



Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Sudan EMOP 10339: “Assistance to populations affected by conflict in greater Darfur, West Sudan”

1. Introduction

It is widely agreed that the 3-year old emergency in Darfur (and neighboring Chad) is far from winding down, and very possibly worsening. For WFP, both the challenges of the operating environment and the scope of its own engagement have steadily grown since 2003. By the end of 2005, WFP was running in Darfur one of the largest emergency programs in its history.

WFP operations in response to the Darfur crisis are likely to remain substantial for the foreseeable future. Taken together with a new generation of Southern Sudan interventions related to recovery and reconstruction (peace building), WFP’s activities in Sudan could represent one fifth or more of the agency’s worldwide operations.

In accordance with the WFP Evaluation Policy, **WFP will undertake a comprehensive evaluation of its emergency operations in Darfur in 2004-2005 under EMOP 10339 “Food Assistance to Populations Affected by War in Greater Darfur”.**

This evaluation of WFP’s emergency intervention in Darfur comes at a critical time. It has the potential to positively impact all WFP operations in Sudan, and to influence the response of the larger international humanitarian community.

2. Background

For a chronology of the conflict in Darfur, the international humanitarian response, and WFP’s role within it, please refer to Annexes 1-2.

Copies of official documents covering WFP’s emergency operations in Darfur over the period 2004-2005 will be sent on a CD-ROM to the successful bidder.

For detailed information on WFP’s ongoing humanitarian activities in Darfur, please refer to WFP’s public web site www.wfp.org.

3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover WFP emergency assistance to Darfur over the period 2004-2005. While WFP’s initial activities in Darfur occurred under Budget Revisions 2-3 of EMOP 10048.2, this evaluation will focus primarily on Sudan EMOPs 10339.0 and 10339.1: “Food assistance to populations affected by conflict in greater Darfur. Sudan EMOPs 10339.0/1 were supported by three Special Operations (SOs) in Sudan and one SO in Libya⁴². These will be considered in the evaluation only in so far as they support and complement EMOPs 10339.0/1. They will not be evaluated in their own right.

⁴² SO 10371 Logistics Augmentation; SO 10181 UN Humanitarian Air Services; SO 10342 UN Joint Logistics Centre; SO 10417.0 WFP Libya – Special Operation)



The evaluation will also take into account, though will not evaluate in detail, the impact on EMOPs 10339.0/1 of the related Chad EMOP 10327.0/1: Assistance to Sudanese refugees and host communities in eastern Chad.

Table 1. Principal WFP Emergency Operations in Darfur 2004-2005

EMOP No.	Start	End	Note
10048.2 Budget Rev 2	Nov 2003	Mar 2004	Added 600,000 beneficiaries in Darfur to original South Sudan caseload
10048.2 Budget Rev 3			Included 660 mt high energy biscuits for beneficiaries in Darfur
10339.0	Apr 2004	Dec 2004	1.18 M beneficiaries exclusively in Darfur
10339.0 Budget Rev 1	Oct 2004	Dec 2004	Provided full ration; increased beneficiaries from 1.18 M to 2.0 M due to poor harvest; augmented capacity
10339.0 Budget Rev 2	Aug 2004	Nov 2004	Provided blanket feeding for children under 5 years
10339.1	Jan 2005	Dec 2005	Increased beneficiaries from 2.0 M to 2.3 M;
10339.1 Budget Rev 1	Mar 2005	Dec 2005	Increased ration from 13.5 to 15 kg to compensate for milling losses and support markets; augment capacity;
10339.1 Budget Rev 2			Increased beneficiaries from 2.3 M to 3.25 M and extended relief to remote areas

4. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is three-fold: accountability, guidance and learning.

Accountability: Under the WFP evaluation policy, the size of the Darfur programme requires that it be evaluated, and that the evaluation be managed by the Office of Evaluation (OEDE). The evaluation will examine if work has been conducted in appliance with agreed rules and standards, and report objectively on performance results. ‘Accountability’ in the context of this evaluation will include not just accountability to WFP’s Executive Board and donors, but to the



extent possible and practical, it should also include WFP's accountability to its beneficiaries and cooperating partners.

Guidance: WFP and its Executive Board increasingly recognise the importance of evaluative guidance during an operation and not just at the mid and end points. Periodic and comprehensive evaluation is clearly indicated in the case of Darfur due to the complexity of the problem, the size of the programme, and the wealth of relevant lessons from prior WFP interventions under similar circumstances in Sudan.

Learning: It is the expressed interest of the Executive Board that WFP's Office of Evaluation spend more time on evaluation of large EMOPS, as these are increasingly becoming the 'standard profile' of WFP interventions. Darfur is presently WFP's largest humanitarian operation, and one of the largest in its 40 year history. The evaluation will both draw upon and contribute to a rich and growing knowledge base of food aid interventions in complex emergencies

5. Guiding principals of the evaluation

In accordance with WFP evaluation policy and practice, the evaluation will respect the following principles:

- *Be **comprehensive***, by applying the standard OECD DAC criteria for evaluation of humanitarian interventions);
- *Take **account of lessons learned*** in recent and historic evaluations in Darfur and Sudan (see Annex 4), and also the WFP thematic review of recurring problems in humanitarian emergencies (WFP/EB.3/99/4/3);
- *Directly address **management needs***, by reviewing evaluation findings and lessons learned in relation to the main programme and management functions of WFP;
- *Identify and actively engage **local partners in the evaluation***, i.e. identify appropriate roles and responsibilities for key stakeholders, including donors, national partners, cooperating partners and beneficiary groups;
- *Actively **support local capacity building processes***, which includes the dissemination of lessons learned, one to one debriefings, and where appropriate having national partners participate in a national Reference group and evaluation activities.
- *Apply **accepted, rigorous and objective methodological approaches*** to evaluation, in accordance with ethical codes of conduct.
- *Take account of relevant **evaluation policies and good practice guidelines***, including those of WFP, donor, and implementing partner policies.
- *Include a **strategy for dissemination*** of findings, lessons and recommendations among key stakeholders in Sudan and beyond. These processes should be supported by the appointment of both international and national peer review groups.

6. Modalities of the evaluation

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of external evaluators contracted through (and responsible to) one lead evaluation agency with proven capacity in evaluation and demonstrable knowledge of humanitarian operations, preferably in Sudan. The contract will be managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation (OEDE) and advised by technical reference groups nominated by



same. The TORs and expected outputs for the evaluation will be decided by OEDE. Responsibility for all deliverables will be that of the contractor.

WFP has invested substantial time and effort in background data collection and analysis to inform both the design and the eventual implementation of this evaluation. This research will be made available in full to the contractor and includes the following:

- Narrative summary of the Darfur crisis, the international response, and WFP's role within it;
- Meta-analysis of recent evaluations of humanitarian activities in Darfur and their relevance for WFP operations in Darfur;
- Stakeholder analysis;
- In-depth analysis of the key issues of concern to WFP stakeholders in this evaluation.

These materials, along with a comprehensive set of project documents and weekly, monthly and annual progress reports, will serve as the starting point for this evaluation.

Good practice argues for the strong inclusion of stakeholders' perspectives, not just as objects of the evaluation but equally as subjects of the evaluation. Participation of stakeholders is particularly important in providing an objective view of the relevance and appropriateness of WFP's strategic approach. In addition, WFP recognises that capacity building should be an objective of all its efforts, evaluation included. As a result, this evaluation will strive to incorporate both international and local stakeholder participation in a relevant and appropriate manner. Principal stakeholder participants could include members from:

- key UN cooperating partner (eg. UNICEF, UNHCR)
- key NGO partners, including established INGOs, INGOS arriving in Darfur only after 2003, local NGOs, Sudan Red Cross / Red Crescent, etc.
- UN coordinating partners (eg. OCHA, SG, HC)
- evaluation quality assurance partners (ALNAP)
- key donor(s)
- government and extra-government authorities, private sector and civil society

7. Approach and methodology

Basic methodological components

The evaluation should apply a range of standard evaluative techniques, including:

- desk reviews and studies of monitoring and assessment reports and data (qualitative and quantitative analysis),
- selected key informant interviews from WFP Cooperating Partners (CPs) and other selected stakeholder groups (e.g. government, donors, other UN agencies, ICRC, civil society), and
- focus group interviews applying a range of PRA techniques as appropriate with relief committees, beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, civil society groups and tribal leaders during field visits to a range of selected locations in Darfur.

Reference Groups



The WFP evaluation manager will form and chair two ad hoc evaluation reference groups, one international in nature and composed primarily of WFP, donor, NGO, and other UN evaluation experts, the other local in nature and comprised of members of Sudanese government, NGOs, and civil society. The international reference group will advise the evaluation team on technical issues related to evaluation and evaluation best practice. The local reference group will advise the evaluation team on key issues for consideration in the evaluation, opportunities for effective participation, and a strategy for dissemination of the results.

Evaluation questions and judgement criteria

The evaluation should be based on a list of *evaluation questions* to be agreed between the evaluation team and WFP with the advice of the reference groups. The evaluation team will be responsible for the first proposal of the evaluation questions. The evaluation questions should draw heavily on the insight and analysis contained in the evaluation's preliminary design phase research.

For each agreed evaluation question, quantitative and /or qualitative judgement criteria will be identified, around which data collection methods will be decided and built. The evaluation team will provide a brief outline of key evaluation questions, judgement criteria, and proposed data collection and analysis methods to the Evaluation Manager and reference group members for their comment at least ten days prior to the start of field work.

Data collection

Security permitting, field visits should be made in all three Darfur regions. Field sites should be selected to include a range of intervention contexts, e.g. IDPs in camps (established & newly formed; those experiencing problems with registration); where IDPs are integrated with the urban population; distributions in more remote SLM areas; distributions to rural non IDPs; distributions to urban host/residents and pilot areas for Food For Education (if different from above).

The proposed evaluation methodology should be in accordance with WFP policies, programme guidance on evaluation (as elaborated in the Programme Guidance Manual and its supporting documents) and the principles and guidelines for humanitarian evaluation published by the OECD/DAC).

8. Focus of the evaluation

The evaluation will apply the standard OECD DAC criteria for the evaluation of humanitarian interventions:

- Relevance / appropriateness
- Connectedness
- Coherence
- Coverage
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Impact

As mentioned above, key evaluation questions will be prepared by the evaluation team and approved by Office of Evaluation with the advice of the relevant reference group. Based on



preliminary desk study and interviews with key WFP stakeholders in Rome, London, Khartoum and North Darfur over the period December 2005 to February 2006, WFP has identified the following priority issues for investigation in the evaluation. In general, the evaluation questions will focus on these priority areas of concern:

Relevance: Was the design of WFP's intervention appropriate to the magnitude and nature of the problem? Did the objectives remain relevant throughout the intervention, and/or did they appropriately evolve in the face of rapidly changing circumstances on the ground in Darfur? Was the intervention design in line with WFP corporate strategies, policies and protocols, and was it relevant vis à vis the policies and capacities of WFP's donors and cooperating partners?

Special issues for consideration:

- *Management of food aid 'pull factor':* How well did WFP manage the strategic challenge of addressing the emergency needs of IDPs concentrated in and around urban areas, while minimising the 'pull factor' of food aid distribution? What were the positive and negative effects of the strategies employed? What are the implications for future WFP interventions?
- *Protection:* Did WFP's intervention modalities adequately account for the protection issues and needs of beneficiaries in the Darfur context? What was the overall effect of WFP's approach to protection in Darfur, and what are the implications of this experience for future interventions in Sudan or elsewhere?
- *Experimental design:* WFP tested several innovative approaches in Darfur intended to leverage existing resources: (1) increased rations of sugar in the food basket as a direct income transfer, and (2) the use of an expanded cereal ration to offset milling costs and support the functioning of private markets in remote areas with a view toward reducing in-migration to settlements. What were the results of these efforts? The costs? What are the lessons and implications for future WFP interventions?

Effectiveness/impact: Did the WFP intervention effectively meet the basic food needs of conflict-affected persons in Greater Darfur? Did it successfully contribute to improving and maintaining the nutritional status of target populations? Did these actions indeed save lives as intended? Did WFP accomplish these objectives with appropriate consideration for age, gender, material and non-material needs? Was the EMOP effective in providing IDP children with continued, consistent education in spite of their displacement?

Efficiency/coverage: Did WFP combine human, material and financial inputs most economically and in a timely manner to achieve its desired results? What constraints did WFP face in Darfur with respect to organisational structure, partner capacity, resourcing, physical access, humanitarian access, and security, and what strategies did they employ to mitigate or overcome them? Were these efforts successful, cost-effective and sufficient? What were the key lessons learned from these actions and what implications do they hold for future WFP interventions?

Special issues for consideration:

- *Logistical challenges and responses:* Darfur presented WFP with unusually serious and diverse logistic challenges, including limited physical infrastructure (ports, roads, storage), pervasive insecurity, and strong competition from the commercial sector for available operational inputs (port access, transport, storage, fuel); Creative responses allowed WFP to set agency records for logistical deliveries in a complex emergency, consistently increasing deliveries through the rainy season; what were the results in terms of vulnerable individuals reached who would otherwise have been neglected?



What were the costs? What are the specific implications for future logistics operations in Sudan and elsewhere?

- *Use of mobile distribution teams and 'unsupervised' community-based targeted distribution (CBTD) in a conflict situation:* WFP used security escorts and mobile distribution teams in Darfur to extend food aid coverage to insecure areas; this required the use of unsupervised community based targeting and distribution mechanisms; What were the results of this strategy vis à vis the level of coverage that otherwise would have been possible under the given security constraints? What were the costs? What were the approximate levels of targeting error under unsupervised CBTD vis. WFP Sudan's experience with partner-supervised CBTD? In the end, how did communities evaluate the experience of unsupervised CBTD?
- *Beneficiary registration:* Was beneficiary registration handled according to WFP policy and usual practices? Was registration timely and effective? What constraints did WFP and its partners face in registration, and how did they attempt to mitigate them? What were the impacts of registration inefficiencies on targeting outcomes? What are the implications for future registration practice?

Connectedness: Did WFP's humanitarian intervention in Darfur sufficiently consider, and address where possible, the long term needs of Sudan? Did the design of the emergency intervention reflect a sufficient understanding of the medium and long term development aims of WFP in Sudan as expressed in the Country Programme, co-existing PRRO, and nascent post-peace programming? Were institution- and capacity-building opportunities sufficiently considered and captured in the intervention planning and implementation?

Coherence: Did WFP's emergency activities in Darfur appropriately and sufficiently complement and/or supplement the activities and objectives of other actors, including effected households (coping activities), state, non-state, UN, NGO and bi-lateral entities?

9. Evaluation team composition and experience

The evaluation team should have proven knowledge and experience of humanitarian programming in camp and non-camp environments, food aid modalities for IDP and non-IDP populations, emergency nutrition, and emergency logistics. Such knowledge and experience should include operating in complex emergencies (ie. insecure environments), preferably in Sudan. The team should also have proven knowledge and expertise in evaluation planning, evaluative methods and techniques, and evaluation management. Familiarity with WFP structure, operations and policies is desirable.

The evaluation team should include local technical assistance from independent consultants and/or partner institutions in Sudan with experience, expertise, and language skills relevant to the evaluation.

The exact team composition will be proposed by the contractor and is subject to the approval of WFP. For illustrative purposes WFP has proposed an evaluation team comprised of a team leader, a programme specialist, and an economic analyst/ logistics specialist. However, a different team composition may be proposed based on the judgement of the contractor. Once a bid is awarded, the team composition may change only if so indicated in the process of refinement of the evaluation design or methods, and only if agreed by WFP.

At least one of the team members should have proven knowledge and practical experience in the field of emergency nutrition.