



World Food Programme
Programme Alimentaire Mondial
Programa Mundial de Alimentos
برنامج الأغذية العالمي

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

The Executive Director

2 July 2019

Ms. Vibeke Gram Mortensen
Deputy Permanent Representative
Embassy of Denmark
Rome

Mr. Marcus A. Johnson, Jr.
Alternate Permanent Representative
Counsellor for Development Affairs, USAID
US Mission
Rome

Dear Ms. Mortensen and Mr. Johnson,

I want to thank Denmark and the United States, and you specifically, for serving as the institutional leads on the 2017–2018 Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) assessment of the World Food Programme (WFP). The teams here benefitted greatly from the thorough, engaging collaboration with the MOPAN Secretariat and the IOD Parc consultant team.

More broadly, we believe the MOPAN approach will deliver great dividends for WFP and the people we serve. MOPAN's multi-partner assessment approach makes donor monitoring and evaluation requirements much more coherent, reducing the fragmentation and expense that can come with individual donor assessments. We also greatly appreciate the improvements made in the MOPAN methodology that make it possible to have a robust evidence base for the assessment.

WFP intends to make continuous use of the MOPAN assessment. In fact, we are doing that right away, including holding an Executive Board briefing this Friday, 5 July, to discuss the assessment. We will also use it as a complement to our Annual Performance Report and the individual Annual Country Reports.

It is worth noting that this MOPAN assessment recognizes the achievements of some significant WFP reforms. We are particularly pleased that stakeholders see that the Integrated Road Map-driven strategic work we are doing with government stakeholders and partners is improving planning at the corporate and country levels. Our Strategic Plan (2017–2021) is aligned to SDG 2 and SDG 17 and we are committed to keep building on WFP's planning, budgeting and management systems to deliver results.



We are also glad to see continued recognition of how well WFP responds to the sadly increasing number of severe and protracted humanitarian emergencies. We aim, always, to be the best of the best when it comes to humanitarian response, so we especially appreciate the recognition of the support we give through our extensive field presence and our supply chain and telecommunications strengths.

But as with any thorough evaluation, there are always areas for improvement. We are at work on many of these issues already, and as our teams can tell you, I will be expecting progress on them. As you might know, we are especially focused on reforms that lead to what I call an "exit strategy," essentially the sustainable capacity WFP programmes should be building in order to hand them over. Under protection issues, we will emphasize gender and continue to focus on the work we are doing internally on gender parity. For the entire assessment, we have a more detailed response in the enclosed annex, along with a plan for how we will improve.

WFP is committed to taking the findings of the MOPAN assessment and using them to help us get even better, working in collaboration with our partners on behalf of the hungry and vulnerable around the world.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David M. Beasley". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

David M. Beasley

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE MATRIX Addressing “Unsatisfactory” Key Performance Indicators		
“Unsatisfactory” Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Synthesized Findings	Management Response and Implementing Measures
<p>Strategic Management</p> <p>KPI 2.1a: Gender equality and the empowerment of women</p>	<p>Despite the application of the gender marker, there are identified challenges in integrating gender in WFP programmes, such as the inconsistent use of guidance in programmes. WFP still has progress to make towards sufficient human and financial resources to effectively address gender issues.</p>	<p>WFP will continue the integration of gender in all programmes and activities. The Gender Division will closely work with the various divisions in the Programme and Policy Development Department to ensure systematic incorporation of Gender into guidance for VAM, Nutrition, School Feeding and Programme. The integration of Gender into VAM and other analytical tools will ensure that the CSP design is informed by gender analysis, with implementation compliance tracked through the application of GaM during monitoring.</p> <p>In addition, WFP will increase the resources allocated to gender-related activities in 2020-2022 to reach the target established by the Gender Policy; as well as ensuring that the application of GaM in the design and monitoring of CSPs will be the standard.</p> <p>Finally, WFP will prioritize the implementation of the Gender Transformation Programme to go beyond counting numbers to changing lives.</p>
<p>Strategic Management</p> <p>KPI 2.1b: Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change</p>	<p>WFP is explicit in its commitment to climate change and environment issues, however, there may be limited understanding within the organisation of the implications of the policies for interventions. Results on environment and climate provide limited evidence and environmental screening systems are not yet in place. While initial funding has been allocated for the implementation of the Environmental Policy, there are no references to resource commitments for ensuring technical capabilities in climate.</p>	<p>Implementation of the Environmental Policy is planned for 2017-2022 inclusive. To date, WFP has allocated a total of USD 1.3m in extra budgetary funds to support its implementation. The tools outlined in the policy (Environmental Standards and Screening Process, and information about the Environmental Management System (EMS)), have been published on WFPgo and are currently being mainstreamed. In 2018, 16 countries reported in their Annual Country Reports that they had undertaken some form of environmental screening. Of these, 14 did so through the crosscutting results. Structural elements of the EMS are being put in place through an Environmental manual that explains: 1. overarching processes (such as responsibilities, communication protocols, etc.); 2. steps for EMS implementation (such as the use of guidelines, standard forms, etc.); 3. where environmental guidance has been mainstreamed into specific functional areas (supply chain, emergency response, administration etc). There is also a toolkit to assist country offices to implement EMS locally. Accountability mechanisms are being developed, such as reporting through the annual performance report. Implementation of EMS is planned in a further four country operations in early 2019, in addition to the pilot site, WFP Kenya.</p>

		<p>Specific training initiatives have commenced: Environment as a cross cutting issue is noted in the Global Onboarding training for all new staff and a module on environmental management created for all new Administration staff. Training on specific topics, such as Sustainable Procurement and on hazardous waste management in motor vehicle workshops, has been delivered. A more comprehensive training plan encompassing the Environmental Standards, the screening process and EMS, is under development. WFP's EMS work builds on a longstanding UN-wide collaboration to promote environmental reporting, through the Climate Neutral UN initiative (est. 2007) and Greening the Blue report. Through these vehicles, 100% of WFP country offices report energy use and greenhouse gas emissions from their operations (premises, vehicles, and aviation) and in 2018 60% reported on waste and water management (water reporting commenced in 2017). Work is ongoing to integrate these results into the Annual Performance Report and to further expand rollout of waste and water reporting as well as taking action to reduce these environmental impacts.</p> <p>With regards to the implementation of WFP's Climate Change Policy, the organisation is responding to the need for capacity strengthening at all levels on issues related to climate risk analysis, climate risk financing, and climate change adaptation. WFP's climate and DRR programmes Unit (OSZIR) is implementing a capacity development strategy which tracks the number of staff at all levels of the organisation which receive training on climate issues. In 2017, 278 WFP programme staff at different seniority level were trained on climate issues through 8 learning and awareness raising exercises; In 2018, 509 WFP staff at different seniority levels were trained in 24 learning and awareness raising exercises.</p> <p>Another indicator that shows the growing effectiveness of climate mainstreaming in WFP is the number of CSPs that include climate-related interventions. As per April 2019, 75% of all approved CSPs include climate-related interventions (43 out of 57). 39 governments were actively supported in the scoping, design or implementation of strategic climate change adaptation proposals.</p>
<p>Strategic Management</p> <p>KPI 2.1c: Good Governance</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan 2017-21 has made reference to capacity strengthening more explicit. There is an aim to mainstream capacity strengthening under all Strategic Objectives and results, with associated indicators and targets, although this is still a work in progress. While there is no dedicated policy on good governance, there are specific policies on Capacity</p>	<p>In line with the commitments and deadlines put forth in the Management Response to the Evaluation of the WFP Policy on Capacity Development (as updated in 2009), concerted efforts are underway to establish an adequately resourced and mandated internal structure to guide the organisation in this domain and clearly articulate WFP vision and implementation approach for capacity strengthening. As planned, WFP will submit a new capacity strengthening policy (or strategy) to the Executive Board for approval in 2020.</p> <p>The policy will clearly articulate relevant roles and responsibilities, ensure commitment to quality assurance procedures and accountability mechanisms at all levels. It will build on Evaluation and internal audit findings to ensure weaknesses identified are systematically</p>

	<p>Strengthening and Emergency Preparedness. However, the evidence from evaluations has shown an inconsistent focus on capacity building of partners, mixed effectiveness of assessment mechanisms, and limited staff capacity in both quantity and skills.</p>	<p>addressed, and corporate performance enhanced over time. The policy or strategy will also outline clear plans for enhancing internal capabilities in capacity strengthening across all areas of WFP work. As a testament to WFP's commitment to enhancing performance in this area, the November 2018 revision of the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) saw the depth and breadth of corporate indicators for capacity strengthening greatly enhanced.</p> <p>Simultaneously, WFP has refined its approach to designing sustainable capacity strengthening interventions and has developed practical technical tools and guidance to support Country Offices put these efforts into practice. Continuing to work on awareness-raising and internal capability development in capacity strengthening as a robust and results-oriented discipline will continue to be a priority for 2019.</p>
<p><i>Strategic Management</i> KPI 2.1d: Human Rights</p>	<p>The Evaluation of WFP Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts concludes overall that the principles and the policy have not been effectively disseminated, do not include implementation measures and are not fully operationalised. While human rights are not explicitly referenced within discussion of the Strategic Objectives or results, or WFP's intended means of addressing these, there is some limited evidence of the use of rights language in some indicators.</p>	<p>WFP's efforts to promote human rights is captured under its approach to protection that is aligned to the key principles of the human rights-based approach. As such, the WFP's Protection Policy (2012) provides a framework for WFP's contribution to human rights.</p> <p>Following the evaluation of the Protection Policy that was presented to the Executive Board in June 2018, WFP is embarking on a consultative process to formulate an updated policy on protection. In this context, the issue of human rights will be more directly explored.</p>
<p><i>Strategic Management</i> KPI: 2.1 Protection</p>	<p>The Evaluation of WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (May 2018) found mixed results with regard to implementation. There is still a recognised need for further resources to ensure that protection issues are included consistently.</p>	<p>Building on the recommendations of the evaluation of WFP's humanitarian protection policy, WFP has developed a new strategy for the integration of protection that will guide the organization's focus and work while a new policy is being formulated. The new strategy encompasses protection and accountability to affected populations along with making inclusion of people with disability a more explicit component of protection work.</p> <p>The strategy comprises four strategic areas for accelerated action focusing on the ability of field operations to substantively operationalise protection, the development of partnerships to ensure stronger integration of protection, putting systems and processes in place that support effective and accountable action, and ensuring the right capacity at country, regional, and headquarter levels. Under this strategy, work is already under way to strengthen WFP's ability to analyse protection risks and implement mitigating measures</p>

		and enhance the systematic use of mechanisms to ensure two-way communication with affected people. In parallel to the implementation of the strategy, a consultative field-based process has been launched to feed into the formulation of an updated Protection Policy for the organisation.
<p>Operational Management</p> <p>The MOPAN methodology does not include a specific KPI for this area; however, this observation was made by the MOPAN Secretariat during the de-brief and launch sessions.</p>	<p>Challenges remain in securing the required numbers and skillsets in the right places. Meeting humanitarian staff requirements is a constant challenge, despite investment in building surge capacity. The number of consultants hired has increased, and the workforce includes a high proportion of short-term staff. Exploring new approaches is therefore essential – one area currently being looked at is the localisation of long-term expertise. Strategic workforce planning tools and guidance were being finalised at the time of this assessment, but these have not yet been applied systematically.</p>	<p>WFP presented a new corporate framework on Workforce Planning to the Executive Board at the end of October 2018, where they subsequently requested to implement and scale-up the framework. The framework model is skills-based, future-focused and aligned to the Country Strategic Plans and Functional Policies. The results of the framework will enable the development of relevant HR initiatives, from recruitment to learning and development or talent deployment, to identifying strategic opportunities. In the past year, WFP has achieved some important milestones. In support of the Integrated Road Map implementation, HR initiated an ‘Organization Alignment Project’ aimed at ensuring “the right organisational structures, talent and skills are in place to support and achieve their Country Strategic Plan”. In 2018, WFP partnered and piloted this approach with Nutrition. In 2019, the pilot will be completed and will be expanding to other key WFP functional areas. In order to complete the exercise, the right level of investment in a technology platform is required, in addition to adequate human resources to lead the exercise in all functional areas, including HR. Transitioning to systematic workforce planning across all functions will take several years to implement fully.</p>
<p>Operational Management</p> <p>KPI: 3.4HR systems and policies performance based and geared to the achievement of results</p>	<p>The People Strategy and WFP’s performance management system do not explicitly outline the process for managing disagreement and complaints relating to staff performance assessments. While management information indicates that the PACE system involves a clear and systematised process for managing disagreements between staff and their management, as well as the existence of a recourse procedure, there is evidence that not all staff experience the process in this way.</p>	<p>The People Strategy helped to guide approaches to performance management, and a number of related processes and policies were put in place, including clear guidelines to managing disagreements in performance assessments. Guidance and information on this topic are available to all staff on WFP’s intranet. In addition, for staff to build a shared understanding in this area, throughout late 2017 and 2018, HR ran an extensive outreach campaign on how to effectively address underperformance, and these sessions included information on how to address situations when there are disagreements between staff and supervisors.</p> <p>Staff are afforded the opportunity to raise any disagreements during each stage of the performance appraisal cycle. At the PACE end of year review, for example, the staff member can include his/her own self-assessment, can comment on the first level supervisor’s final review before the second level endorsement and provide inputs after the input of the second level supervisor.</p> <p>In terms of the more detailed steps and processes, in case of a disagreement between the staff member and the first level supervisor, the staff member can raise his concerns with</p>

		<p>the second level supervisor. The second level supervisor can request the first level supervisor to amend or modify any of the content of the assessment. For national staff, before the Country Director makes the final decision as the second level supervisor, the PACE is reviewed by the Management Review Committee (MRC), which is a panel in each Country Office that provides a thorough review, assesses any issues raised by the staff member and makes the final recommendation to the Country Director/Regional Director.</p> <p>The recourse procedure, which was updated in late 2016 as part of the renewed approach to underperformance, provides opportunity to address significant flaws in the performance assessment process. In case the staff member's performance has been rated as "unsatisfactory" the staff member can request to have the PACE reviewed by a committee with members appointed by the management, staff association and HR. To complement these processes and procedures, there are other informal channels to raise concerns and disagreements such as the Ombudsman, Respectful Workplace Advisers (RWA), Staff Counsellors and HR focal points.</p>
<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 5.3: Capacity analysis informs intervention design and implementation, and strategies to address any weakness found are employed</p>	<p>Successive Operations Evaluations Syntheses find that WFP's intervention designs increasingly prioritise capacity development of national partners. This, however, is not yet supported by a clear statement of the capacities of national implementing partners and country capacity assessments are not systematically conducted through joint analysis.</p>	<p>Significant progress has been made in this area since the Evaluation of the Capacity Development Policy. The National Capacity Index is no longer in use and has been replaced by a more robust and more operationally relevant tool and methodology. Furthermore, the tool and guidance to support national stakeholder capacity assessment ("Capacity Needs Mapping") are grounded in a comprehensive Theory of Change for Capacity Strengthening and a robust conceptual model and framework for operationalising capacity strengthening support. The guidance underpinning the capacity assessment process focusses extensively on a participatory, stakeholder-driven process and provides very clear guidance on articulating realistic and measurable capacity outcome statements in which to anchor effective operationalisation. These very clearly address the "what" whilst the capacity strengthening framework clearly articulates the "how" of WFP's support to national stakeholder capacities. After extensive field testing of the latest tools and approach to capacity assessment over the past few years, the core HQ Capacity Strengthening team is articulating an internal Learning and Development plan and an internal Communications Strategy for Capacity Strengthening that will support internal awareness raising of the above and contribute to internal capability development to support effective utilisation of this approach across the organisation.</p>

<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 5.5: Intervention designs include the analysis of cross-cutting issues (as defined in KPI 2)</p>	<p>Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation is clear that outcomes and outputs must integrate cross-cutting issues, however, environmental sustainability is lightly integrated.</p>	<p>WFP's first wave of CSPs has pre-dated the approval of WFP's Environmental and Climate Change policies. Since these policies were approved, all CSPs were reviewed by Policy and Programme staff (OSZIR) to strengthen content related to the integration and mainstreaming of climate issues. As a result, and in conjunction with a dedicated capacity strengthening campaign, 76% of all approved CSPs now incorporate climate-related issues and actions (25% of which are also tagging the corresponding activities in COMET).</p> <p>In addition, in 2018, Annual Country Reports were reviewed at Regional Bureau and HQ level to strengthen Environmental and Climate Change inputs. 16 countries reported the use of an environmental screening instrument, using either a national government tool, WFP's draft tool (available from October 2018) or other methods.</p>
<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 5.6: Intervention designs include detailed and realistic measures to ensure sustainability (as defined in KPI 12)</p>	<p>Evaluations find continued weakness in the extent that WFP interventions prepare for transition and sustainability. There are significant gaps in developing and implementing adequate transition strategies.</p>	<p>This weakness was noted during several Informal Consultations at the beginning of the IRM/CSP process. Countries were advised to strengthen this aspect of the CSP from the design process using the Theory of Change and other forward-looking techniques. Work is also ongoing to strengthen WFP's work and tools on capacity strengthening to provide for better and more realistic handover strategies of activities, mostly related to Root Causes and Resilience Building focus areas. Work on handover during emergencies is also ongoing. WFP is currently undertaking analyses to better understand the key shifts CSPs lead to in different contexts, including in sustainability and handover. These analyses will feed into the reflexions on the second generation of CSPs and Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews.</p> <p>CSPs are focusing more on capacity strengthening related to national policies and laws; however, for instance, on the sustainability issues, it remains something that WFP needs to continue prioritizing to ensure adequate policy environment for its CSPs.</p> <p>WFP has also made significant investment in acquiring staff with appropriate skills for a sustained investment in policy reform in many countries. WFP will need to continue its efforts to capitalize on best practices to expand this knowledge and replicate where possible. WFP is looking at further strengthening how Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews identify policy gaps and make recommendations to address these.</p>

<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 6.4: Strategies or designs identify synergies, to encourage leverage/catalytic use of resources and avoid fragmentation</p>	<p>WFP needs a comprehensive forward-looking strategy to partner with the private sector.</p>	<p>Throughout 2018 WFP laid the groundwork to reset the development of a new corporate Private Sector Partnership and Fundraising Strategy in-line with WFP’s goal of diversifying funding resources and leveraging government donations more efficiently through strategic partnering with the private sector. Following the initial work conducted in Autumn 2017-May 2018, WFP took a collaborative approach to the development of the Executive Board Paper, consulting with its Board, Functional units, Regional Bureaus and Country Offices to ensure broad support and contributions; as well as engaging the Boston Consulting Group to support processes. To allow for the inclusion of the newly joining Assistant Executive Director, the delivery date of the Strategy, originally scheduled for June 2019, shifted to November. With list meetings commencing in February, and Informal Board Consultations in March and April 2019, the draft strategy is on track for scheduled presentation for Board approval in November 2019.</p> <p>The new strategy will be a WFP corporate approach that will include a clear demonstration for strengthening private sector engagement through non-financial and financial contributions to WFP programmes with a timeline showing what amounts can be achieved by when, and the corresponding investments required based on the organization’s needs. The Strategy is organized around Impact, Income and Innovation to leverage private sector in the area of technical partnerships, fundraising and in exploring development areas of private sector engagement.</p> <p>While the development process for the new Strategy has been ongoing, WFP continued to execute regional and function-specific private sector workplans and has in place a Private Sector Partnerships and Fundraising Strategy – Transition Plan. In 2018, WFP surpassed the 2018 target of USD 80 million by achieving USD 86 million from partnerships with key corporate and foundation partners. In addition to cash support, WFP received support in the form of technical expertise, market knowledge, business processes and innovations that strengthen WFP’s capacity to achieve its Strategic Objectives.</p>
<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 6.5: Key business practices (planning, design, implementation, monitoring and reporting) co-ordinated with other relevant partners (donors, UN agencies, etc.)</p>	<p>Full alignment of WFP planning cycles to those of the government, sister agencies and other key strategic frameworks in countries is still a work in progress. While WFP participates in joint evaluations, these are not widely commissioned</p>	<p>The ongoing UN Reform process will align WFP’s CSPs with the new United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF, or ex-UNDAF). In this context, WFP will align its programme cycle with other UN system agencies and, in the context of the Reform, undertake common analysis with sister UN agencies of the drivers of food insecurity and malnutrition, develop collective outcomes, and develop UN-wide benchmarks against which to measure performance against the SDG goals and national priorities. WFP has already begun the process of developing guidance for COs on how to position the organisation at country level vis-à-vis national priorities as well as forging stronger partnerships with dual mandated agencies such as UNICEF and WHO.</p>

		<p>In 2018, WFP explored further opportunities for joint decentralized evaluations with other United Nations agencies, NGOs and government partners. In addition, OEV has been a very active member of the inter-agency humanitarian evaluation steering group since the group's inception and plays a central role in positioning the group in the updated inter-agency standing committee structure. Inter-agency humanitarian evaluations are expected to play an increasingly critical role in the context of the system-wide humanitarian evaluations for strengthening learning and enhancing accountability to affected people, national governments, donors and the public.</p> <p>During the year, five joint evaluations were completed and another five were ongoing, representing a significant increase in joint decentralized evaluations since 2016. In addition, OEV and the Regional Bureau for Southern Africa organized a learning workshop in 2018 with eight partner organizations aimed at informing the further development of WFP guidance on joint evaluations in 2019 and contributing to the improvement of joint evaluation practice. OEV is also actively engaged with other members of UNEG on UNDAF evaluations in support of the 2030 Agenda. Building on the progress made in 2018, OEV will continue to contribute to improved practice in joint evaluations in 2019.</p>
<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 6.7: Clear standards and procedures for accountability to beneficiaries implemented</p>	<p>Clear standards and procedures for accountability to beneficiaries through beneficiary management guidance and more systematic reporting on cross-cutting results need to be implemented.</p>	<p>WFP's new Protection and Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) Strategy 2019-2021, specifically includes a focus on developing, adjusting, and adapting corporate systems, processes and tools to ensure field level implementation is strategic and accountable. This will entail an update of the policy framework covering protection, but also establishing stronger knowledge management systems for protection and AAP to facilitate the documentation and dissemination of learning. Efforts to strengthen WFP's corporate reporting system to better capture qualitative aspects of AAP have already been initiated by updating its corporate indicators for performance on receipt and utilization of feedback from affected people, as well as reinforcing the key performance indicator on complaints and feedback mechanisms.</p>
<p>Relationship Management</p> <p>KPI: 6.9: Deployment of knowledge base to support programming adjustments, policy dialogue and/or advocacy</p>	<p>There is an acknowledged gap in WFP's corporate knowledge production and management.</p>	<p>WFP's vision for knowledge management is to create, access, retain and share knowledge internally and externally. The knowledge management framework focuses on three key components – people, processes, and systems – and is enabled by cultural change and strong leadership engagement. This framework is in line with recent Joint Inspection Unit recommendations, with an emphasis on staff as the foundation for knowledge management, technology as a supporting enabler, and the necessity of fostering an</p>

organisational culture that enables and rewards the creation and dissemination of valuable knowledge.

The fundamental elements of WFP’s knowledge management systems are in place, including a newly revamped intranet (WFPgo), an internal peer-to-peer communication platform (WFP Communities) and a dedicated learning channel (WeLearn), as well as an overarching high-level strategy for knowledge management. However, implementation of the strategy has not been resourced corporately, and the people and process components of knowledge management have been largely ad-hoc efforts at the individual divisional and regional levels. WFP has therefore not yet achieved an overall critical mass of activities.

Additionally, WFP facilitates knowledge exchanges between developing countries through South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC). In WFP’s Global South-South Cooperation Action Plan 2019/2020, knowledge management is referred as an integral part of WFP efforts in SSTC under Priority Activity 4 (“Internal awareness raising, knowledge management and expanding WFP’s community of practitioners in SSTC”). WFP efforts in SSTC aim to equip host governments with knowledge, including technology and expertise, to strengthen their efforts to achieve food security and nutrition. In practice, WFP helps countries identify gaps in knowledge and potential partners that can share expertise/good practices and help them to implement win-win partnerships.

Under the SSTC function, WFP applies a methodology known as “South-South review” that helps WFP Country Offices identify, formulate and prioritize the top South-South investment opportunities that help to implement outcomes under WFP’s Country Strategic Plans. WFP also facilitates regional SSTC mappings which match country demands to providers and their offers within different regions. WFP engages with a vibrant online community of SSTC practitioners, and has a quarterly newsletter to keep WFP’s Executive Board members and colleagues at country, regional and global level abreast of the latest SSTC initiatives.

WFP recognizes the need for a more integrated approach to both internal and external knowledge management activities, including working with WFP’s leadership to embed a culture of learning and sharing of best practices, particularly in the context of operations. This has been explicitly recognized in WFP’s proposed new organization structure, in which the corporate responsibility for knowledge management will rest with the Innovation and Knowledge Management Division. Future plans include piloting and establishing innovative channels for knowledge creation and sharing at regional and national levels; institutionalizing the role of Communities of Practices around thematic

		areas such as nutrition, school feeding, and cash transfers, as well as business operations linked to the UN Reform; curating and sharing best practices around new approaches and learnings on recent innovations/new practices across all locations to increase capture of knowledge, improve staff learning, organizational agility, efficiency and effectiveness.
<p>Performance Management</p> <p>KPI: 7.1: Leadership ensures application of an organisation-wide RBM approach</p>	<p>The CRF is a work in progress. It remains to be seen how the Indicator Compendium guidance will be used in planning and programming. Further work is required to align the existing tools once the CRF is revised, and it remains to be seen how effectively these tools will be used.</p>	<p>The revised CRF, approved in November 2018, is accompanied by updates to existing guidance, tools, and the indicator compendium. The WFP monitoring system has been in place since the previous results framework and includes tools that are well known and regularly used by M&E officers. In conjunction with the roll-out of the CRF, a series of webinars were conducted by the various programme technical units for RB and CO M&E Officers. It is currently posted in the monitoring WeLearn platform and ensures the capacity development of all monitoring staff. WFP has worked to ensure that all logframes are realigned to the revised CRF and reporting on 2019 will correspond to the revised CRF.</p>
<p>Performance Management</p> <p>KPI: 7.3: Results targets set based on a sound evidence base and logic</p>	<p>There is still work to be done to ensure that the outcome and output categories are broad enough to capture the linkages between interventions and outcomes at the level of country strategic plans. The indicators are not sufficiently broad ranging to capture the intended results. The CRF is currently under significant revision.</p>	<p>Outcome and output categories are formulated broadly to demonstrate the results of different types of interventions. The linkages between different types of interventions are reflected in the free-text Strategic Outcome and Output statement and outcome/output indicators are selected to demonstrate those results. In the revised CRF, the outcome indicators are presented by programme area and are not linked to specific outcome categories, to better reflect the different results WFP is contributing to within each broad Strategic Outcome category--for instance, the Strategic outcome category 1.1, 'Maintained/enhanced individual and household access to food'. Linkages are further reflected qualitatively in the CSP and ACR narratives. The revision to the CRF also provides a list of SDG-related indicators and adds new indicators in areas where there were gaps, for example, in results related to SDG 17 for country capacity strengthening and partnerships. There is also a new indicator added that reflects basic needs, the Economic Capacity to Meet Essential Needs. In addition, the revised CRF provides the flexibility to continue developing and strengthening programme and management performance indicators.</p>
<p>Performance Management</p> <p>KPI: 7.4: Monitoring systems generate high quality and useful performance data</p>	<p>Work is underway in WFP to further develop and test outcome level indicators that can be used at the national level for the CRF and further work will be needed to develop systems in line with this revised framework. The capacity to be able to carry out monitoring effectively at the country level still needs to be</p>	<p>The Corporate Monitoring Strategy 2018 - 2021 was shared in the previous year and has three priority areas of work related to 1) adequate monitoring expertise, 2) financial commitment, and 3) functional capacity. It is designed to address observed weaknesses in WFP's monitoring while moving towards its vision for an optimised monitoring function defined by credibility, relevance and use through robust and evidence-based operational planning, design and implementation.</p> <p>On data quality assurance, the COMET monitoring module is currently under development. Changes are also being made in the COMET system to improve data quality</p>

	<p>strengthened. Considerable work will be needed once the CRF is revised to ensure that data collected is adequate to provide a clear picture of corporate results.</p>	<p>and reduce errors. There is currently development undergoing of a dashboard to help HQ and RB improve oversight over CO monitoring data. To be noted, WFP is still in a transition period with some countries in a project environment and others in a CSP environment. This poses some challenges with aggregation for reporting. For the improvement of monitoring data, the revised CRF has further developed cross-cutting indicators, capacity strengthening, partnerships and output indicators, some of which are being piloted. Additional guidance and updated tools have also been developed to guide country offices on qualitative monitoring and process monitoring.</p>
<p><i>Performance Management</i></p> <p>KPI: 7.5: Performance data transparently applied in planning and decision-making</p>	<p>WFP has considerably strengthened its commitment to a results-based focus, but continued attention is needed to ensure the quality and use of data on which the system is based. It was felt that categories and indicators in particular were insufficiently comprehensive to capture the intended results of WFP's work.</p>	<p>For process, output and outcome monitoring at country level, there are systems in place to ensure that issues are addressed in a timely and effective manner. To undertake process monitoring, many countries have follow-up action matrices which are populated and assign responsibility for follow-up. There are also developed systems in place that ensure that any process monitoring data and information is being acted upon. Output data is very closely followed up upon, with distribution reports completed monthly and outcome information reported on through regular monitoring reports and the Annual Country Reports. While the CSP Mid-term Reviews will be implemented mainly for CO learning, the guidance outlines that there should be a mechanism in place to ensure adequate follow-up for the recommendations at the responsibility of CO programme and management.</p>

<p>Performance Management</p> <p>KPI: 8.4: Mandatory demonstration of the evidence base to design new interventions</p>	<p>While there is reporting on the overall commitment to mainstream lessons learned in the Annual Performance Reports, neither the number nor proportion of new operations that draw on lessons is recorded or made public.</p>	<p>In addition to the corporate and decentralized evaluations that offer evidence to support new programmes, CSPs are also underpinned by the Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews. The latter are government-led and provide the national context analysis and evidence to identify and prioritise the planned CSP activities. The Strategic Reviews are complemented with specific impact assessments that serve as a baseline for new interventions (i.e., micro-insurance, blockchain), or proof of concept efforts. As the IRM becomes a more mature process, the premium put on evidence and analytics is expected to increase, not only for CSP design, but also as a way to measure performance.</p> <p>From 2019, OEV will introduce a KPI for gauging whether the use of evidence in a CSP or interim CSP meets or exceeds requirements.</p> <p>The formulation of CSPs and ICSPs provided an unprecedented opportunity to use evaluation evidence in the design of programmes and long-term adjustments to them. In 2018, Regional evaluation officers and OEV continued to map evidence from recent global and country-level evaluations and identified ways of strengthening the evidence base for informing decisions regarding future programme design and implementation. For instance, four regional bureaux produced summaries of evaluation findings aimed at supporting country offices with evaluative evidence for the design of their new CSPs. With financial support from OEV, regional evaluation officers supported innovative initiatives for the dissemination of decentralized evaluation reports and participated in regional workshops by sharing evaluation findings on specific themes.</p> <p>To help fill the gap in knowledge management mentioned in the MOPAN report, OEV commissioned a synthesis of WFP’s country portfolio evaluations in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa in order to identify findings and lessons, particularly those applicable in fragile contexts and conflict settings. The synthesis covers eight country portfolio evaluations completed between 2016 and 2018 in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Somalia and South Sudan. The synthesis report will be presented to the Board for consideration at its 2019 annual session. Plans for 2019 include a synthesis of lessons from policy evaluations.</p> <p>In 2018, OEV updated an analysis of ten policy evaluations conducted between 2008 and 2018 and actively disseminated the synthesis of the top ten lessons concerning policy formulation and practicalities in WFP and at the European Evaluation Society Conference OEV will continue to develop capacities for synthesizing evaluative evidence in order to enhance its use and will build on its experience by producing further products specifically to address evidence gaps and meet learning needs.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Performance Management</p> <p>KPI: 8.5: Poorly performing interventions proactively identified, tracked and addressed</p>	<p>The Corporate Monitoring Strategy Workstream on Utilising Monitoring states that APPs should be conducted six-monthly to assess progress to date, there is no detail provided specifically on poor performance, with the statement rather that, where targets had not been met, some progress had been made.</p>	<p>The revised CRF further develops the management performance approach. Management performance is measured by functional area. Business processes are grouped by expertise under the functional areas, which enables the implementation of CSP activities. Annual Performance Plans articulate the deliverables and resources required in each functional area to support programme implementation. There are Key Performance Indicators related to results included in the revised CRF on the overall progress in country strategic plan implementation that considers the percentage of outcome and output indicators with implementation and outcome and output indicators that achieve targets or are on track.</p>
<p>Results</p> <p>KPI: 9.5: Interventions assessed as having helped improve environmental sustainability/helped tackle the effects of climate change</p>	<p>Environmental sustainability has only recently become a focus of WFP programming, particularly in its work around natural and disaster risk management. Results for climate change and sustainability remain peripheral to core programming.</p>	<p>WFP has measured resilience impacts of the R4 Rural Resilience initiative through application of the Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA-II) tool. The RIMA-II methodology is a quantitative approach that allows to explain why and how some households cope with shocks and stressors better than others do. RIMA-II directly measures resilience through the Resilience Capacity Index (RCI) and the Resilience Structure Matrix (RSM). Results are available for Malawi and Kenya, confirming a tangible and quantifiable contribution by WFP's R4 programme to greater climate resilience of vulnerable communities.</p> <p>In parallel, the WFP evaluation office is developing a dedicated impact evaluation window for climate and resilience programs, which will be operationalized in 2019.</p> <p>Lastly, the joint Inspection Unit of the UN Secretariat has appraised the contributions of all UN agencies to Disaster Risk Reduction and singled out WFP among the top 3 UN agencies (together with UNDP and FAO) that make the most substantive contribution. Further assessments will be undertaken by UN DRR (formerly UNISDR) on an annual basis.</p>
<p>Results</p> <p>KPI: 9.7: Interventions assessed as having helped improve human rights</p>	<p>WFP's effects on improving human rights through its interventions are not systematically considered in evaluations.</p>	<p>WFP's efforts to promote human rights is captured under its approach to protection that is aligned to the key principles of the human rights-based approach and is further supported by its commitments to accountability to affected people (AAP) that are a core element of a human rights-based approach. The Protection Policy Evaluation has highlighted a number of achievements across both of these areas and pointed to areas where more focus is needed. WFP's Strategy on Protection and AAP 2019-2020 outlines WFP's efforts over the next coming years for how existing gaps will be closed. A key part of this strategy is to ensure that protection and AAP commitments are implemented in country operations.</p>

<p>Results</p> <p>KPI: 9.8: Interventions assessed as having helped improve protection</p>	<p>Although protection is a cross-cutting concern for WFP’s interventions, intended to inform all aspects of WFP’s response, evaluations do not systematically assess the extent WFP has addressed protection in its interventions.</p>	<p>WFP efforts in recent years under the Humanitarian Protection Policy (2012) and the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action (2016) have brought solid gains. The results of surveys conducted in 2016 and 2017 highlights consistent progresses in a number of areas. In particular, in country, capacity has been augmented with 56 Country Offices reported having appointed Protection specific staff or focal points. Five regional bureau had Humanitarian Advisors in place. Corporate indicators on protection have consistently indicated a high rate of country offices meeting targets for protection. In 2018, the figure was 98 percent.</p> <p>Building on the recommendations of the evaluation of WFP’s humanitarian protection policy, WFP developed a new strategy for the integration of protection that will guide the organization’s focus and work while a new policy is being formulated. Through the operationalization of the strategy, WFP’s presence and programmes will support affected people’s ability to meet their food needs in a safe, accountable, and dignified manner that respects their integrity. The new strategy will encompass protection and accountability to affected populations along with making inclusion of people with disability a more explicit component of protection work.</p> <p>With an overall focus on strengthening implementation of protection and AAP commitments in country operations, the strategy encompasses four strategic areas for accelerated action: analysis and implementation support, the development of the right partnerships for food security and protection outcomes, putting systems and processes in place that support effective and accountable action, and ensuring the right capacity country, regional, and headquarter levels.</p>
<p>Results</p> <p>KPI: 12.1: Benefits assessed as continuing or likely to continue after project or programme completion or there are effective measures to link the humanitarian relief operations to recovery, resilience and, eventually, to longer-term developmental results</p>	<p>The transition from humanitarian relief operations to longer-term development results are mixed, but overall there is limited likelihood of benefits continuing after the project/programme completion or WFP leaving the context. The plans for transition or handover to national stakeholders are not always clearly planned and implemented from the outset.</p>	<p>The majority of WFP’s large-scale responses are in protected emergencies where handover to authorities could be a catalyst for additional conflict. Pursuing a conflict sensitive approach whereby ‘do no harm’ is the minimum standard, WFP’s ability to implement handover plans that ‘reduce need’ is constrained by political factors, funding and partnerships. Until 2017 WFP’s planning envelop was programme dependent and between 2-3 years. The CSP process combined with a Zero Hunger Strategic Review provides WFP with a 15-year window and a 5-year programme cycle to engage more substantially with national, development and IFI actors to better embed WFP’s interventions within a longer-term programme of work. This provides greater oversight and granularity for WFP to plan from a longer perspective handover. In addition, SDG17 also provides WFP’s with the tools to consider handover through capacity strengthening (modality, objective and goal) within the planning framework of the CSP. The vision of the</p>

		<p>Secretary General and subsequent UN reforms being rolled out require stronger internal and external integration across the humanitarian-development-peace community.</p>
--	--	---

The tensions between humanitarian and development principles can lead to potential complications between the humanitarian and development nexus, including, where possible the contribution to peace.