Technical Note

Stakeholder Analysis

1 Introduction

2 What is a stakeholder analysis and why is it important?

3 Stakeholder Definition: Who are stakeholders?

4 Integrating perspectives of affected populations

5 When do stakeholders participate in the evaluation?

6 Further reading

7 Annex 1. Example of completed stakeholder mapping

8 Annex 2. A simple tool to prioritize stakeholders

1. Introduction

1. The **purpose** of this Technical Note is to explain the role of a stakeholder analysis in the design and implementation of a decentralized or centralized evaluation. This means how to map and analyze stakeholders and decide who, when, how and how much to involve them. WFP staff commissioning and/or managing an evaluation, and/or evaluation teams conducting these for WFP, should read this note. An example of a stakeholder analysis is provided in Annex 1. An exercise aimed at helping you identify roles for stakeholders based on the needs of your evaluation is found in Annex 2.

2. **When to use it?** The evaluation manager (EM) should read this Technical Note during the Preparation Phase, when identifying the key stakeholders who will be involved in the evaluation. During Inception, the evaluation team develops a more detailed Stakeholder Analysis as part of the Inception Report (IR).

2. What is a stakeholder analysis and why is it important?

3. WFP operates within complex environments, where multiple actors have varying roles, interests, influences, and expectations about a specific intervention and the evaluation associated with it. It is important to analyze who these stakeholders are, their roles, and their interests. Stakeholder analysis involves.

   a. *identifying who stakeholders are*;

   b. *understanding their 'stake' (i.e. level of interest and influence) in the subject being evaluated and in the evaluation*; and

   c. *Determining how much they should be involved in the evaluation*.

4. The **objective** of a stakeholder analysis is to ensure, as much as possible, that those who have an interest in the subject of the evaluation, and/or those can influence the evaluation are considered. It is important that their perspectives are taken into account from the start of the process. Experience has shown that such an approach improves the quality of evaluation process and product, and greatly strengthens stakeholder ownership of the evaluation's findings and recommendations

3. Stakeholder Definition: Who are stakeholders?

5. The Organization for Economic and cooperation development (OECD) defines stakeholders as '*agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation*.'[1] Some are stakeholders of the subject being evaluated, while some are stakeholders of the evaluation. A Government Partner, for example, may not be funding or implementing an intervention, but is very likely an interest in its evaluation.

6. For WFP evaluations, stakeholders may include some or all of the following internal and external stakeholder groups.

Box 1: Stakeholder groups

Internal Stakeholders	External Stakeholders
• WFP Country / Sub / Area Office • Regional Bureau • WFP HQ divisions • Office of Evaluation • WFP Executive Board (if applicable)	• Affected populations/communities (see next section for further details) • Government (at country, regional and local levels) • UN Agencies/ UN Country Team • NGOs and community-based organizations • Donors • Cooperating partners or subcontractors • Private sector (if applicable)

7. The EM should identify agencies or individuals (disaggregated by sex and age) who are interested in the evaluation. Internal stakeholders include focal points for the subject being evaluated. External stakeholders are decision-makers, community leaders, partners, or ministries involved with or affected by the intervention.

8. Most interventions have many stakeholders, some with more stake than others. Thinking about what level of stake each one has in the evaluation will help the EM identify how to interact with them at the various stages of the evaluation. The EM and evaluation team should take these stakeholders' concerns into consideration: when they are included in early discussions of the evaluation, they are more likely to take ownership of evaluation results. The most important stakeholders will likely be part of the ERG and would therefore also have input into the evaluation purpose and questions.

4. Integrating perspectives of affected populations

9. Evaluations should include the perspectives of affected populations. They have an important stake in the outcome of an evaluation[2]. The stakeholder analysis should include appropriate Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment analysis, beyond simply disaggregating by sex. Analysis of target groups should consider the differences within target groups, like age (children, youth, adult men and women), gender, sector, urban/rural, humanitarian situation.

10. In conflict or fragile environment, or during a humanitarian response, it may be harder to access affected populations. When planning for an evaluation, consider challenges that might arise in accessing and consulting with beneficiaries, particularly for marginalized groups, and how to manage the challenges. Document the

[1] OECD (2002) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management

[2] Please see related guidance: In line with the Technical Note on integrating gender in WFP evaluations, Checklist, and Quick Guide, the United Nations System-wide action plan (UNSWAP) evaluation performance indicator (EPI), and the important UN guidance: Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation towards UNEG Guidance, (August 2014)

limitations in the Inception Report. Seeking the perspectives of affected populations (men, women, boys and girls) is a way to ethically represent their experiences in the evaluation.

5. When do stakeholders participate in the evaluation?

11. It is not always easy to get stakeholders engaged and keep them involved throughout an evaluation, yet it is important. The EM should involve the country office management and the programme team teams who should be included in the stakeholder lists. If those who have been identified are not able to participate, the EM should find out why, and explore opportunities to engage them, even in ad hoc meetings to hear about their "stake" in the programme or its evaluation. Otherwise, they may feel their interests are not heard and, consequently, feel no "ownership" of the evaluation results. It is important that their involvement does not compromise the independence, integrity or impartiality of the evaluation.

12. Table 1 illustrates when it is common to involve the main stakeholders, though the actual involvement will differ from one evaluation to another depending on context and stakeholders.

Table 1: Common stakeholder participation, by phase

Phases	Stakeholder involvement
1. Planning & Preparation	• Identify a preliminary list of stakeholders internal and external • For the Terms of Reference, the EM should identify who has a 'stake' in the evaluation • Consult stakeholders as needed for input on technical issues, methods and timing while drafting the TOR (For DEs, see Template for TOR and Quality Checklist for TOR) • Share draft ToRs with stakeholders (through the ERG)
2. Inception	• Consult with stakeholders to identify specific people to consult during data collection • When it is not possible to involve all key stakeholders, indicate this as a limitation in the IR (see Template for Inception Report and Quality Checklist for Inception Report) • Share draft IR with stakeholders (through the ERG)
3. Collect Data	• Consult stakeholders through surveys, interviews and focus groups • Consult affected populations directly and equitably: include men, women, youth, boys and girls, as well as other vulnerable groups
4. Analyze Data and Report	• Provide stakeholders a draft evaluation report (ER) for their comments through the ERG • For evaluation this is through the ERG; submit comments to the evaluation team • Organize a validation workshop to discuss draft recommendations
5. Disseminate and Follow-Up	• Disseminate final ER to internal and external stakeholders (required for evaluation) • Target recommendations to specific stakeholders or stakeholder groups • Share evaluation results in line with the communication and learning plan

When does "stakeholder engagement" become a "participatory evaluation"?

Some evaluations offer opportunities for even greater involvement of stakeholders, with the goal of making an evaluation more participatory. When such a design is desired, additional stakeholders might usefully be included at different moments in the evaluation. This requires resources and time, as well as sharing some of the control of the evaluation with a wider group. On the other hand, expanding the list of stakeholders and/or sharing the responsibilities of the evaluation more broadly can enrich the process, as these examples show:

- **Programme staff** may have evaluation questions of their own; including their questions in the evaluation can empower their perspectives and result in a greater sense of "ownership".
- **Programme staff** can also be included in discussions of findings and conclusions, to jointly generate recommendations that are more grounded in contextual and political economic knowledge of project environments.
- **Recipients of assistance** can be included in data collection with simple instruments and straightforward training, such as observation of remote sites, brief surveys in the community, or accessing individuals who don't regularly access public sites, such as the elderly or people living with disabilities.
- Presenting evaluation results to **recipients of assistance** can create valuable dialogue about project processes and outcomes, rather than simply extracting information for donor reporting. They are also excellent sources for unintended project outcomes and for ideas for improvement.

Participatory methods for dialogue – community town halls, appreciative inquiry, outcome mapping, Most Significant Change method and others – can be used to incorporate insights from recipients of assistance, project teams, or others, and these methods tend to leave stakeholders feeling empowered, unlike many traditional methods. Evaluation firms proposing to do such work should be experienced in it, and comfortable with questions. See Better Evaluation, or What Works for more detailed information and examples.

If you or your evaluation team are interested in exploring options like these, do so as early in the process as possible, to be sure to make time and reserve the necessary resources

6. Further reading

13. MEASURE Evaluation: Stakeholder Analysis and Engagement
14. Linda G. Morra Imas, Ray C. Rist (2009) "The Road to Results: designing and conducting effective development evaluations", pg 147-148.
15. ODI (2009) Planning Tools: Stakeholder Analysis
16. Veena Pankaj, Myia Welsh, Laura Ostenso (2011) "Participatory analysis: Expanding Stakeholder Involvement in Evaluation."
17. USAID Learning Lab: Evaluation Stakeholder Analysis
18. Better Evaluation: Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis
19. Kinnon, Nicole, et al. "Who Really Matters? A Stakeholder Analysis Tool"

7. Annex 1. Example of completed stakeholder mapping

Example taken from: Inception Package: Mozambique, 200286 Country Programme: An evaluation of WFP's Operation

1. The stakeholder analysis was initiated in the TOR by the EM and completed in the inception phase by the Evaluation team
2. The stakeholder analysis below groups stakeholders according to:
   a. **Internal** and **external** stakeholder groups;
   b. **Primary** (who have a direct interest in the evaluation) and **secondary** (who have an indirect interest in the evaluation).
3. For each group of stakeholders, the matrix clarifies:
   1. Their interest in the evaluation either because they were responsible of the programme evaluated, affected by it, partners during its implementation, etc.
   2. Their involvement in the evaluation as key informants, users, etc.
   3. Who the stakeholders are and possibly how they were approached during the evaluation process.

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
Internal (WFP) stakeholders			
WFP Country Office in Maputo	Responsible for decision-making regarding the implementation of the CP. Liaise with stakeholders in country. Responsible for design of next CP with WFP HQ	**Key informant, primary stakeholders** and users of the evaluation -Involved in using evaluation findings in deciding on the next CP	*Senior management of WFP CO in Maputo* *Programme officers, logistics, ICT, admin staff* Consultants to the CP between 2012 and 2014 (Will include both current and former WFP staff) **All to be interviewed**
WFP Field Offices in Gaza, Tete, and Beira	Responsible for day-to-day CP implementation. Liaise with stakeholders at decentralized levels. Direct beneficiary contact.	**Key informant, and primary stakeholder -** Users of the evaluation, will be affected by outcomes	*Field office WFP staff* (programme and logistics) (Will include both current and former staff) A**ll to be interviewed, by phone or in person**
Regional Bureau (RB) for Southern Africa (RBJ)	Responsible for oversight of Mozambique WFP. Provides technical support to country offices.	**Key informant and primary stakeholder –** Involved in planning of next CP. Interested in independent account CP performance and applying learning from evaluation to other countries	Programme staff responsible for Mozambique CP *Regional M&E adviser (Silvia Biondi), the Senior Regional Programme Adviser (Sarah Longford), the regional C&V adviser, regional nutrition adviser* **All to be interviewed by phone**

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
Office of Evaluation (OEV)	Provides indirect, independent oversight through commissioning of evaluations (in consultation with the WFP decision making structures)	**Commissioner of the Evaluation** - OEV has an interest in promoting learning from evaluations across WFP. Also interested in gathering lessons from this approach to conducting evaluations. Will include the evaluation findings in the annual synthesis of all OpEvs	Evaluation manager. Other staff of the evaluation office (no interviews) **No interviews to be conducted**
WFP Headquarters (HQ)	Selected departments provide technical support and inputs into design and implementation of CP components (e.g. school feeding, social protection)	**Key informant and primary stakeholder** - can provide further information and clarity on relevant aspects of strategy/guidance.	**Interviews to be conducted as necessary** to enhance understanding of corporate policy and support provided to country level
WFP Executive Board	Provides final oversight of WFP operations and guidance to programmes.	**Primary stakeholder -** The evaluation will feed into an annual synthesis of all OpEvs, which will be presented to the EB.	Members of the EB. **No interviews to be conducted**
External stakeholders			
Beneficiaries			
School Feeding beneficiaries	Ultimate recipients of WFP support	**Key informants and primary stakeholder** - Providing perspectives on the results, outcomes, and emerging impact of WFP's intervention. Will be affected by the decision to continue the interventions or not.	*Selection of schools, and in schools from among:* *Direct beneficiaries: pupils, teachers and cooks* *Indirect: parents, Parent Teacher Association (PTA), community members and leaders consult equal numbers women and men)* **Individual and group interviews**
Social Protection beneficiaries	Ultimate recipients of WFP support	**Key informants and primary stakeholder** - Providing perspectives on the results, outcomes, and emerging impact of WFP's interventions. Will be affected by the decision to continue the interventions or not.	*Persons living with HIV and TB receiving food.* *Vulnerable people receiving cash and vouchers.* *Participants in food for assets programmes (To reflect ratio of female:male beneficiaries.* **Individual interviews and focus groups**

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
Nutrition beneficiaries (component 3 and cross-cutting across operation areas)	Ultimate recipients of WFP support	**Key informants and primary stakeholder -** Providing perspectives on the results, outcomes, and emerging impact of WFP's intervention. Will be affected by the decision to continue the interventions or not	*Persons living with HIV and TB receiving food.* *Vulnerable people receiving cash and vouchers.* *Participants in food for assets, moderately malnourished patients receiving super cereal.* *Health centre staff responsible for HIV/AIDS* **Individual interviews and focus groups**
Small Producers and Processors	Ultimate recipients of WFP support		*Small producers and processors contracted by WFP or partner's NGOs* **Individual interviews and focus groups**
Disaster Risk Reduction beneficiaries	Intermediate recipients of WFP support	**Key informant and secondary stakeholder** - Providing perspectives on the results, outcomes, and emerging impact of WFP's support in Disaster Preparedness. Will be affected by a decision to continue the interventions or not	*Beneficiaries in villages with environmental hazards over the period of the CP to gain insight into effectiveness and efficiency of the support they have received from GoM institutions* *Beneficiaries in areas where DRR assets have been rehabilitated or constructed* **Individual interviews and focus groups**
Government at central level (Maputo)			
Ministry of Education (MoE)	Responsible for providing guidance on school feeding priorities and approaches, and ensuring alignment with Government policy	**Key informant and primary stakeholder -** on government policy, priorities, views on support by WFP and on expanding school feeding, on GoM commitment to providing/ mobilizing resources. Lesson learning	*Director of DIPE Directorate) / Head of Agriculture and School Feeding Department (Special Programs (Department of special programs)* *Director of Planning.* Director of Finance. **Individual interviews**
Ministry of Health (MoH) / Ministério da Saúde (MISAU)	Responsible for oversight of nutrition interventions that are delivered through the health system at central and decentralized levels	**Key informant -** on government policy, coordination, views on achievements, challenges, and inputs by WFP. Will have perspectives on next CP phase, and on links to GoM priorities. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*Head of nutrition unit in the MoH/MISAU* *Coordinator of Programa de Reabilitação Nutricional (PRN)* **Individual interviews**

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIC)	Responsible for oversight of market information system implementation; supervise MIC cereal storage and milling facilities	**Key informant and primary stakeholder** on government policy, coordination, views on achievements and challenges and on inputs by WFP. Will have perspectives on next CP phase, and on links to GoM priorities. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*National Director of trade Mr Cabriel Muianga* Director of the Cereal institute of Mozambique (ICM) ***Head of INFOCOM (market information system)*** **Individual interviews**
Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG)	Responsible for oversight of support to smallholder farmers	**Key informant and primary stakeholder** on government policy, coordination, views on achievements, challenges, and inputs by WFP. Will have perspectives on next CP phase, and on links to GoM priorities. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*Head of National Directorate of Agrarian Services (DNSA).* *Head of International Cooperation Department* Head of National Directorate of Economy (DNE). Head of Agricultural Market Information System **Individual Interviews**
National Institute for Disaster Management (INGC)	Responsible for disaster response oversight, raising public awareness on disaster prevention, early warning systems, mobilizing relief activities during and after disasters	**Primary stakeholder and key informant** on government policy, views achievements, challenges, and inputs by WFP. Will have perspectives on next CP phase, and on links to GoM priorities. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*Staff at INGC Maputo* **Individual Interviews**
National AIDS Council (CNCS)	Responsible for the coordination of the National HIV/AIDS response of all actors involved	**Primary stakeholder and key informant –** views on government policy, as well as on achievements, challenges and technical and financial inputs by WFP. Will have perspectives on next CP phase, and on links to GoM priorities. Lesson learning from the evaluation	Head of the National AIDS Council **Individual Interviews**
Ministry of Women and Social Affairs (MMAS)	Responsible for policy development and experimentation of different modalities of social action	**Primary stakeholder and key informant** - on government policy, views on achievements, challenges of safety nets, and inputs by WFP and partners. Will have perspectives on next CP phase, and on GoM commitment to providing resources. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*Minister of Women and Social Affairs.* Technical staff as necessary **Individual Interviews**

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
National Institute for Social Action (INAS)	Supervises social programmes implementation and experimentation	**Primary stakeholder and key informant** - on implementation of social programmes. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*Head of INAS.* Technical staff as necessary **Individual Interviews**
Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security SETSAN	Responsible for coordinating efforts around food security	**Primary stakeholder and key informant -** on development of baselines, risk mapping, and nutritional analysis. Lesson learning from the evaluation	*Head of SETSAN* and technical staff as necessary **Individual Interview**
Government decentralized level (Gaza and Tete)			
Education authorities at district and provincial level	Responsible for overseeing education sector performance, including implementation of school feeding, and liaising with other government departments at decentralized level	**Primary stakeholder and key informant -** on implementation of the school feeding component including on selection of schools, support processes (training), other processes and results. Will have perspective on challenges and achievements. May assist in facilitating field visits.	*School directors, administrative staff in schools, teachers, district education managers* **Group interviews**
INAS/SDMAS at district and provincial levels	Responsible for oversight of social action at district level (Note: this is usually only one person who is part of the district health office, so no selection needed)	**Primary stakeholder and key informant on** implementation, supervision and beneficiary selection, including on the inputs provided by WFP, process factors and results. Will have perspective on challenges and achievements. May assist in facilitating field visits.	INAS provincial staff involved in social protection programmes *INAS/SDMAS district officers* **Individual interviews**
District and Provincial Directorates of Health	Responsible for implementation of health plans	**Primary stakeholder and key informant -** on nutrition interventions	*Staff of health centres who received training and who provided and supervised nutrition efforts.* Staff responsible for nutrition at district and provincial level, including hospitals

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
District Reps of National Institute of Disaster **Technical Secretariat, Food and Nutrition** **Security (SETSAN)**	Responsible for building DRR capacity at grass roots	**Beneficiary -** of WFP's capacity strengthening in this area	*Staff involved in conducting vulnerability baselines, risk mapping etc., who received training or guidance directly from WFP or WFP trained trainers* **Individual interviews**
District Service for Agriculture and Extension (SDAE)	Responsible for the selection of sites for DRR assets	**Primary stakeholder and key informant**	District Engineer / Agricultural Officer **Individual interviews**
District Services for Economic Activities (SDAE)	Involved in CP field activities monitoring, profiling, selecting and training Farmers Organizations (FOs), market data collection, economical/agrarian statistical data collection	**Key informant on** FO performances and local markets, beneficiary of WFP's capacity strengthening in post-harvest management, FO capacity building, quality	**Director and staff of SDAE** **Individual interviews**
Provincial Directorate of Agriculture (DPA)	Monitoring of agricultural campaign and rural markets Promotion/divulgation of P4P opportunities	**Key informant**	***Director of DPA*** **Individual interviews**
Provincial Services of Rural Extension (SPER)	Training of Trainers (gender issues, quality, warehouse management)	**Key informant on** FO performances and local markets, beneficiary of WFP's capacity strengthening in post-harvest management, FO capacity building, quality	**Director and staff of SPER** **Individual interviews**
UN Country Team			
UNICEF	Involved in social protection policy, education, and nutrition, and WFP dialogue partner on Social protection policy	**Secondary stakeholder and Informants** - on overall context, and delivering as one. User of the evaluation report for lesson learning purposes	*Nutrition programme officer* *Education programme officer* *Social Protection officer* **Individual Interviews**

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
UNDP – Office of the Resident Coordinator	Responsible for UNDAF implementation; interested in alignment of WFP with UNDAF	**Secondary stakeholder and Informant** - on overall context, and delivering as one	*Resident coordinator or someone who represents him/her* **Individual Interviews**
WHO	Partner in the HIV/AIDS response. Strong focus on nutrition.	**Secondary stakeholder and Informant** - on overall context, health progress and priorities	*Nutrition programme officer* **Individual Interviews**
FAO, IFAD, ILO, UNESCO, UNFPA, HABITAT		**Secondary stakeholder and Informant -** on overall and aid context	Programme officers as relevant (including social protection officers) **Individual Interviews**
World Bank	Social protection partner	**Secondary stakeholder and Informant -** on overall and aid context	Programme officer as relevant (including social protection officer) **Individual Interviews**
NGOs			
International Non Governmental Organizations (NGO)	Direct responsibility for implementing interventions under the five component areas of the CP and programme related responsibilities	**Primary stakeholder and key informants** - in a position to provide information on the working relationship with WFP, the implementation of the activities, challenges faced, and will have inputs into the recommendations	*Relevant programme officers from Red Cross, World Relief, Samaritan's Purse* **Individual Interviews with at least three organizations**
Local NGOs	Direct responsibility for implementing interventions under the five component areas of the CP and programme related responsibilities	**Primary stakeholder and key informants** - in a position to provide information on the working relationship with WFP, the implementation of the activities, challenges faced, and will have inputs into the recommendations	*Relevant programme officers of Profamilia, Conselho Cristão de Moçambique (CCM), Associação Desenvolvimento Rural Mágoe, Associação Moçambicana para o Desenvolvimento da Família (AMODEFA)* **Group interview**
Donors			

Stakeholder	Interest in the evaluation	Involvement in Evaluation	Who
Funders of WFP	Funders of WFP	**Primary stakeholder and informant** - on the relationship with WFP and the priorities moving forward	CIDA – portfolio manager Belgium – portfolio manager Common Funds – Deputy Resident Coordinator for the UN **Individual interviews**
Other donors involved in the sectors supported by WFP	Observers, participants in policy discussion (from various sectors). Involved in discussions on overall priorities for the country	**Secondary stakeholders and informants** - on overall donor context	*Relevant portfolio managers at Department for International Development (DFID),* ***European Union (EU),*** *Netherlands Embassy, Irish Government, French, Italian, Norway, Sweden, Japanese Cooperation, and USAID* **Individual Interviews (at least three)**
Others			
Government of Brazil and the Brazil/WFP Centre of Excellence	Promoting rolling out of school feeding across different contexts. Key partners for the school feeding component	**Secondary stakeholder** - interested in learning from the evaluation findings on School Feeding	Key liaison person for Mozambique Daisy Vasconcelos – FNDE/ABC Brasil consultante **Individual Interviews**
Global Initiatives/ Networks	Involved in promoting nutrition in Mozambique	**Secondary stakeholder** - interested in selected findings	Focal points for REACH, SUN, GAIN at country level **Individual Interviews**

8. Annex 2. A simple tool to prioritize stakeholders

Using the mapping results in Annex 1, the EM's task will be to prioritize stakeholders and make decisions about who to engage in the evaluation, and at what level. In the mapping exercise above, stakeholders have been identified as either primary and secondary; this is a first draft of the prioritization. The following exercise will help you identify roles for stakeholders based on the needs of your evaluation. Read the instructions, and then use the matrix that follows as a tool to prioritize how and in what capacity to engage your stakeholders.

1. List the primary and secondary stakeholders from the mapping exercise. Use individual names where available.
2. Mark a "1" in each box that applies for that stakeholder:
    a. Primary
    b. Secondary
    c. Enablers: stakeholders whose (passive or active) engagement may affect other elements of the evaluation. For example, a key national government stakeholder may enable district staff to respond to surveys.
    d. Influencers:[3] stakeholders with influence on the organization, or on the reception of evaluation results in the wider context
    e. Users: stakeholders who work in or direct project implementation, including the use of results and recommendations
3. Total the points for each stakeholder. The following list serves ***only*** as a guide. As you discuss how and when to engage these stakeholders with the evaluation team and others involved with the evaluation, this score should encourage you to consider greater or lesser involvement.
    a. Four points: Include most or all such stakeholders in planning and apprise them of progress. Include some in evaluation reference groups. Interview them or include in group discussion on evaluation purpose and questions.
    b. Three points: Alert these stakeholders during preparation stages and seek input pertinent to their role. One or more may be appropriate to serve in a reference group.
    c. Two points: Engage some such stakeholders for support at needed points during the evaluation, including dissemination.
    d. One point: Include on dissemination lists or invite to wider dissemination events.

Stakeholders	Primary	Secondary	Enablers	Influencers	Users	Total

For more information on Decentralised Evaluations visit our webpage http://newgo.wfp.org/how-do-i/do-an-evaluation

Or contact OEV Cap/Qual Unit at: wfp.decentralizedevaluation@wfp.org

[3] Adapted from Kennon, Nicole, et al, AFBM Network. "Who really matters? A stakeholder analysis tool" at http://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/109602/EFS_Journal_vol_5_no_2_02_Kennon_et_al.pdf