Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation

Mid-Term Evaluation of the Improved Global Governance for Hunger Reduction Programme, GCP /INT/130/EC

Annex 3 - Terms of Reference

June 2013

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: http://www.fao.org/evaluation

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2013

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

1 Background of the Project

Programme framework and strategy

1. At the end of 2011, the European Union (EU) and FAO signed a Programme "Improved Global Governance for Hunger Reduction", partly funded by the EU (Euro 30 million) and partly by FAO (Euro 17 million). The overall objective is "Better coordinated and informed food security and nutrition governance at global, regional and national levels" by delivering 21 Outputs organized around 4 interdependent Outcomes which are:

- Outcome 1: Strengthened CFS functioning in accordance with its renewed mandate
- Outcome 2: Food security decision-making processes at global, regional and national levels use better information and common standards to prevent and/or mitigate the effects of food crises and to effectively address chronic hunger and malnutrition
- Outcome 3: Use of improved instruments for food security and nutrition policy and programme design and implementation
- Outcome 4: Strengthened human and organizational capacities of global, regional and national organizations to generate and use relevant food security analyses

2. As a follow-up to the recommendation of the Independent External Evaluation of FAO (2007) to better integrate FAO's Regular Programme and extra-budgetary funding, the Programme is fully integrated into FAO's the Programme of Work and Budget (2012-2013), to the extent that the Programme log-frame includes indicators from the FAO Strategic Framework (2010-19). Jointly with other resources and efforts the Programme contributes to achieving twenty-three Organizational Outputs. These Organizational Outputs contribute to sixteen Organizational Results and eight Strategic Objectives of the existing FAO Strategic Framework (2010-19). The existing FAO Strategic Framework has been revised and similar alignment needs to maintained with the revised Strategic Framework, which becomes effective as of 2014.

3. The Programme's implementation strategy rests on three essential pillars:

- Translating knowledge into action through specific country work by: linking FAO knowledge and operational activities; collaborating with the country operations of other partners; capacity development; and improving communication;
- Creating a more favourable institutional environment for food security through better coordination and partnerships and improved governance; and
- Improving the effectiveness of food security interventions by addressing gender and nutrition dimensions.

Institutional set-up

4. The Programme, which is coordinated by the Agricultural Development Economics Division (ESA), involves 11[1] FAO Divisions and is implemented in collaboration with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Food Programme. Each of the Programme outputs is managed as "baby projects"[2], for which there is a budget holder[3] and a Technical Focal Point. Resource persons from relevant technical Divisions work with the Output Focal Points to technically support them in addressing issues related to nutrition, governance, gender and capacity development and in drawing lessons from experiences in doing so.

5. The Programme is governed by a composite mechanism that includes a Programme Steering Committee (PSC), an Executive Committee and a Technical Working Group (TWG). This mechanism is designed to support coordination and multi-stakeholder participation in decision-making at different levels without compromising the Programme's agility. The PSC is made up of high-level representation from the European Union, IFAD, FAO, and WFP and is responsible for providing strategic guidance, reviewing and discussing progress and addressing constraints. The Executive Committee, which is made up of Directors of FAO Divisions participating in the Programme, provides internal guidance and ensures effective coordination of Programme implementation within FAO. The TWG is comprised of a Technical Focal Point for each of the outputs and supports a well coordinated and coherent approach to Programme implementation across the eleven participating Divisions.

6. IFAD and WFP are involved in designing and implementing Programme activities and in reviewing progress reports and work plans before these are submitted to the PSC. Existing coordination mechanisms (e.g. CFS Secretariat, the Food Security Information Network) provide the basis for such collaboration. Specific collaboration mechanisms such as Letters of Agreement that allow the transfer of funds to IFAD and WFP are in place to facilitate the full participation of these partners in Programme implementation (e.g. with IFAD on gender mainstreaming, with WFP in the implementation of the Integrated Food security Phase Classification component and the FAO/WFP Joint Strategy for ISFNS) as well as other key partners such the Civil Society Mechanism (for CFS related work), High Level Task Force, partners of the Integrated Food security Phase Classification. Letters of Agreement also form the basis of collaboration with the New Partnership for Africa's Development (in the implementation of pillar 3 of CAADP), the Permanent Interstate Committee for drought control in the Sahel and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

---

[1] Originally 12 Divisions were involved but as a result of organizational restructuring, which has led to certain functions being moved from one Division (TCS) to others, the total number of Divisions is now 11.

[2] In Oracle, each project account comprises a main or "Mother" account and at least one lower level or "baby" project account, known as the "child" project account. It is at this lower level that postings take place, so that for a project with a single budget (and budget holder), postings to the first baby or child project represent all postings on that mother project. For each subdivision of the budget and delegation of budgetary authority within a project, a further baby project is established, against whose budget all related commitments and expenditures are charged.

[3] In the context of the Field Programme, a staff member entrusted with the responsibility for implementing a project expenditure plan (or budget) whether at Headquarters or in the field.

2 Purpose of the Evaluation

7. The project is almost half-way through implementation and as planned in the Inception Report a mid-term evaluation is needed to assess progress made so far and inform organizational learning. Moreover, the revised FAO Strategic Framework, which comes into action in 2014, and discussions in the meeting of the Project Steering Committee of 8 March 2013 stress the importance of the MTE in providing strategic advice to Programme management, oversight mechanisms and the PSC on key decisions related to the following five areas of interest (described in more detail in the next section):

- Strategic focus
- Added value of the Programme
- Effectiveness of collaboration between the Rome-based agencies
- Country-level impact
- Contribution to the FAO reform process

3 Evaluation framework

8. Given the complexity of the programme, the framework for the evaluation, based on the five standard evaluation criteria, will be built around the five areas of interest to the PSC mentioned above:

9. **Strategic focus of the Programme**: The Programme involves 11 Divisions covering a broad range of technical areas of work. As a result, though the Programme is organized around 4 well-defined outcomes, each of which plays and importance role in improving governance, and has a common strategic approach across all Programme outputs, it is spread across as many as sixteen Organizational Results and eight Strategic Objectives of the existing FAO Strategic Framework (2010-19). In light of this and of the revised FAO Strategic Framework that will be effective as of January 2014, the MTE has an important role to play in identifying whether the Programme requires greater strategic focus and how this can be achieved. In addition the MTE will assess the relevance and possible challenges associated with placing greater focus on the following themes/issues identified during the Programme Steering Committee of 8 March 2013 and progress made with respect to each of these:

- CFS and some of its main work streams such as the Guidelines for Responsible Agricultural Investment (RAI) and the Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises
- Implementation of the guidelines to improve land tenure governance
- Resilience related initiatives (programming and measurement) with a particular focus on the Sahel
- Stepping up nutrition mainstreaming
- CAADP process

10. **Added value of the Programme**: While on the one hand the Programme's strong integration with the FAO PWB avoids the fragmentation of efforts, provides a longer term perspective to the Programme's initiatives and contributes to the FAO reform process, on the other hand the PSC has noted that in some instances as a result of this integration the added value of the Programme with respect to the different on-going processes and initiatives is unclear and it requested that efforts be made to understand the Programme's added value at

outcome level. Accordingly, between May and July 2013 the Programme logframe will be reviewed with the intention of identifying Programme-specific indicators that can be used for assessing the added-value of the Programme. The MTE will be expected to assesses the updated logframe as a tool for assessing the Programme's progress towards planned outputs, outcomes and impact as well as for assessing the added value of the Programme.

11. **FAO Reform process**: The recommendations of the in-depth Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of the FAO, which concluded its work in 2007, have been incorporated in the Strategic Framework whose specific renewal objectives include: modernized human resources management, leaner and more efficient administrative services, new tools and techniques to help a complex, global institution "function as one" and governing body reforms such as the reform and renewal[4] of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). These renewal objectives are expected to enhance FAO's effectiveness in promoting food security governance at all levels in line with its mandate and are complemented by FAO's renewed strategic approaches to improving gender equality, nutrition, capacity development, governance and partnerships. The Programme is expected to contribute to this reform process, in particular through its support to the CFS (Outcome 1) and by supporting the mainstreaming of nutrition, gender, capacity development, governance and partnerships. The MTE will assess the extent to which programme design, implementation and management are supporting the implementation of this reform.

12. **Effectiveness of collaboration between the Rome-based agencies**: IFAD and WFP are part of the PSC, were consulted during the inception phase and in the design of activities and their involvement in the implementation of specific Programme activities has led to a number of very strategic collaborations (e.g. Food Security Information Network, High Level Forum on Food security in Protracted Crises and the Agenda for Action that stems from this etc.). Nonetheless, the PSC recently noted that more effective collaboration could probably have been attained if IFAD and WFP had been more closely involved in the formulation phase of the Programme. The MTE will be expected to provide advice on the scope for further increasing the extent and effectiveness of collaboration between the Rome-based agencies within the Programme.

13. **Country-level impacts:** The Programme is global in nature in that it supports the generation and fine-tuning of global public goods such as tools and methods for improving the availability and use of gender and nutrition sensitive data and policy instruments for addressing emerging and long-standing food security challenges. Consequently, it is largely based in headquarters. Nevertheless, it is critical that these public goods are relevant to national contexts, that they are used in decision making processes and that, in consistency with the revised Strategic Framework, they contribute to achieving impacts at the country-level. Accordingly, to promote collaboration between Programme outputs, and to avoid a dispersion of efforts, country activities are largely targeted in a group of focus countries in the Horn of Africa (i.e. Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, and Uganda) the Sahel (Mali

[4] As stated in the CFS Reform document, the aspirations for the renewed CFS are: "The reforms are designed to redefine the CFS' vision and role to focus on the key challenges of eradicating hunger; expanding participation in CFS to ensure that voices of all relevant stakeholders are heard in the policy debate on food and agriculture; adopt its rules and procedures with the aim to become the central United Nations political platform dealing with food security and nutrition; strengthening its linkages with regional, national, and local levels; and supporting CFS discussions with structured expertise through the creation of a High Level Panel of Experts (HLPE) so that the decisions and the work of the CFS are based on hard evidence and state of the art knowledge (CFS:2009/2: Paragraph 2).

and Niger) plus Guatemala and Mozambique. These are selected on the basis of high levels of food insecurity and malnutrition; opportunities for joint action with IFAD and WFP in strengthening linkages between emergency and development and developing resilience; presence of important initiatives (i.e. Horn of Africa and Sahel with their respective Plan of Action) which will allow to continue and expand activities beyond the duration of the Programme; a concentration of Programme capacities to work in these countries; and them being identified as priority countries within the Statement of Intent between the European Union, FAO, IFAD and WFP. To complement country work and engage in important regional policy process, such as CAADP and AGIR Sahel (Alliance Globale pour l'Initiative Resilience) the Programme works with regional organizations including NEPAD, CILLS and COMESA. While considering the global nature of the Programme the MTE is expected to provide advice on the appropriateness of this country selection, whether there is scope for increasing the country-level impacts of the Programme and how this can be achieved.

4 Scope

14. The Mid-Term Evaluation will cover the period from January 2011 to the date of the evaluation (planned for September 2013) to include:

- Identification phase (January to March 2011)
- Formulation phase (April to December 2011
- Inception phase (January to June 2012) and
- Initial implementation period (January 2012 to September 2013)

15. Given that the Programme is still to reach mid-way through its life and country level activities are still at a very early stage, consultations will largely be with the Programme's global-level stakeholders namely FAO, IFAD, WFP and the European Union and key people involved in Programme implementation including Technical Focal Points, members of the oversight mechanisms (Technical Working Group, Executive Committee, Project Steering Committee); the Budget Holder, Programme Coordinator, core team involved in supporting management of the Programme and resource persons that support the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues within the Programme. Nevertheless, since the Programme also plans to influence regional and country-level decision-making processes interviews – using phone/skype/email - will be held with representatives of key Programme partners (e.g. AU/NPCA, COMESA, CILSS/ECOWAS, ASEAN and SICA) at regional and/or country level Programme's.

16. Being a mid-term evaluation, consultations will largely be focused on the five areas of interest described in section 3 (i.e. strategic focus; added value of the Programme; effectiveness of collaboration between the Rome-based agencies; country-level impact; contribution to the FAO reform process) with the intention of facilitating mid-course corrective action. Accordingly, evaluation criteria will be applied to draw findings on the five areas of interest and less for drawing premature conclusions about sustainability and impact.

4.1 Evaluation criteria

17. The Programme will be critically assessed through the internationally accepted evaluation criteria (i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability). In line with the new FAO project cycle, the evaluation will assess compliance with the following UN Common Country Programming Principles: Gender equality, Capacity Development and

Results Based Management. Additional characteristics to guide the analysis are: robustness, clarity, coherence, realism and technical quality.

4.2 Evaluation issues

I. Relevance of concept and design

a. Project relevance to: global (e.g. CFS), regional (e.g. CAADP) and national development priorities; FAO Strategic Objectives/Core Functions; and programming frameworks of the EU
b. Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project by assessing the revised logical framework[5] and its suitability as a tool for assessing the Programme's progress towards planned outputs, outcomes and impact as well as for assessing the added value of the Programme.
c. Appropriateness of the of the selection of focus countries

II. Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes

d. Overall potential effectiveness of the Programme in achieving impacts and outcomes by comparing these to progress achieved thus far and identification of any emerging unplanned outcomes.
e. Actual and potential added value of the Programme to the normative and knowledge function of FAO and to achieving country-level impacts and use made of the Organization's pre-existing normative and knowledge products.

III. Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation process

f. Strategic focus:
- Extent of alignment with FAO's revised Strategic Framework, including its country-level approach
- Extent to which the strategic priorities of IFAD, WFP and the EU are considered and included in the project;
- Realism of planned impacts at global, regional and country levels and breadth of areas of work;
- Relevance, quality and realism of the Programme's implementation strategy and it's alignment with FAO's reform process, including FAO strategic approaches to improving gender equality, nutrition, capacity development, governance and partnerships
- Relevance and possible challenges associated with placing greater focus on:
    - CFS and some of its main work streams such as the Guidelines for Responsible Agricultural Investment (RAI) and the Agenda for Action for Addressing Food Insecurity in Protracted Crises
    - Implementation of the guidelines to improve land tenure governance
    - Resilience related initiatives (programming and measurement) with a particular focus on the Sahel
    - Stepping up nutrition mainstreaming
    - CAADP process

[5] As mentioned, in response to a request by the PSC the Programme's logical framework will be revised between May and June 2013

g. Assessment of project management in terms of work planning and reporting, supporting oversight mechanisms (i.e. Technical Working Group, the Executive Committee and the Programme Steering Committee) and with a particular focus on: i) facilitating the Programme's contribution to FAO's reform process by supporting the implementation of the Programme strategy and inter-divisional collaboration ii) supporting country-level work.

h. Assessment of institutional setup, including oversight mechanisms (i.e. Technical Working Group, the Executive Committee and the Programme Steering Committee); core team supporting programme management, technical focal points, resource persons, informal country co-ordination groups with a specific focus on its suitability in supporting effective collaboration between the Rome-based agencies, achieving country-level impacts and contributing to the FAO reform process.

i. Assessment of financial resources management, with reference to the adequacy and realism of budget allocations to achieve intended results and rate of delivery at the time of the evaluation

IV. Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles, cross-cutting themes

j. Analysis of gender mainstreaming for gender equality. This will include:
- extent to which gender equality considerations were reflected in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, and in the identification of beneficiaries;
- extent to which gender equality considerations are being taken into account in project implementation and management;
- extent to which gender relations and equality have been or will be affected by the project.[6]

k. Analysis of the Capacity Development dimension in the design, implementation and results of the project, at individual, organizational and enabling environment levels.[7] This will include CD on both technical and soft-skills, i.e. planning, budgeting, partnering and negotiating.

l. Analysis of nutrition mainstreaming. This will include:
- extent to which nutrition considerations were reflected in Programme objectives and design to improve the Programme's impact and demonstrate the effectiveness of a food-based approach to nutrition ;
- extent to which nutrition considerations are being taken into account in project implementation and management;

m. Analysis of partnerships and alliances, in particular with IFAD and WFP namely:
- how they were planned in the project design and developed through implementation;
- their focus, strength and extent to which these are based comparative strengthens
- modalities and mechanisms being used to support collaboration
- their effect on project results and sustainability[8].

---

[6] See: http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/gender/docs/FAO_FinalGender_Policy_2012.pdf
[7] See: http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/en/
[8] See: http://www.fao.org/partnerships/partners-home/en/

V. Impact

n. Potential and likely impacts at global, regional and, in particular, at the country level
o. Potential and likely contribution of the project to FAO Strategic Objectives, implementation of the corporate Core Functions as well as to regional and national level processes (e.g. CAADP, National Agricultural Strategies etc.) and to EU country-level instruments.

VI. Sustainability

p. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the project's results by FAO, IFAD, WFP, the EU, Regional Organizations and/or Governments after the termination of the project. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
   - Institutional, technical, social and economic sustainability of proposed methodologies, guidance material, innovations and/or processes;
   - Expectation of institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project;

4.3 Recommendations and lessons

18. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by FAO, the EU and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for follow-up or up-scaling action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons to be learned as they are of interest to other similar activities. Any proposal for further assistance should include specification of major objectives and outputs and indicative inputs required.

5 Evaluation methodology

5.1 Approach and tools

19. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards[9].

20. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

21. The evaluation will make use of the following methods and tools: review of existing reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by check lists and/or interview protocols; direct observation during field visits; surveys and questionnaires.

[9] United Nations Evaluation Group, http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards

5.2 Stakeholders and consultation process

22. The evaluation team will discuss in detail with the key stakeholders of the project and will take into account their perspectives and opinions. Key stakeholders will include:

- Project Task Force members;
- Budget Holder and Programme Coordinator;
- Core team supporting Programme management;
- Technical focal points and resource persons that support the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues;
- Members of the Programme Steering Committee, Executive Committee and technical Working Group;
- Programme partners: IFAD and WFP;
- the European Union;
- FAO Representatives in selected focus countries;
- Representatives of selected Regional Organisations and Governments

23. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with: the FAO Office of Evaluation, the Project Task Force members and the Core team that supports Programme management at headquarters. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

24. The team will present its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the project stakeholders in FAO HQ and Brussels, to obtain their feedback at the end of the data-gathering phase.

25. The draft ToR will be circulated with the Programme Steering Committee for comments before finalization; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by OED. The draft evaluation report will also be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalization; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

6 Roles and responsibilities

26. FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Project Task Force (PTF) of the project will initiate the evaluation process, draft the first version of the Terms of Reference, and support the evaluation team during its work. They should be available to participate in meetings with the team if requested, make available information and documentation as necessary, and comment on the draft final terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the project Task Force will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.

27. The BH will also lead and coordinate the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

28. The FAO Office of Evaluation will assist the BH and LTO in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the team's work; it is responsible for approving the finalized ToR and the team composition;[10] It shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for quality assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations.

29. The Office of Evaluation will also follow up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response (upon presentation of the final report) and the Follow-up to the management response (one year later).

30. The EU, IFAD and WFP will review and provide comments on the term of reference of the MTE and on the selection of the Evaluation Team. They will also participate in consultations and provide comments on drafts of the report and of the management response and participate in related presentations.

31. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report.

32. The Team Leader guides and coordinates the team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

33. The Evaluation team will be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available.

34. The mission is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO, other than the OED quality assurance mentioned above.

35. As a contribution to the OED Knowledge Management System:

- the Team Leader will be responsible for completing the OED quantitative project performance questionnaire, to be delivered at the same time as the final evaluation report;
- OED will ask all team members to complete an anonymous and confidential questionnaire to get their feedback on the evaluation process.

[10] The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team, will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

7 Evaluation team

36. Mission members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

37. The evaluation team will comprise of two senior experts and a research assistant. The experts are required to assess the project and provide strategic advice, and as a whole, the team will have expertise in the following areas:

- General
  - analytical skills
  - planning, monitoring and evaluation exercises and tools
  - interpersonal communication skills
  - drafting and communication skills in English and communication skills in French
- Specific
  - Good understanding of the food and nutrition security governance architecture at global, regional and national levels
  - Substantive knowledge and experience on the role of normative public goods, including methodologies for food and nutrition security analysis and policy tools and capacity development in improving governance at global, regional and country levels
  - Good understanding of the respective roles and comparative advantages of FAO, IFAD and WFP in supporting improved food security governance
  - Experience in mainstreaming of gender equality, nutrition, governance and HRBA, capacity development across large organizational initiatives;
  - Skills in conducting evaluations and, in the specific case of the senior expert, in leading strategic evaluations and reviews
  - Substantive knowledge and experience in corporate-level strategic planning and project management
  - Knowledge of EU procedures and rules for external actions would be an advantage

38. Furthermore, to the extent possible, the team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

8 Evaluation deliverables

39. Issues paper will be prepared towards the beginning of the evaluation and will identify, in greater detail than done in the ToR, some of the questions that the evaluation will seek answers to. The paper will also included an updated workplan.

40. A power-point presentation and summary note of key findings will be prepared and delivered to the Project Task Force before submitting the draft evaluation report

41. The evaluation report (60 pages, including executive summary) will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in these

ToR. It will include an executive summary (10 pages). Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

42. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

43. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided in Annex I of this ToR. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs, following OED template for report writing. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.

44. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within 3 weeks from the conclusion of consultations with FAO, IFAD, WFP, the EU and at the regional and/or country level. Within 3 additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within maximum two weeks.

45. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though need not be limited to, the following as relevant:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of project outputs;
- Evaluation tools.

9 Evaluation timetable

Activity	Lead	September				October				November				December				January				February			
Share project documentation with MTE team	PTF																								
Brief MTE Team in HQ	OED, PTF																								
Review documentation	MTE Team																								
Consultations with EU, FAO, IFAD & WFP	MTE Team																								
Prepare and submit issues paper	MTE Team																								
Interviews with regional/country partners	MTE Team																								
Presentation of initial findings and main recommendations	MTE Team																								
Prepare and submit note of main findings and recommendations	MTE Team																								
Prepare and submit draft MTE report	MTE Team																								
Provide comments on draft MTE report	OED, PTF, PSC																								
Update and submit MTE report to OED and PTF	MTE Team																								
Circulate final MTE report to all stakeholders	OED																								
Request management response to PTF	OED																								
Coordinate preparation of management response	PTF																								

Annexes

Annex 1. Project evaluation report outline
Annex 2. FAO Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions, 2010-2019;
Annex 3. OED project performance questionnaire