on Access and the Policy and Programme Division who will be responsible for taking action, on the basis of the evidence and recommendations provided by the evaluation, to further improve WFP organizational frameworks, systems, guidance, processes and capacities; ii) WFP Executive Board, who will have the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation conclusions and recommendations as well as the corresponding Management Response;. iii) Donors supporting WFP, who will be informed in a transparent and credible manner on WFP's principled action and may benefit from the evaluation by understanding the impact of some donors' legislations and policies on WFP's ability to reach populations in need; and iv) United Nations Humanitarian Country Teams as well as the IASC Reference Group on Principled Humanitarian Action at corporate level may draw from the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve harmonized action.

3. Subject of the Evaluation

3.1. WFP's Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts

20. In line with the UNGA resolutions, WFP defined its core humanitarian principles as follows:[14]

   a) **Humanity**. WFP will seek to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it is found and respond with food aid as appropriate. It will provide assistance in ways that respect life, health and dignity.

   b) **Impartiality**. WFP's assistance will be guided solely by need and will not discriminate in terms of ethnic origin, nationality, political opinion, gender, race or religion. In a country, assistance will be targeted to those most at risk from the consequences of food shortages, following a sound assessment that considers the different needs and vulnerabilities of women, men and children.

   c) **Neutrality.** WFP will avoid taking sides in a conflict and will not engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature. Aid will not be provided to active combatants.

   d) **Operational Independence:** WFP will provide assistance in a manner that is operationally independent of the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where such assistance is being provided.[15]

21. WFP's 2004 Policy Statement on Humanitarian Principles also includes seven standards for WFP's humanitarian action: respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the State in which WFP is working; self-reliance; participation; capacity-building; coordination; accountability; and professionalism (see definitions in Annex 5). These principles and standards constitute normative and moral obligation for WFP, cooperating partners and staff. Their objective is to ensure more positive

---

[14] These definitions have evolved over time. As such, the concept of "food aid" has been replaced by "food assistance". Under impartiality, the reference to "from the consequences of food shortages" has been taken out.

[15] While operational independence is not one of the core humanitarian principles listed in WFP's policy, it has been affirmed by the organisation in the 2014-2017 and 2017-2021 Strategic Plans and is consistent with UNGA Resolution 58/114 (see para 6 of this ToR).

humanitarian outcomes and, at a minimum, to prevent assistance from causing further harm to affected populations.

22. The 2006 Policy Document "Note on Humanitarian Access and its Implications for WFP" defines access as follows: "the free and unimpeded movement of humanitarian personnel to deliver relief services, or the free and safe movement of humanitarian agencies to reach civilians who are trapped, unable to move or detained because of armed conflict, natural disasters and other difficult access situations. Humanitarian access allows impartial assessment of the needs of populations at risk and the delivery of assistance to respond to those needs. Access is therefore a precondition to humanitarian action".[16] The state has the primary responsibility for meeting the needs of crisis-affected civilians. If it cannot respond, its government or the United Nations Secretary-General may ask for WFP's assistance in the form of food assistance or logistics support. The note does not prescribe a standard WFP approach to access: every case is situation-specific and demands flexibility and creativity to balance needs and safety issues. Ensuring safe access requires sound situation analysis and security-risk management, adherence to international law and humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and operational independence, coordination and partnerships among stakeholders, and advocacy at various levels. It also describes the responsibilities within the UN system: Humanitarian Coordinators lead strategic and high-level advocacy and negotiations for access; simultaneously, WFP often negotiates permission for its own operations to ensure that timely assistance can be delivered across borders and conflict lines, especially when food insecurity is a major element of the crisis or when WFP is working on behalf of other humanitarian actors, for example, as the logistics cluster lead. Where there are peacekeeping or special political missions, WFP approach to securing access should be coherent with the policy of UN integration. In all cases, WFP ensures that governments and other parties are informed of and in agreement with its activities.

23. WFP's Protection Policy approved in 2012 further stipulates that "WFP's food assistance processes – including negotiations for humanitarian access, advocacy, partnerships, and delivery mechanisms – will be pursued in accordance with humanitarian principles and international law. WFP food assistance will be provided in ways that aim to support the protection of conflict- and disaster-affected populations and, at the very least, will not expose people to further harm."[17]

24. A 2014 ECHO evaluation assessed the extent to which the implementation of the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid had contributed to promoting and upholding the fundamental humanitarian principles, promoting international humanitarian law (IHL) and respecting the distinct nature of humanitarian aid.[18] The evaluation concluded that "overall the EU – and DG ECHO in particular – was widely perceived as a principled humanitarian actor in compliance with IHL. The implementation of the European Consensus was cited as one factor among others that helped to encourage and increased focus on humanitarian principles among Member States. Application of the principles in the field varied between EU actors, most notably in crises that created tension between access to those in need and the principle of neutrality." Some interlocutors questioned the feasibility of the principles in complex emergencies, citing the example of the 2010 floods in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of Pakistan, where assistance could only be channelled through the Pakistani government. The concentration of aid to newly liberated zones

---

[16] WFP/EB.1/2006/5-B/Rev.1

[17] WFP/EB.1/2012/5-B/Rev.1

[18] ECHO/Analysis for Economic Decision, Evaluation of the implementation of the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, Final Report. June 2014. P 55.

from Al Shabaab in Somalia, or to areas of Syria controlled by President Assad, were also provided as examples where humanitarian needs conflict with the principle of neutrality.

25.   The 2012 thematic evaluation and review of humanitarian access strategies in DG ECHO-funded interventions concluded that there are no simple solution for increasing access. "What works to increase access in one context can be counterproductive in another."[19] However, important lessons were identified and should be systematically considered: i) how to avoid risk transfer to field staff, partners and beneficiaries, ii) how to build acceptance, iii) how to ensure that field staff have the necessary skills and experience, iv) what to do when access deteriorates, v) how to adapt monitoring to remote management, and vi) how to deliver outputs as directly as possible and locate senior staff as close as possible to the area of intervention.

3.2. Overview of WFP Arrangements and Activities for Policy Implementation

26.   Table 1 below outlines the key milestones that led to and informed the formulation and approval of the policy documents on Humanitarian Principles (2004) and the Note on Humanitarian Access and its implications (2006), as well as the arrangements put in place to guide and support their implementation.

Table 1: Key milestones in WFP's normative and guidance framework supporting adherence to humanitarian principles and enabling access

When	What	Description
1999-2000	Internal review composed of a series of country case studies on access negotiation	Aimed to analyse WFP approaches to overcoming access constraints, feed into interagency discussions on this topic and provide broad parameters and guidance for staff.
Sept 2001	Food Aid in Conflict workshop	Aimed to better understand the key issues faced by staff when planning and implementing programmes in complex emergencies.
May 2002	WFP info pack on Access negotiation	Included background information on humanitarian access, broad parameters to guide WFP's approach to access issues and suggested strategies to address difficulties accessing vulnerable people or areas in emergency and protracted relief and recovery operations.
2003	WFP's Experience in Working with the Military	Collated examples of WFP's experience in working with the military; and aimed to generate ideas to further WFP's internal and inter-agency discussions on developing policy and operational guidelines for interacting with the military.
1999-2004	UN-CM Coord/ Civil-Military Exercises/ Training	Aimed to further increase WFP staff's understanding of respective principles, mandates and structures of the civil and military communities
Feb 2004	**Approval of Policy on Humanitarian Principles**	Principles and standards constitute normative and moral obligation for WFP, other humanitarian agencies and their staff to ensure more positive

---

[19] GPPI, Thematic evaluation and review of humanitarian access strategies in DG ECHO-funded interventions, June 2012. p.9

When	What	Description
		humanitarian outcomes and, at a minimum, to prevent assistance from causing further harm to affected populations
2004-2005	Research work on access	Debrief of staff who have extensive experience with humanitarian access in order to consolidate lessons and practices and feed into approaches in other regions and countries. Publication of WFP/UNU/Tufts University book on humanitarian diplomacy
2005- Ongoing	Training on access negotiations	As part of WFP's emergency response, protection, Logistics Cluster (in Brindisi) and Leadership (for CDs) trainings.
2005 – 2008	Protection Project	Included global training of staff on International Law and access negotiations
2006	**EB Policy - Note on Humanitarian Access and its implications**	Aimed to explain the challenges faced by WFP in securing humanitarian access in conflict and non-conflict emergencies and to describe WFP's role and approach, within the wider UN and humanitarian community, in ensuring safe and secure access
November 2007	WFP Strategic Plan (2008-2013)	Re-affirmed WFP's commitment to the humanitarian principles as defined in the 2004 Statement.
2009 (developed in 2008)	Training Manual on Protection in WFP Operations	Aimed to provide trainers with the necessary guidance materials to conceptualise, organise and deliver a training workshop on protection in the context of WFP's work.
June 2009	Conference on Humanitarian Assistance in Conflict and Complex Emergencies	Convened by WFP, the conference on Humanitarian Assistance in Conflict and Complex Emergencies gathered WFP senior staff and country directors, other UN officials, academics, thinkers and practitioners to consider how WFP can meet the needs of vulnerable communities in the shifting humanitarian context of conflicts and complex emergencies. Critical areas of engagement were discussed, including: (i) United Nations and integrated missions, and their impact on humanitarian space; (ii) non-state actors and security, and their impact on humanitarian space; and (iii) protection, the rights agenda, principled humanitarian action and advocacy.
Feb 2012	**Approval of WFP humanitarian protection policy**	Outlined what humanitarian protection means for WFP, and proposed directions for sustainable engagement aimed at making WFP's presence safer and its assistance safer and more dignified. Based on the principle that WFP's food assistance processes should be pursued in accordance with humanitarian principles and international law.
Nov 2013	**WFP Strategic Plan (2014-2017)**	Reaffirms WFP's commitment to the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and operational independence.
Nov 2013	**EB Policy - WFP Peacebuilding Policy**	Established the parameters of WFP's engagement in peacebuilding, reaffirming the Do No Harm principle and supporting national priorities where possible, but following humanitarian principles where conflict continues
Dec 2013	Operational Guidance on Civil-Military Coordination	To provide WFP personnel at all levels with a basic knowledge of the global civil-military environment to assist in their preparation for, and response to, natural disasters and/or man-made emergencies where military forces are deployed.

When	What	Description
May 2014	**Approval of the Update on Implementation of the Protection Policy**	Focused on achievements and lessons learned across WFP in each of the six elements of the policy: i) staff capacity development; ii) context and protection risk analysis; iii) integration into programme design and implementation; iv) incorporation into programme tools; v) protection information management; and vi) partnerships.
Oct 2015	**Update on WFP Peacebuilding Policy**	Focused on early results in: i)conducting risk analysis, ii) using conflict-sensitive programming and iii) engaging with peacebuilding partners; to continue to ensure that WFP's food assistance programmes avoid to do harm
Sept-Dec 2014	Summary report/review on "Perspectives on Humanitarian Access: Summary of Interviews"	Included interviews with over 75 WFP staff in COs, RBs and HQ on access challenges faced in providing principled humanitarian assistance, the approaches adopted, and lessons.
Feb 2015	Access workshop	Held in Rome, gathered 16 WFP staff involved in access negotiations to share recent experience in emergency settings.
June 2015-current	Director-Level Advisory Group on Access	Establishment of an inter-functional group with three objectives: (1) promote a more systematic, comprehensive and coordinated approach on access vertically and horizontally across divisions and functional areas; (2) serve as a support cell for targeted requests from RBs and COs, and; (3) lead efforts to strengthen WFP's knowledge and capabilities on access.
Sept 2015 – current	Technical Access Cell	Aimed to assist in developing strategies for Director-Level Advisory Group on Access initiative and support activities, including among other others: - inclusion of access related issues in WFP Emergency Preparedness and Response Package. - Set up of an informal professional network on access : to review and contribute to the development of initiatives on access, provide an additional pool of support to personnel and country offices seeking advice and guidance on access challenges and dilemmas, and to share experiences - In-country support field mission on access. Conducted in collaboration with the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiations. 4 COs now have developed an access strategy, one CO has produced an actor mapping report and 4 COs have developed a power-broker map. Remote advice provided to 6 COs/RB and direct field support to 3 COs. - Finalization of WFP Operational Guidance on Humanitarian Access (draft available) - Training on Access: Inter-active training package on access and negotiations developed to build the capacities of WFP and partner personnel to develop and effectively implement access strategies. Delivered in 2016 in 4 locations. In total, trained over 100 WFP and partner staff on access strategies and 48 WFP and UNICEF staff on humanitarian access negotiations.

When	What	Description
2016-ongoing	Establishment of a professional network and Community of Practice	Through the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiations, aimed to be used as a central hub where humanitarian practitioners can share experiences and lessons, develop joint tools and initiatives and provide mutual support

3.3. Potential Risks Associated with the Evaluation

27. Conducting an evaluation of WFP's policies framing such politically and operationally-sensitive areas as principled humanitarian action and access entails risks. These, together with associated mitigating actions were identified and consulted on during the scoping and evaluability assessment for this evaluation. These risks include:

- Increase security risks for staff, partners and communities and threaten WFP's license to operate in certain countries or areas

- Increase reputational and related financial risks due to 'zero tolerance' donor policies

- Trigger overly restrictive rules

- The evaluation may not be perceived as credible.

28. Equally, the reputational and operational risks involved in <u>not</u> conducting this evaluation were considered, together with the potential missed opportunities: WFP could be exposed to reputational risk by failing to proactively evaluate the increasingly prominent issues around principled humanitarian action and access; operationally, ongoing efforts to improve WFP's capacities and processes for handling decisions involving humanitarian principles, including access negotiations, would not benefit from the evidence and insights provided by independent evaluation, thus undermining WFP's ability to preserve a principled humanitarian action in the medium- to long-term. This evaluation was found to be highly relevant in the present context, and the vast majority of consulted stakeholders saw many potential uses and important added values in the exercise. These opportunities would be missed if no evaluation would be conducted. A full risk analysis is available in annex 7.

3.4. Evaluation Approach and Scope

29. To manage and mitigate the risks summarised in section 3.3, and achieve the expected evaluation uses listed in section 2.3, this evaluation will follow a phased approach, starting with a confidential research and learning component. Described in table 2, component 1 will enable staff involved in critical programmatic decisions and frontline access negotiations to exchange experiences and lessons in a safe and highly confidential environment. It will also create a pooled (and decontextualized) evidence base from which to examine factors enabling and constraining principled humanitarian action and access. Drawing from the detailed learning, Component 2 will systematically address the 3 main evaluation questions and contribute to WFP's internal and external accountability. This approach is deemed essential to achieve the objectives of the evaluation listed in section 2.2. Table 2 also provides an overview of the respective outputs, key evaluation questions, key stakeholders and users and timeframe of the two components.

Table 2: Proposed Approach

Component 1: Confidential research and learning	Component 2: Evaluation
Outputs • In-depth global context analysis • Highly confidential interviews with current and former WFP and partner staff; • Learning events for WFP's frontline negotiators and decision makers; • Restricted and confidential knowledge bank on approaches to securing access and implications for principled actions; • Anonymized and decontextualized summary briefs (focussing on specific sub-themes)	**Outputs** • Reconstructed theory of change; • Inception report covering both components • Evaluation report including findings, conclusions and recommendations
Main guiding questions • What trade-offs and dilemmas did you encounter relating to humanitarian principles and access? • To what extent did humanitarian principles guide your decision-making and how? • How adequate were WFP's processes, guidance and capacities for handling the situation? • What enablers and constraints for taking principled decisions were present? • What advice would you give to other staff whether frontline negotiators or senior managers?	**Key evaluation questions** • What is the quality of the policy framework? • What are the results of the policy framework with respect to influencing and guiding relevant decisions, perception and reputation, encouraging principled humanitarian action as well as influencing WFP's level of field access? • What are the most important enabling and constraining factors for principled humanitarian action and access?
Stakeholders and users • Current and former WFP staff involved in critical programmatic decisions and access negotiations.	**Stakeholders and users** • WFP senior management, current and former staff, government and NGO partners, donors, Board members, other UN partners, academia, civil society and affected populations
Geographic focus • Complex emergencies with strong to severe challenges for humanitarian principles and access	**Geographic focus** • Decontextualized data on enablers and constraints from the research and learning component. • Global level data
Evaluation Reference Period • Between 2004 (adoption of the humanitarian principles policy document) and 2017. • The learning component is expected to include historical negotiation cases (2004 to 2017). • The evaluation component is expected to have a stronger focus on the past three to five years due to challenges in accessing historical data and limited institutional memory.	

30.   To ensure that the evaluation delivers the greatest possible benefits while mitigating the identified risks, the overall scope of the policy evaluation will focus on WFP organizational frameworks, systems, guidance, processes and capacities.

31.   The evaluation will:

- Assess the quality of WFP's policy framework including implementation measures for humanitarian principles and access (Question 1);

- Establish the extent to which WFP's approach to and application of the humanitarian principles affects its reputation; level of access; and staff and beneficiaries' exposure to security risks (Question 2);

- Identify factors within and beyond the control of WFP that enable or constrain principled humanitarian action and access (Question 3).

32.   The following will not be considered as in-scope of this evaluation:

- While the confidential research and learning component will reflect on individual negotiations or case-specific decisions, those will not be assessed under Component 2 in order not to compromise the security of staff, partners and affected communities, or put WFP's operations at risk.
- The evaluation is not intended to facilitate the identification of universally applicable "red lines" or similar guidance, considering the appropriateness of decisions is to a great extent specific to each operational context.
- Without prejudice to findings emanating from the evaluation process, the evaluation will not conduct a specific analysis of the risks involved in mobile data collection; this will be covered in a forthcoming WFP strategic evaluation of remote management approaches scheduled to start in 2017.

33. To avoid duplication and maximize complementarities, the respective scopes of the evaluation of WFP's policies on humanitarian principles and access in humanitarian contexts and the evaluation of WFP's protection policy have been carefully delineated during the scoping exercise. The following thematic overlaps were identified: i) staff's analytical capacity; ii) the principle of impartiality / non-discrimination; iii) level of staff and partner awareness of the humanitarian principles and key concepts; iv) advocacy; and v) partnerships. For each of them, the respective focus of the two evaluations is set out in Annex 3. The two evaluations are distinct in their approaches and timelines and will be conducted separately. However, synergies between the two processes will be ensured through management by a single evaluation manager, some common membership of the reference groups, and close coordination between the two independent evaluation teams. It is expected that the findings of the evaluation of WFP's protection policy may inform this evaluation.

4. Evaluation 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.

34. A preliminary evaluability assessment is provided below and will be deepened during the inception phase to inform selection of appropriate methods and ensure that the evaluation questions and sub-questions are systematically addressed. The main limitations relate to the lack of an existing, explicit theory of change for the policy documents under investigation, as well as gaps in the availability of certain data as follows:
- Staff and partners involved in negotiations and in decisions potentially involving trade-offs between different principles or between principles and access may not be willing to share relevant information or data for fear of negative consequences for their security, the projects they are responsible for, or their career.

- The results of any perceptions surveys applied in the evaluation will need to be analysed with caution due to the likelihood of incomplete data, data gaps, respondent and temporal bias. To be fully inclusive and engage with national

cooperating partners, affected populations as well as state and non-state actors, country visits will be required to complement and triangulate any electronic survey-based data.

- Datasets with relevant data, e.g. on WFP's current level of field access, may not be accessible and/or not complete. The team will explore the potential use of the database generated by the 2014-2016 Secure Access in Volatile Environments research programme by Humanitarian Outcomes and GPPi.[20] The potential use and suitability of other databases (e.g. UNDSS incident database and OCHA access database) by the evaluation team is being investigated as part of the preparation for this evaluation; even where access is granted, available data may be incomplete, not disaggregated by agency and/or not fully comparable.

- Comparisons with the policies and practices of other organisations may be limited as only few comparable assessments have been carried out (including for example a 2012 evaluation of OCHA's role in humanitarian civil-military coordination and a 2012 thematic evaluation and review of humanitarian access strategies in DG ECHO-funded interventions). In addition, other agencies may not be willing to provide relevant documents to the evaluation team and, given the sensitivity of the topics, might offer either partial or biased information.

- While a theory of change has not yet been made explicit, the objectives of the relevant policy documents are fairly clearly defined. On this basis, as well as selected interviews, it should be possible to reconstruct a plausible theory of change. In addition, the evaluation focuses strongly on the results level (EQ2) and complements this with an open-ended enquiry into the factors key stakeholders deem as most important for enabling or constraining positive results. These assessments can be carried out in a credible fashion even if a theory of change is absent or imperfect.

- The evaluation will include a confidential research and learning component, which is deemed essential in creating a safe space allowing involved staff and partners to provide sensitive data and information. Special confidentiality measures, going beyond standard procedures for policy evaluations, will be put in place.

- The gaps and other limitations in external data sources are most pertinent to EQ2 (what are the results of the policies). The sub-questions for EQ2 cover multiple parallel indicators or proxy indicators for those results. Even if it may not be possible to credibly answer all sub-questions, the evaluation should be in a position to answer the overall question of where WFP stands with respect to principles and access.

4.2 Evaluation Questions

35.   Drawing on available evidence, the evaluation will address the following three questions as outlined in table 3. They will be further detailed in an evaluation matrix to be developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Collectively, the questions aim to generate evaluation insights and evidence that will support the successful application of UN humanitarian principles by WFP; help the organization secure access; and thereby maximize its humanitarian contribution.

---

[20] GPPi and Humanitarian Outcomes, Secure Access in Volatile Environments (SAVE), 2014-2016.

Table 3: Evaluation questions

Question 1. What is the quality of the policies and associated guidance?[21]	(1) Are the policies and their provisions coherent and consistent, including with other policies notably on risk management and normative frameworks? (2) How are tensions and potential trade-offs between norms and principles addressed in the policies and guidance? (3) Was the design of the policy documents informed by adequate research and analysis? (4) How does WFP's policy framework in this area compare to that of other humanitarian organisations? (5) How relevant are the policy documents and the principles they embody in a changing global context?
Question 2. What are the results of the policies?	(1) To what extent are staff members aware of the humanitarian principles, and share a common understanding of them? (2) To what extent do staff feel empowered, capable and supported to operationalise them? (3) To what extent have WFP organizational frameworks, systems, guidance, processes and capacities supported the operationalization of the policies and encouraged principled action? (4) How do staff, partners, donors, host governments, non-state actors and affected populations perceive WFP's commitment to the humanitarian principles and its ability to preserve a principled approach compared to other organisations? (5)Is there any evidence of a relationship between WFP's adherence to humanitarian principles, access levels and staff and beneficiary exposure to security risks? (6) Has the policy framework had any unintended effects?
Question 3. What are the most important enablers and constraints?	(1) Which internal factors enable or constrain principled humanitarian action and access (e.g. capacities, systems, processes, incentives, type of programme and transfer modality, security arrangements, and risks management strategies)? (2) Which external factors enable or constrain principled humanitarian action and access (e.g. country context, overall level of funding, donor flexibility, counterterrorism clauses in contribution or partnership agreements, coordination among aid agencies…)? (3) What measures has WFP implemented to maximize enablers and address constraints and how effective were they? (4) What can the organization learn from these enabling and constraining factors to improve its application of humanitarian principles and access?

36.   These evaluation questions will form the basis of a comprehensive evaluation matrix including further sub-questions as appropriate, data-sources and proposed analysis, to be developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Gender and other relevant socio-economic factors will be addressed in each line of inquiry where appropriate.

4.3 Methodology

> *Amongst other issues, this evaluation will examine the extent to which gender and equity dimensions are integrated into WFP's policies, systems and processes.*

37.   The evaluation will employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria including those of relevance, coherence (internal and external), effectiveness and connectedness.

38.   **Methodology.** At the inception stage, the evaluation team will articulate a theory of change to facilitate further development of the evaluation matrix and tools. Based on this, the evaluation team will develop the most appropriate and credible methodology to address the above evaluation questions in a way that serves the dual

---

[21] The evaluation team may consider additional criteria for evaluating the quality of the policy framework.

objectives of accountability and learning, while managing the risks identified in 3.3. The methodology should:

- Specify how gender and other structural socio-economic factors will be addressed;

- Take into account the limitations to evaluability pointed out in 4.1 as well as budget and time constraints.

- Review the key risks, mitigation measures and confidentiality arrangements identified and further refine appropriate management measures.

39.   The methodology should demonstrate impartiality and absence of biases by relying on a range of information sources (from various stakeholder groups) and using a mixed methodological approach (e.g. quantitative, qualitative and participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.

40.   **Benchmarking**. It will be used to situate WFP's policy framework within those of other UN humanitarian agencies, focusing on the identification of commonalities and differences and on the extraction of learning and good practices.

4.4 Quality Assurance

41.   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 Director of Evaluation 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.

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

43.   To enhance the quality and credibility of this evaluation, an External Advisory Group (EAG) composed of key experts in evaluation and the subject matter will provide further quality assurance to the evaluation, will comment on the draft inception and evaluation reports and provide inputs at key stages in the evaluation process (see Annex 6 for more information on the EAG membership).

5.   Organization of the Evaluation

5.1. Phases and Deliverables

Table 4: Timeline summary of the key evaluation milestones

Main Phases	Timeline	Tasks and Deliverables
1. Inception	Dec 2016-April 2017	- Literature and document review - Briefing and consultations - Inception Mission - Inception report (draft and final) - Platform for confidential knowledge bank set up

2.Confidential Research and Learning	May 2017 – August 2018	• Global context analysis • Confidential Staff Interviews • Regional learning workshops • Set up and population of restricted access knowledge database • Thematic summary briefs
3. Evaluation	May 2017 – Feb 2018	• Media and social analysis • Perception surveys • Country field visits • Research on enablers and constraints • External stakeholders interviews • Learning events and workshop
4. Reporting	Feb – Aug 2018	• Draft Evaluation Report and matrix of comments • Stakeholders workshops • Final Evaluation Report • Summary Evaluation Report for presentation to EB2/18

5.2. Evaluation Team

44.   The evaluation will be conducted by a team of external consultants, expected to include around 4 members with an appropriate balance of expertise in evaluation methodologies and relevant contextual and technical skills as detailed below.

45.   The Team Leader will report to OEV's Evaluation Manager. S/he will have strong evaluation experience of humanitarian response in complex environments, humanitarian principles and access negotiations, as well as the ability to undertake and effectively communicate credible strategic analysis.

46.   His/her responsibilities include: ensuring appropriate, credible, and ethical methodology and approach; conducting the confidential interviews with WFP staff and partners, guiding and managing the team during each phase of the evaluation process; consolidating and quality assuring team members' contribution to the evaluation deliverables; representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders; contact point between the team and designated OEV Evaluation Manager; delivering the reports to the standards and expectations set out in this TOR and further confirmed in the approved inception report, in compliance with associated quality assurance systems operated by OEV (EQAS).

47.   Other team members will include: i) a high profile and experienced academic who will be responsible for carrying out a global context analysis as well as providing advice/ on the methodology as part of the inception report, summary brief and draft evaluation report; and ii) a researcher with very good quantitative data analysis skills.

48.   Team members will report to the Team Leader. Together they should present strong expertise in humanitarian principles and access negotiations; ability to process large amount of qualitative and quantitative data; good interpersonal skills in order to generate confidence in the confidentiality and approach for the evaluation; very strong facilitation experience and skills to deliver success learning workshops/ events; team working; excellent analytical and writing skills; fluency in English and French (knowledge of Arabic would be an asset). The report will be written in English.

49.   Members of the team 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. Strict adherence to special confidentiality measures will be crucial.

5.3. Roles and Responsibilities

50.   This evaluation is managed by OEV. Gaby Duffy, 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. She is responsible for drafting the TOR; selecting and contracting the evaluation team; preparing and managing the budget; setting up the review group; organizing the team briefing in HQ; identifying the list of WFP staff for confidential interviews; facilitating the set up pf the confidential knowledge bank; 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. She will also be the main interlocutor between the evaluation team, represented by the team leader, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process.

51.   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 in selected countries; 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.

52.   The active engagement of WFP's Emergencies and Transitions Unit in the learning component will be sought. However, 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. An Internal Reference Group (IRG) will be established to ensure key internal stakeholders are involved throughout the evaluation process and provide inputs at key stages.

5.4. Communication

> *It is important that Evaluation Reports are accessible to a wide audience, as foreseen in the Evaluation Policy, to ensure the credibility of WFP – through transparent reporting – and the usefulness of evaluations. The dissemination strategy will consider from the stakeholder analysis who to disseminate to, involve and identify the users of the evaluation, duty bearers, implementers, beneficiaries, including gender perspectives.*

53.   The communication plan is articulated around the following elements (See more details in Annex 2):

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

- **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; to internal and external reference groups, and senior management as appropriate

- **Regional learning events**: These will be organised following the confidential staff interviews to allow COs staff to share their experience. Key members of the Technical Access Cell would participate.

- **Final global workshop**. In order to elicit feedback on the findings and exchanges around the conclusions and draft recommendations emerging from the data analysis, a workshop will be organised with the Internal Reference Group.

- **Dissemination of the findings.** a SER and an evaluation brief will be prepared 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).

5.5. Budget

54. The evaluation will be financed from OEV's Programme Support and Administrative budget.

Annexes

Annex 1: Detailed Evaluation Timeline

Legend for timeline cells: ▓ = grey, G = green, R = red

Activity	Resp.	16·12	2017·1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	2018·1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Phase 1 - Inception																								
Desk review	Team	▓	▓																						
Interviews with selected HQ, RB, CO staff and key	EM&Team	▓	▓																						
HQ Briefing in Rome	EM&Team			G																					
Submit Draft Inception Report (IR) to OEV	TL			▓																					
OEV quality assurance and feedback	EM				▓																				
Submit revised draft IR (D1) to OEV.	TL				▓																				
OEV quality assurance and Share IR with IRG for their feedback. OEV consolidate all comments in matrix and share them with team	EM				▓																				
Submit revised IR	TL					▓																			
Circulate final IR to WFP key Stakeholders for their information + post a copy on intranet.	EM					▓																			
Platform for confidential knowledge bank set up	EM&Team					▓																			
Phase 2 - Confidential Research and Learning Component																									
Highly confidential interviews with key WFP staff at CO and RB level	Team						▓		▓	▓	▓														
Development and population of restricted confidential knowledge bank	Team							▓	▓	▓		▓	▓	▓											
Regional learning workshops	Team											G	G	G											
Anonymized and decontextualized thematic briefs	Team																		G	G	G	G			
Phase 3 - Evaluation Phase																									
Media and social media analysis	Team													▓	▓										
Perception surveys	Team								▓	▓	▓														
Affected population surveys	Team							▓	▓	▓	▓														
Fieldwork. Internal briefings with CO and RB	Team						▓	▓	▓	▓	▓														
Phase 4 - Reporting																									
Submit draft 0 Evaluation Report (ER) to OEV (after company's quality check)	TL																	▓							
OEV quality feedback sent to the team	EM																	▓							
Submit revised draft 1 ER to OEV	TL																	▓							
DoE clears draft ER and shares it with WFP stakeholders (IRG) for comment	EM/DoE																	▓							
OEV consolidate all WFP's comments (matrix), and share with team	EM																	▓							
Stakeholder workshop on overall findings and recommendations	EM / TL																		G						
Submit revised draft 2 ER to OEV based on the WFP's comments, and team's comments on the matrix of comments.	TL																			▓					
Review matrix and ER, share D2 with EAG. OEV consolidate comments received from EAG and share with evaluation team	EM																			▓					
Submit revised draft 3 ER and draft Summary Evaluation Report (SER)	TL																				▓				
Seek DoE's clearance and send the SER to WFP Executive Management Group for comment	EM																				▓				
OEV consolidates comments on SER from WFP's Executive management Group and shares with the team	EM																					▓			
Submit final draft 4 ER (with the revised SER) to OEV. Seek Final approval by DoE. Clarify last points/issues with the team	EM / TL																					▓			
Approve final ER and SER	DoE																					R			

Note: TL=Team Leader; EM=Evaluation Manager; OEV=Office of Evaluation; RMP = Performance Management and Monitoring; DoE=Director of Evaluation

Activity	Resp.	16·12	2017·1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	2018·1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Executive Board (EB) and follow-up phase																									
Submit SER/recommendations to RMP for management response + SER for editing and translation	EM																					▓			
Tail end actions, OEV websites posting, EB Round Table Etc.	EM																						▓	▓	
Presentation of SER and Management Response to the EB	D/OEV & D/RMP																								R

Annex 2: Evaluation Communication and Learning Plan

Internal (WFP) Communications Plan

When Evaluation phase with month/year	What Communication product	To whom Target group or individual	What level Organizational level of communication	From whom Lead OEV staff with name/position	How Communication means e.g. meeting, interaction, etc.	Why Purpose of communication
Preparation (Oct 2016) TOR (Dec 2016)	Full TOR TOR Summary	OEV, CO, RB, HQ, EAG	Conceptualization & Strategic	Evaluation Manager (EM)	Consultations, meetings and written exchanges	Draft TOR for comments / Final for information
Inception (Dec 2016-Apr 2017)	HQ Briefing + Inception Mission & Report	CO, RB, HQ, EAG, stakeholders	Operational & Informative	EM + Evaluation Team Leader (TL)	Written exchange and presentations	IR final for information
Research and Learning (May 2017 – Aug 2018)	Thematic summary briefs Regional learning events	CO, RB, HQ	Operational & Informative	TL	Meeting Thematic briefs	For information and verbal feedback
Field work, debrief (May/Oct 2017)	PPT	CO, RB, HQ, CO stakeholders	Operational	TL	Meeting / Teleconference	For information and verbal feedback
Reporting (Feb 2018/ Aug 2018)	Draft and Final ER Learning events	EAG, EMG, CO, RB, HQ, stakeholders	All	EM + Director of Evaluation + TL	Written exchanges (+ matrix of comments on request) and presentations	Draft ER for written comments / Final ER for information Workshop for verbal feedback
Dissemination/EB (sept-Nov 2018)	Evaluation Brief	EMG, CO, RB,HQ	Informative	EM + Director	Written exchange	Dissemination of evaluation findings and conclusions

External Communications Plan

When Evaluation phase	What Communication product	To whom Target org. or individual	What level Organizational level of communication	From whom	How Communication means	Why Purpose of communication
TOR, Dec 2016	Final TOR	Public, UNEG	Strategic	OEV	Websites	Public information
Inception report, April 2017	Final TOR	Public, UNEG	Strategic	OEV	Websites	Public information
Formatted ER/Translated SER, Oct 2018	Final Report (incl. SER)	Public, UNEG	Strategic & Operational	OEV, EB Secretariat	Websites	Public information
Evaluation Brief, Oct 2018	2-page Ev Brief	Board Member & wider public	Strategic	OEV	Website	Public information
EB, Nov 2018	SER & Mgt Resp	Board Member	All	OEV & RMP	Formal presentation	For EB consideration

Annex 3: Delineation with the Protection Policy Evaluation

Analysis: Strengthening the analytical capacity of WFP staff is an important step for improving WFP's protection performance (where an analysis of the context and protection risks are key) and is very likely to emerge as one of the critical factors affecting WFP's ability to negotiate access while respecting humanitarian principles in an adequate way.

- The protection policy evaluation will select a distinct set of country case studies. It should explore the quality and usability of the context and protection analysis in each of these cases. In addition, it should explore corporate measures to strengthen WFP's analytical capacity and, since it should reach this stage of implementation earlier than the principled action and access evaluation, share findings with it.
- In addition to using (and, if necessary, further deepen) the findings on corporate measures for strengthening WFP's analytical capacity, the principled action and access evaluation should provide indications of how adequate current analysis levels are for the purpose of enabling access negotiations and decisions (e.g. exploring in how many negotiation cases analytical ability was a key constraint; analysing differences between cases in which analytical capacity was a constraint as compared to where it was not).

Impartiality / non-discrimination: As one of the key humanitarian principles, impartiality will be at the core of the evaluation of principled action and access. At the same time, the protection policy specifies that effectively integrating protection in programmes would entail ensuring no discrimination.

- The evaluation of principled action and access should focus on internal and external factors that enable or constrain WFP's ability to handle access negotiations and take adequate decisions regarding trade-offs, including with respect to the principle of impartiality.
- The protection policy evaluation should adopt a more micro level perspective, exploring whether / how WFP and its partners take potential threats to different groups into account and to what extent it creates accountability equally to different gender, age, ethnic (etc.) groups. As part of the analysis of WFP's do no harm practices, the protection policy evaluation would also explore what measures WFP has in place to ensure it is not complicit in denying rights to specific groups of people.

Mind-set change / level of staff and partner awareness: For both cases, the current level of understanding and awareness of key concepts and their operational significance are important indicators for policy results. Relevant data on these aspects could be generated through an (ideally broad) staff and partner survey, complemented by staff and partner interviews.

- Each evaluation should assess the effectiveness of the training measures relevant to its own policy areas and conduct complementary interviews.

Advocacy: Similarly, advocacy is an important aspect of both policy areas, although it is not yet clear whether advocacy will emerge as a central factor enabling or

constraining access and therefore whether the principles and access evaluation will focus on this issue in greater detail.

- The protection policy evaluation will conduct country case studies and is expected to do so before the evaluation on humanitarian principles and access will implement more in-depth analyses of the most important factors enabling or inhibiting principled access. The protection policy evaluation can therefore share its results on country-level advocacy efforts and processes with the evaluation on humanitarian principles and access.
- At the global level, both evaluations are likely to explore the same advocacy channels, each with a different, but related focus. Here, the evaluation teams should coordinate closely, e.g. by conducting a joint interview with the Executive Director and sharing the results of related document analysis.

Partnerships: Relationships with cooperating partners are central to the successful implementation of both policy areas. However, the focus of the two evaluations would differ:

- With respect to protection, the evaluation should assess how partners at country and field-level were selected; how they are encouraged to strengthen protection considerations in their work; whether / what kind of capacity enhancing measures WFP provides; and what role standby and other partners play in supporting WFP's protection capacity.
- Regarding principled action and access, likely factors that could emerge from the initial, open-ended enquiry could include for example processes for selecting and monitoring partners in remote management situations, as well guidance and support to them.

Annex 4: Definitions of core humanitarian principles in key UN Agencies

	Humanity	Neutrality	Impartiality	Independence
OCHA[22]	Human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health and ensure respect for human beings	Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature	Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, giving priority to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinctions on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinions	Humanitarian action must be autonomous from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.
UNHCR[23]	The singular motivation of humanitarian action is to save lives and alleviate suffering in a manner that respects and restores personal dignity. Accordingly, humanity is the principal driver for any response to a crisis, whether caused by conflict, violence or natural or man-made disaster	The neutrality of humanitarian action is furthermore upheld when humanitarian actors refrain from taking sides in hostilities or engaging in political, racial, religious or ideological controversies.	At the same time, humanitarian actors distinguish themselves from other actors responding to a crisis by their impartiality. This means that humanitarian action is based solely on need, with priority given to the most urgent cases irrespective of race, nationality, gender, religious belief, political opinion or class.	Independence requires autonomy on the part of humanitarian actors, who are not to be subject to control or subordination by political, economic, military or other non-humanitarian objective
UNICEF[24]	**The humanitarian imperative**: Human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found, with particular attention to the most vulnerable in the population, such as children, women, the displaced and the elderly. The dignity and rights of all those in need of humanitarian assistance must be respected and protected. The humanitarian imperative implies a right to receive humanitarian assistance and a right to offer it. At times, humanitarian access to civilian populations is denied by authorities for political or security reasons. Humanitarian agencies must maintain their ability to obtain and sustain access to all vulnerable populations and to negotiate such access with all parties to the conflict.	Humanitarian agencies must not take sides in the hostilities or in controversies based on political, racial, religious or ideological identity (non-partisanship/independence). Transparency and openness are key issues to keep neutrality. Neutrality for an organization that has taken on a rights-based approach must not, however, be an obstacle to tackling human rights violations. Neutrality is not a justification for condoning impunity or turning a blind eye to egregious human rights abuses. It does not negate the need for some form of action, whether through strategic advocacy, simple presence, political demarches, local negotiations, etc. Neutrality also requires that humanitarian actors be clear about the specific and limited circumstances in which military assets can be used: only as a last resort (where there is no comparable civilian alternative); the operation as a whole must remain under the overall authority and control of the responsible humanitarian organization; and any use of military assets should be clearly limited in time and scale. The military and civil defence assets of belligerent forces should never be used to support humanitarian activities.	Aid is delivered to all those who are suffering; the guiding principle is only their need and the corresponding right. Human rights are the basis and the framework for an assessment of needs. This principle includes both the proportionality to need (where resources are not sufficient, priority is always given to those most affected) as well as the principle of non-discrimination (no one should be discriminated against based on their sex, age, ethnicity, identity, etc.). It is crucial to emphasize state responsibility in ensuring that aid is delivered in an impartial way	No definition

---

[22] OCHA. Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. 2012

[23] UNHCR. Emergency Handbook: Humanitarian Principles. 2016

[24] UNICEF.UNICEF's Humanitarian Principles. 2003

Annex 5: WFP's Foundations of Humanitarian Action

FOUNDATIONS OF EFFECTIVE HUMANITARIAN ACTION	
Respect	WFP will respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the state in which it is working. WFP will respect local customs and traditions, upholding internationally recognized human rights. WFP will act in accordance with the United Nations Charter and consistent with international humanitarian law and refugee law. WFP will also take into account the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, when applicable.
Self-reliance	WFP will provide humanitarian assistance with the primary objective of saving lives, in ways that support livelihoods, reduce vulnerability to future food scarcities and support durable solutions. WFP will work to ensure that food aid does not undermine local agricultural production, marketing or coping strategies, or disturb normal migratory patterns or foster dependency. WFP's programmes will be planned and implemented in ways that facilitate the link from relief to development.
Participation	WFP will involve women and men beneficiaries wherever possible in all activities and will work closely with governments at the national and local levels to plan and implement assistance.
Capacity-building	Within its own capacity and resources, WFP will strengthen the capacity of affected countries and local communities to prevent, prepare for and respond to humanitarian crises. WFP will ensure participation by women's organizations and will integrate a gender perspective in capacity-building activities.
Coordination	WFP will provide assistance with the consent of the affected country and, in principle, on the basis of an appeal by the affected country. All States Members of the United Nations or Members or Associate Members of any specialized agency or of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are eligible to submit requests for consideration by WFP. WFP may also provide emergency food aid and associated non-food items and logistics support at the request of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. WFP will work within established United Nations coordination structures at the global and field levels. This will include working with other humanitarian actors such as NGOs and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.
STANDARDS OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROFESSIONALISM	
Accountability	WFP will keep donors, host country governments, beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders informed of its activities and their impact through regular reporting.
Professionalism	WFP will maintain the highest standards of professionalism and integrity among its international and national staff to ensure that its programmes are carried out efficiently, effectively, ethically and safely. All staff will adhere to the Standard Code of Conduct for the International Civil Service and the Secretary-General's Bulletin on Sexual Abuse and Exploitation in Humanitarian Crises and Other Operations.

Source: WFP's 2004 Policy Statement on Humanitarian Principles

Annex 6: Key stakeholder groups membership

Internal Reference Group	
Amir Abdulla	Deputy Executive Director
Ramiro Lopes da Silva	Assistant Executive Director
Stanlake Samkange	Director, Policy and Programme Division
Denise Brown	Director, Emergency Preparedness and Support Response Division
Erika Jorgensen	Director, New York Liaison Office
Gordana Jerger	Director, Geneva Liaison Office
Bonnie Green	Director, Ethics Office
Arnhild Spence	Director, Partnership, Policy Coordination and Advocacy Division
Zlatan Milisic	Deputy Director, Policy and Programme Division
David Kaatrud	Regional Director, RBB
Valerie Guarnieri	Regional Director, RBN
Abdou Dieng	Regional Director, RDD
Muhannad Hadi	Regional Director, RDC
Chris Nikoi	Regional Director, RBJ
Miguel Baretto	Regional Director, RBP
Laurent Bukera	Country Director, Somalia CO
Jakob Kern	Country Director, Syria CO
Mick Lorentzen	Country Director, Afghanistan CO
Joyce Luma	Country Director, South Sudan CO
Matthew Hollingworth	Country Director, Sudan CO
Bienvenu Djossa	Country Director, CAR CO
Sally Haydock	Country Director, Iraq CO
Claude Jibidar	Country Director, DRC CO
Fatai Adegboye	Country Director, Yemen CO
Deborah Hines	Country Director, Colombia CO
Silvia Caruso	Country Director, Mali CO
Mutinta Chimuka	Country Director, Nigeria CO
Stephen Cahill	Chief, Global Logistics Cluster
Paul Howe	Chief, Emergencies & Transitions Unit
Antonio Galli	Policy Officer, Emergencies & Transitions Unit
James Lattimer	Chief, Monitoring Unit
Ahmareen Karim	Chief, Strategy Implementation & Risk Management Branch
Brian Lander	Senior Liaison Officer, Geneva Office
Gina Pattugalan	External Relations Officer, New York Office
Sandra Luvisutto	Consultant, Field Security Division
Marcus Prior	Programme Officer, Partnership, Policy Coordination and Advocacy
Andreas Hansen	External Relations Officer, Partnership, Policy Coordination and

External Advisory Group	
Jeremie Labbe	Policy Adviser, ICRC
Aurelien Buffler	Chief, Policy Advice and Planning Section, OCHA New York & Co-Chair of IASC Reference Group on Principled Humanitarian Action
Karen Perrin	Humanitarian Officer, Policy Advice and Planning Section, OCHA New York
Francesca Bonino	Senior Evaluation Officer, UNHCR and UNEG Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group (HEIG) Co-convenor
Segolene Adam	Chief of Emergency Programmes, UNICEF
Anne Claire Luzot	Chief Evaluation Officer, WHO and HEIG member
Margie Buchanan-Smith	Independent Senior Evaluator
James Munn	Director NRC Geneva & Co-Chair of IASC Reference Group on Principled Humanitarian Action

Annex 7: Risk analysis

Risks involved in conducting the evaluation		
Risk	**Mitigation measures**	**Risk analysis**
1. Increase **security risks** for staff, partners and communities and **threaten WFP's license to operate** in certain countries or areas by bringing to light agreements and arrangements that were made informally and 'under the radar screen'.	☐ Refrain from assessing individual access negotiations and decisions and their compliance with humanitarian principles. ☐Fully decontextualize information about sensitive issues and contexts when published so that it cannot be related to any specific country or individual. ☐Select country studies very carefully to avoid countries in which negotiations are currently in a very sensitive phase or avoid conducting formal country case studies.	**Risk Rating** — Frequency of mention: High; Impact: Severe; Likelihood: Medium; Ability to mitigate: High
2. Increase **reputational and related financial risks**. At the moment, many donors and political actors have 'zero tolerance', for example regarding diversion, payments for access, or engagement with organizations classified as terrorist. Certain donors and member states could therefore penalise WFP for publishing evaluation results that provide details about compromises made or even for acknowledging that trade-offs and compromises are commonplace.	☐ Refrain from assessing individual access negotiations and decisions and their compliance with humanitarian principles. To remain credible, however, the evaluation would need to at least describe abstractly what kinds of compromises are common and how WFP's frontline negotiators and decision makers themselves assess the outcomes. While reduced, a residual reputational and financial risks therefore remains. ☐Comply with OEV standards that require presenting findings in a balanced and forward looking way and to include good practice examples.	**Risk Rating** — Frequency of mention: Medium; Impact: Medium; Likelihood: Medium; Ability to mitigate: High
3. Trigger **overly restrictive rules**. Donors, member states or WFP itself could react to findings describing inconsistencies in WFP's practices by imposing more rigid and restrictive rules. These rules could undermine the flexibility of country offices in operationalizing humanitarian principles and identifying the best approach for ensuring sustainable access. In addition, the evaluation could create a divide between members of the Executive Board who may have different positions regarding humanitarian principles and access	☐Be clear on the scope and limitations of the evaluation; ☐Regularly inform and involve senior management and members of the Executive Board through participation in an external reference group and progress briefings to the Board; ☐Provide explicit recommendations on whether or not rules should be defined.	**Risk Rating** — Frequency of mention: Rare; Impact: Medium; Likelihood: Medium; Ability to mitigate: Medium

Risks involved in conducting the evaluation		
Risk	**Mitigation measures**	**Risk analysis**
4. The **evaluation may not be perceived as credible**. Several aspects could create this perception: (1) The evaluation team will likely face access constraints in many of the operational contexts that would be most relevant for the topic at hand and key informants may be reluctant to provide information about sensitive issues and controversial decisions. The evaluation may therefore not get sufficient access to data to present credible findings and conclusions. (2) If the evaluation adopts a reduced scope to address some of the risks described above and does not look into individual, controversial situations and decisions, the expectations of key stakeholders could be disappointed. (3) If WFP pre-determines too many aspects about how the evaluation should be conducted and how results should be presented, stakeholders may question the independence of the evaluation team and process.	To improve the team's access to data, stronger confidentiality arrangements than usual should be defined for the evaluation and learning exercise; Well respected former WFP staff members should be involved in the team; The exercise should include the experiences of individuals that formerly held relevant positions and have either moved on or retired; Senior WFP managers, as volunteered by the Deputy Executive Director, should publicly endorse the exercise and request transparent engagement. OEV and WFP management should clearly state the purpose and scope of the evaluation early on including limitations to the scope, in accordance with OEV standards. Executive Board members should receive progress updates.	**Risk Rating** Frequency of mention — High Impact — Low Likelihood — Medium Ability to mitigate — High
Risks involved in not conducting the evaluation		
Risk	**Mitigation measures**	**Risk analysis**
1. Reputational risks. Through inaction, WFP would fail to address these highly sensitive and politically relevant issues proactively. Since an evaluation on the subject was already included in OEV's work plan, WFP would have to explain the decision in front of the Executive Board. This could potentially trigger a counter-reaction by the board, leading for example to a request for an evaluation, which would leave WFP with less flexibility in shaping the design and implementation of the evaluation and thereby exacerbate the risks identified above.	Address issues relating to humanitarian principles and access through a different mechanism, for example an internal learning exercise or a stronger contribution to the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiations. However, these would have less formal authority than an evaluation.	**Risk Rating** Frequency of mention — Medium Impact — Low to medium Likelihood — High Ability to mitigate — Medium

Risks involved in conducting the evaluation		
Risk	**Mitigation measures**	**Risk analysis**
2. Operational risks in the longer-term. Without the impetus coming from a formal evaluation, efforts to improve WFP's capacities and processes for handling access negotiations and decisions involving humanitarian principles could remain half-hearted. Insufficient capacities and processes could undermine WFP's ability to gain principled access in the medium- to long-term.	☐Alternative measures such as an internal learning exercise or strengthened executive endorsement and support for WFP's ongoing work to strengthen access and negotiation capacities would help address this risk, even though they would lack the formal authority and follow-up process of an evaluation.	**Risk Rating** Frequency of mention: Rare Impact: Medium Likelihood: Low Ability to mitigate: High

Annex 8: List of References

1. Evaluation process		
1.1 EQAS	**OEV**	**2014**
1.2 Evaluability assessment & Scoping	**OEV**	**2016**
2. Integrated Roadmap to Zero Hunger (SP, FFR, CSP, SP 2017-2021)	**WFP**	**2016**
3. WFP Policies & Strategic Plans		
3.1. Access & Principles		
WFP Humanitarian Principles	WFP	2004
Humanitarian Access and its Implications for WFP	WFP	2006
3.2. Other relevant policies		
WFP's Role in the Humanitarian Assistance System & Updates	WFP	2010&2012-2016
Enterprise Risk Management Policy	WFP	2015
Security Management Policy	WFP	2011
Anti-fraud and anti-corruption policy	WFP	2010 & 2015
WFP Evaluation Policy 2016-2021	WFP	2016
WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy & Update	WFP	2012 & 2014
Peace building policy & Update	WFP	2013 & 2014
WFP Policy formulation	WFP	2011
3.3. Strategic Plans		
Strategic Plan (2008-2013; 2014-2017; 2017-2021)	WFP	2008-2016
Mid-Term Review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2014–2017)	WFP	2016
4. WFP Monitoring Framework		
Corporate M&E strategy 2014-2016	WFP	2014
Indicator compendium	WFP	2015
Strategic Results Framework (2008-2011; 2014-2017)	WFP	2008-2014
Management Plans	WFP	2013-2016
5. Other WFP Resources		
Access & Civil Military Collaboration		
Compilation of WFP Past Practice - Access project_summary of interviews	WFP	2000
Consultation on Humanitarian Issues - Reaching People in Situations of Displacement	WFP	2000
Directive - WFP's Role in Access Negotiation	WFP	2002
WFP Experience with Military	WFP	2003
Food Aid in Conflict Workshop Report	WFP	2002
Conference report - Humanitarian Assistance in Conflict and Complex Emergencies	WFP	2009
Training manual on Negotiation	WFP	2009
Position paper - WFP and IDPs	WFP	2011
Info pack - WFP role in access negotiations	WFP	2013
Directive - WFP Civill Military coordination operational guidance	WFP	2013
Access Workshop - Summary and discussion points	WFP	2015
Advisory Group on Access & Access Cell - Strategy & ToR & NFR	WFP	2016
Donor reports	WFP	2016
Access strategies and mapping reports	WFP	2016
Operational Guidance on Humanitarian Access (Draft)	WFP	2016
Discussion Paper - Humanitarian Principles	NRC	2016
WFP Training Strategy for Working with the Military	WFP	-
RMQ Position Paper - Divisional & Field Security Approaches for Humanitarian Access	WFP	2016
WFP RMQ Information Note - Professional Development for Humanitarian Access	WFP	2016
PPT on access map in Afghanistan	WFP	2016
Advocacy		
Advocacy Frameworks	WFP	2016
Clusters		
Circulars - CD's role in humanitarian country team & WFP Leadership in IASC Clusters	WFP	2013
Cluster Lead Agencies Accountability - 10 years in perspective	-	-
Emergency and Transition		
Emergency and Transition Programming Framework	WFP	2015

Logistics Cluster (GLC)		
Lessons learned reports: CAR, DRC, Mozambique, Somalia, Yemen, Nepal, Ukraine	GLC	2013 & 2016
Protection & AAP		
Protection Project & Case studies	WFP	2004-2008
Protection Guidance (manuals, ToC, TOR protection advisors, studies, strategy, implementation plan)	WFP	2009-2016
AAP (Brief, ToC, Strategy, CFM minimum standards)	WFP	2015-2016
Risk management		
Corporate Risk register - Circular & Summary	WFP	2012-2016
Risk management definitions	WFP	2015
Risk appetite statement	WFP	2016
Corporate Risk register	WFP	2016
Global Risk Profile report	WFP	2016
Crisis management - Circular	WFP	2016
Security		
Guidelines for Security Reporting	WFP	2011
Security Risk Management (SRM) Manual	WFP	2015
Global security environment and significant incidents	WFP	2016
Report - WFP Field Security	WFP	2016
Third party monitoring		
Third Party Monitoring Guidelines	WFP	2014
Third Party Monitoring Audit Report and Management Response	WFP	2016
Transformative agenda		
ED Memo - Transformative Agenda	WFP	2012
IASC Transformative Agenda_Presentation to the EB	WFP	2013
WHS		
WFP Key Messages and Presentations	WFP	2015
WFP Position Papers & Thematic Briefs	WFP	2015
WFP Commitments	WFP	2016
World Humanitarian Summit Quick Guide - July 2016	WFP	2016
6. Datasets		
AAP & Protection		
Protection cross-cutting indicators	WFP	2014-2015
AAP (baseline report, CFM summary report)	WFP	2016
Annual Performance Reports	WFP	2009-2015
Country-specific	WFP	2015-2016
Evaluations		
CPE ER and SER - Afghanistan, DRC, Haiti, Somalia, Sudan	WFP	2011-2014
Strategic Evaluations ER and SER - Global Food Security Cluster, Global Logistics Cluster, Pooled Funds, PREP	WFP	2012-2015
Synthesis Evaluations - EPR	WFP	2015
Policy Evaluations - Gender	WFP	2014
IAHE - Philippines, South Sudan, CAR	OCHA-WFP	2014-2015
L3 Syria	WFP	2015
Operation Evaluations reports (PRRO and EMOP) & Synthesis	WFP	2013-2016
Global Staff survey	WFP	2012 & 2015
Maps		
Access (Constraints) maps	WFP&OCHA	2013 & 2016
Kidnapped, Detention, Killed_kidnapped_injured_assaultes Maps	Aid in Danger	2015-2016
Media coverage analysis (CARMA Reports)	WFP	2014-2015
OCHA Access snapshots	OCHA	2012
Security		
WFP Security Reports	WFP	2012-2015
Worldwide Limited Aid Access	US DS	2015
Security level	UNDSS	2014-2015

Security incidents (SIMSAS)	WFP	2012-2015
Aid worker security database	Humanitarian Outcomes	2016
Quarterly Operational Briefings & SIT REPS	WFP	2016
Actor mapping analysis & Access mapping	WFP	2016
7. Contacts		
WFP Organigramme & Directory	WFP	2016
IRG & EAG	OEV	2016
8. External Documents		
ALNAP		
ALNAP - State of Humanitarian System	ALNAP	2012 & 2015
Evaluating humanitarian action using OECD-DAC criteria	ALNAP	2006
ALNAP - Rhetoric or reality - Putting affected people at the centre of humanitarian action	ALNAP	2014
Innovation more than luck	ALNAP	2016
ALNAP - Evaluation of Humanitarian Action Guide	ALNAP	2016
Center for Competence on Humanitarian Negotiations (CCHN)		
Themes and Panels outlines, summaries, case studies reports and backgrounder	CCHN	2016
CN - Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation	CCHN	2016
CHS		
Core Humanitarian Standards on Quality and Accountability	CHS	2014
CHS-Alliance-Humanitarian Accountability Report	CHS	2015
Sphere_Core_Standards_and_CHS	CHS	2015
ECHO		
ECHO - European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid	ECHO	2014
Evaluation and review Humanitarian Access strategies	ECHO & GPPI	2012
Global Protection Cluster (GPC)		
Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons	GPC	2007
IASC		
IASC - Principles on Military-Civilian Relations	IASC	1995
IASC - Protection of Internally Displaced Persons	IASC	1999
IASC - Use of military or armed escorts for convoys	IASC	2001
IASC - Guidelines Use Military and Civil Defence Assets	IASC	2003
IASC - Civil-Military Relationship in Complex Emergencies	IASC	2004
Human Rights and Natural Disasters Operational Guidelines and Manual	IASC	2008
Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation definition and procedures	IASC	2012
What Empowered Leadership looks like in practice	IASC	2012
Transformative agenda protocols	IASC	2012-2015
Guidelines-on-the-use-of-armed-escorts	IASC	2013
IASC - Multi Cluster Sector Initial Rapid Assessment_MIRA_Manual	IASC	2015
IASC Reference Module for Cluster Coordination at the Country Level	IASC	2015
Risk Management Toolkit - Counterterrorism Measures	IASC	2015
ICRC		
The legal framework of humanitarian access in armed conflict	ICRC	2011
Professional Standards for Protection Work	ICRC	2013
Coming Clean on Neutrality and Independence The Need to Assess the Application of Humanitarian Principles	ICRC	2015
Applying the Humanitarian Principles: reflecting on ICRC experience	ICRC	2016
Fundamental Principles Leaflet	ICRC	-
Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief	ICRC	-
Norwegian Refugee Council		
Tools for the Job - Supporting Principled Humanitarian Action	HPG	2012
Independent Whole of System Review of Protection in the Context of Humanitarian Action	NRC	2015

Principled Humanitarian action report	NRC	2016
NFR ECHO Evaluation-principled-humanitarian-assistance	NRC	2016
OCHA		
Guiding principles on International Displacement	OCHA	2004
Humanitarian Response Review	OCHA	2005
Field Guidelines on humanitarian negotiations with armed groups	OCHA	2006
OCHA on Message_HumPrinciples Factsheet	OCHA	2010
To stay and deliver	OCHA	2011
OCHA on Messages - Humanitarian Access	OCHA	2012
Evaluation of OCHA's Role in Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination	OCHA	2012
Guidance on Inter Cluster Coordination	OCHA	2013
Humanitarian Access Handbook & Practitioners Manual	OCHA	2014
Humanitarian Access Monitoring and Reporting Framework (AMRF)	OCHA, Swiss FDFA, CDI	2014
Guidance - Law Relating to Humanitarian Relief Operations in Situations of Armed Conflict	OCHA	2016
Other		
Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship	-	2003
CDA_2005_DoNoHarm_handbook	CDA	2005
Conference-report-brussels-safeguarding-humanitarian-action	SCHR	2012
HPG - Humanitarian negotiations with non-state actors - key lessons	ODI	2014
HPG - Protection in the context of humanitarian action	HPG	2016
How humanitarian action has changed	ODI	2016
Humanitarian Engagement with NSA groups	Chaham House	2016
SAVE - Secure Access in Volatile Environments		
Use of Third-Party Monitoring in Insecure Contexts - Afgh & Somalia & Syria	GPPI	2016
Monitoring_aid_in_insecure_environments	GPPI	2016
The_effects_of_insecurity_on_humanitarian_coverage	GPPI	2015
Interim reports - Mapping access and coverage trends & Enabling access and quality aid	GPPI	2015
SAVE - Improving the evidence base on delivering aid in highly insecure environments	Humanitarian Outcomes	2016
UN		
UNGA Resolution 46-182 19 December 1991 - Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian	UNGA	1991
UNGA resolution A.59.332 Sep 2004 - safety and security of humanitarian personnal	UNGA	2004
UNGA Resolution A.RES.58.114 Feb 2004 - Strenghtening coordination emergency humanitarian assistance	UNGA	2004
UNGA Resolution December 2005 - A.RES.60.124	UNGA	2005
UNGA Resolution A.70-1. Oct 2015 - 2030 Agenda for SD	UNGA	2015
UNESC - Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian June	UNESC	2015
UN Programme Criticality Framework	UN	2013
UNESC - Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian June 2015	UNESC	2015
HLP Report - Too important to fail—addressing the humanitarian financing gap	UN	2016
ECOSOC - UNDS Inter-linkages - 2 June 2016	-	2016
UN report of the Secretary-General on women and peace and security	UN	2016
HLP Report - Too important to fail—addressing the humanitarian financing gap Jan 2016	HLP	2016
UNEG Paper - Reflecting Humanitarian Principles in Evaluation	UNEG	2016
Humanitarian Financing Task Team - Looking beyond the crisis	FHF	-
UNICEF		
UNICEF - Core Commitments_for_Children_in_Humanitarian_Action	UNICEF	2010
UNHCR		
Handbook on IDP Protection	UNHCR	-
World Humanitarian Summit		
Agenda for humanity Report	UN	2015
Co-Chairs' Summary to the Global Consultation	UN	2015
Synthesis Report of Consultation Process - Restoring Humanity	UN	2015
joint statement on humanitarian principles	UN	-
Report Secretary-General for WHS - One Humanity shared Report	UN	2016
Compiled DRAFT.SG Implementation Report For Comment	UN	2016
United Nations Secretary-General's Report on the Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit	UN	2016
Commitments to Action	UN	2016

Acronyms

CO	Country Office
CoC	Center of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation
DG ECHO Operations	Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid
EAG	External Advisory Group
EB	Executive Board
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
ED	Executive Director
EQAS	Evaluation Quality Assurance System
ERC	Emergency Relief Coordinator
EvT	Evaluation Team
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HEIG	Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group
HQ	Headquarters
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IRG	Internal Reference Group
MSF	Medecins Sans Frontieres
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OEV	Office of Evaluation
OSE	Emergency Preparedness and Response Division
OSPZH	Emergencies and Transitions Unit
RB	Regional Bureau
SAVE	Secure Access in Volatile Environments
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDSS	United Nations Department of Safety and Security
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Programme