

WFP's Private Sector Partnership and Fundraising Strategy: An Evaluation

Vol. II - Annexes

September 2012

Commissioned by the

Office of Evaluation

Measuring Results, Sharing Lessons

Prepared by the team of le Groupe-conseil Baastel ltée, composed of:

John Markie, Team Leader

Andrew Tulchin, Specialist in Private Sector Resource Mobilization

Annemarie Hoogendorn, Specialist in Evaluation and Nutrition

Greg Vaz, Specialist in Logistics in Emergencies

With support from: Laure Belotti, Research support

Report number: OE/2012/010



World Food Programme

Table of Contents

Annex 1: Overview of Evaluation Methodology and Methods	1
Annex 2: Questionnaire and Interview Analyses	16
Annex 3: Suggestions Included in the Evaluation in Addition to the Recommendations	26
Annex 4: Additional Secondary Source Tabular Data on WFP Private and Voluntary Resources and on the Resource Mobilization Context	31
Annex 5: Persons Interviewed	40
Annex 6: Bibliography	49
Annex 7: The Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact	61
Annex 8: Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	62
Annex 9: Evaluation Team Members Curricula Vitae	63

Annex 1: Overview of Evaluation Methodology and Methods

Table of Contents

Evaluation Features	1
Evaluation Approach and Methods	5
Thematic working papers	5
Comparators	5
Questionnaire Surveys	5
Interviews	6
Analysis of Secondary Data	9
Dialogue and opportunity for WFP managers and staff to challenge the findings and recommendations	11
Appendix to Annex 1 – Sample Interview Check Lists	12

Evaluation Features

1. The evaluation concerns the overarching policy and strategy level of WFP and applies the methodology of WFP policy evaluation. It is designed to serve both accountability and learning and has as its purposes:

- Assess and report on the quality and results of the 2008 Private-Sector Fundraising and Partnership Strategy as well as the earlier principles approved by WFP’s Executive Board in 2004¹ and associated operations and activities to implement the Strategy (accountability); and
- Determine the reasons why changes expected to occur as a result of the Strategy did or did not actually occur to draw lessons that should help in updating the existing Strategy (not replacing it) and in its implementation (learning).

2. The Strategy addresses private-sector companies, the general public and high-net-worth individuals. It also covers what in much of Europe are referred to as donor NGOs and what are referred to in the USA as “not-for-profits”. It excludes WFP commercial relationships with the private sector. The evaluation addressed four key questions:

- a. What is the quality of the Strategy?
- b. What were the results of the Strategy?
- c. How did the Strategy produced the results?
- d. How can WFP’s Strategy and approach to private-sector fund raising and partnership be improved for the future?

3. The evaluation final design was based on the inception report. An **Evaluation Matrix** developed in the inception report is shown in Table 1 below. It lists the main evaluation questions or areas of analysis, the data sources and the targets where they were indicated in the original strategy (2008).

¹ New Partnerships to Meet Rising Needs – Expanding the WFP Donor Base, WFP EB, October 2004

Annex 1 – Table 1: Summary Evaluation Matrix

Questions – areas of analysis		Data Sources (means of verification)				Targets Where Indicated in Strategy	Principal criteria Applied with Rigorous Triangulation of Data Sources
		Questionnaires to WFP and private sector	Interviews by telephone and face to face	WFP Central Data Bases	Documents and Literature		
1. What is the quality of the Strategy?							
1.1	Strategy is clearly placed in WFP's objectives and policy framework		X		X		How well does the Strategy compare with others in WFP and other organizations and with best practice in terms of coverage, precision and implementability
1.2	Comparison to the UN standards for public private (and any others identified)		X		X		
1.3	Comparison with strategy of comparators (UNICEF, UNHCR, UNDP)		X		X		
1.4	Comparison of strategy as implemented for resource mobilization with comparators inc. NGOs		X		X		
1.5	Evolution of strategy				X		
1.6	Relation to other WFP strategies and policies				X		
1.7	Extent to which the Strategy takes into account gender, inter-generational issues and the rights of the child		X		X		
2. What were the Results of the Strategy ?							
2.1	Extent of resource expansion and from where			X		By 2017 raise US\$270 million per year of which \$70 million in kind and \$200 million in cash – Of cash \$50 million multilateral unallocated	Progress on meeting the targets specified in the Strategy. Overall results in terms of resources, extent to which those resources were applied in line with WFP priorities and any results to which the resources have a plausible line of contribution in terms of
2.2	Conformity of resource allocation to WFP priorities (country, undernourished, women and children, type of intervention)	X	X	X	X	Strategy aimed to work in WFP priority areas actively seeking partnership in these areas	
2.3	Improved efficiency response times, capacity, etc	X	X	costs		Identified as an aim in the Strategy	
2.4	Increased awareness and visibility for WFP and the hunger agenda	X	X		X	Identified as an aim in the Strategy	

Questions – areas of analysis		Data Sources (means of verification)				Targets Where Indicated in Strategy	Principal criteria Applied with Rigorous Triangulation of Data Sources
		Questionnaires to WFP and private sector	Interviews by telephone and face to face	WFP Central Data Bases	Documents and Literature		
2.5	Relevance of strategy as implemented to implementing WFP's Strategic Plan and achieving Objectives	X	X	Fund allocation	X		improved WFP performance and/or benefits in countries for the poor and hungry
2.6	Overall implications for WFP results	X	X	X	X		
2.7	Ethical and reputational risk and the image of WFP	X	X		X	Recognised as an issue in the Strategy	
3. How has the Strategy produced the results?							
3.1	Modalities of fund raising and of partnership	X	X	X	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-60% from corporations and 40-50% from individuals and foundations Active engagement of country and regional offices 	Vigorous triangulation and presentation of the qualitative and, where appropriate, quantitative data to support balanced findings will be of the essence. The quantification using scales of the questionnaire and interview responses will assist this process
3.2	Organizational structure, staffing and responsibilities	X	X	Actual structure			
3.3	Management and Governance	X	X		X		
3.4	Organizational systems, procedures, management overhead levels and distribution etc.	X	X	X	X	WFP's total costs of raising and administering private-sector funds will be well under 25% (average 13% + 7% PSA)	
3.5	Partnerships Institutionalized for long-term relationships between the donor and WFP in relationships which may be multi-faceted	X	X	Agreement	X	Recruit around 15 global partners willing to engage in a multi-year, multi-faceted relationship	
3.6	Ethical and reputational risk	X	X		X	Application of Executive Board Approved Criteria for screening Companies	
3.7	WFP Culture	X	X				
3.8	Priorities and philosophy of partners – characteristics of partnership for results	X	X		X		
3.9	Cooperation and Competition with other agencies for private-sector resources including NGOs	X	X		X		

Questions – areas of analysis		Data Sources (means of verification)				Targets Where Indicated in Strategy	Principal criteria Applied with Rigorous Triangulation of Data Sources
		Questionnaires to WFP and private sector	Interviews by telephone and face to face	WFP Central Data Bases	Documents and Literature		
4. What are the potentials and future prospects for mobilization and application to WFP's programmes of funds from the private sector and general public?							
4.1	Are there any fundamental questions for the overall direction of the strategy which currently emphasises support through WFP to increase the Programme's direct impacts on beneficiaries rather than on a more normative strategy designed to influence the private sector to reduce its own negative impacts and increase its positive impacts on hunger and malnutrition	X	X		X		This question will have to be addressed in the context of WFP's mandate and how it relates to the normative mandates of other agencies and non duplication of effort in the UN system Global trends, experience of WFP and comparators. Attitude of private-sector partners. Capacity for change within WFP
4.2	Implications of changing patterns of official development and emergency assistance	X	X		X		
4.3	Opportunities for private giving and the lessons to be drawn from comparators – Any additional potentials WFP has as a UN agency with non traditional private sector		X		X		
4.4	Strengthening the link between advocacy and fund raising		X		X		
4.5	Matching organizational priorities to fund availability lessons from comparators and in WFP	X	X		X		
4.6	Investment – Could there be any role in WFP for complementary local private investment		X		X		
4.7	Governance of comparators and any role of the private sector		X		X		
4.8	Overall future prospects and opportunities for funding	X	X	X	X		

Evaluation Approach and Methods

Thematic working papers:

4. The evaluation produced a series of working papers which address within their topic each of the four main evaluation questions with which they were matrixed in the Inception Report. The working papers provided much of the basis for the final report. They remained at the level of working papers, i.e. they are not intended to be published documents. In this context, it should be noted that individual papers could draw conclusions on their evidence base which were not found to be justified when all the evidence from the thematic papers and other sources was triangulated together. Not all the working papers envisaged in the inception report could eventually be prepared separately and several were subsumed into the drafting section of the final report. The papers produced covered: Evidence was analysed in a set of working papers. These do not form part of the evaluation but provided much of the basis for its findings. Several of the working papers envisaged in the Inception Report were combined or treated in the preparation of draft sections of the Evaluation Report itself. The completed working papers covered:

- a. Trends in global fund mobilization from non-governmental sources;
- b. An overview of comparators and best practices;
- c. Data tables on financial performance of private-sector fund raising in WFP, trends in fund allocation, origin of funds, etc;
- d. Partnerships and fund raising for Logistics and Communications (ICT);
- e. Partnerships and fund raising for Nutrition, Health and Education; and
- f. Questionnaire analysis and comparative analysis of corporate interviews.

Comparators:

5. In order to gain information on partnership and resource mobilization elsewhere which would provide a basis for comparison of WFP performance, information was gathered from published sources and interviews on the six largest humanitarian assistance NGOs (Catholic Relief Services, International Committee (and Federation) of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, Médecins Sans Frontières, Oxfam International, Save the Children and World Vision) and on UNICEF, UNHCR and the UN Global Compact. Interviews were conducted both with their headquarters and country offices during country visits. Of the comparators, only UNHCR is fully comparable with WFP in that it started its drive to mobilize resources from non-governmental sources at about the same time and has similar problems of relative lack of name recognition. All were found, however, to have lessons for WFP.

Questionnaire Surveys:

6. Six separately tailored questionnaires were sent to: a) all senior and managerial staff including Country and Regional Directors; WFP CP staff and long-term consultants² divided between b) CPP and c) other CP; the focal points with WFP representing: d) companies, e) foundations, f) Friends of WFP. Questionnaires were provided to all categories of respondents in Survey Monkey for internet response and in an accompanying Word version to allow the whole questionnaire to be printed out and reviewed. WFP staff responses were all in Survey Monkey. All other respondents were given the choice of

² Currently in post for six months or more.

replying on the Word Version or through Survey Monkey. The questionnaires largely used closed questions requiring ranking and optional comment fields in which views could be expressed and examples given. This enabled the evaluators to consolidate perceptions on evaluation questions as quantitative data. All questionnaire returns were confidential to the evaluation team and to WFP OE and did not require the identification of the person completing the questionnaire.

7. Responses were received as follows (See also Table 2):

- Senior staff and management: 64 responses received from staff, 51.6% of whom are based at WFP headquarters, 35.9% at country level, 7.8% in regional bureaux and 3.1% in liaison offices.
- Private Partnerships Unit (CPP): only five replies received from some 30 staff and consultants, i.e. only 17% response rate.
- Communications : Public Policy and Private-Sector Partnerships Division (CP) excluding CPP, i.e. primarily communications, 25 responses.
- Partner Corporations: 13 responses out of 22 corporations receiving questionnaires.
- Partner Foundations: one response from three foundations receiving questionnaires.
- Friends of WFP: three responses from three questionnaires sent.

8. All questionnaires were reviewed for qualitative information but only those with a sufficient number of responses to be statistically significant were used quantitatively in the analysis for the evaluation:

- Senior staff and management
- Communications. Public Policy and Private-Sector Partnerships Division (CP) excluding CPP
- Partner Corporations

9. Annex 2 provides the results of the surveys

Interviews:

10. A complete list of interviewees is included as Annex 5 and a summary of coverage is provided in Table 2 below.

Annex 1 - Table 2: Summary of Interviews and Questionnaires

Group interviewed and responding to Questionnaires	Number of Respondents	
	Interviews	Questionnaires
1.WFP Senior Staff and Management decentralized and HQ		64
2.WFP Private-Sector Unit Staff and Consultants(CPP)	19	5
3.WFP Communications Staff (CPC)	6	24
4.WFP Decentralized Staff (excluding CPP and CPC)	60	Included in 1 above
5.WFP Headquarters Staff	62	
6.Corporations Representatives	34	13
7.Foundations Representatives	2	1
8.Friends of WFP	4	3
9.Staff of UN agencies, including UNICEF and UNHCR comparators	14	
10. Representatives of national governments, including Executive Board	17	
Total	218	110

11. Country visits and telephone interviews were used to provide overall background to the team on the way in which private support was feeding into WFP programmes on the ground in a representative cross-section of country situations (geographically, characteristics of WFP programme, level of development and by private-sector input and level of funding). In the countries, interviews were conducted with WFP staff, government representatives, comparators and private and voluntary donors. Table 3 provides the final selection of countries, with the main criteria. Interviews by phone included Haiti (which received very substantial private-sector support to the earthquake emergency – 17% of total funding) and appears on the list of countries receiving more than ten percent of their total funding from private sources and Senegal, which received virtually no private funding.

12. Each of the visits were undertaken by one team member working against a standard check list of questions for interactive interviewing of WFP staff, private-sector representatives and the national government. Country visits were prepared in advance including preparatory phone discussions with the country office and the assembly of quantitative and qualitative data on the overall WFP programme in the country and the private-sector input. An introduction to the questions to be covered and a copy of the information available to the team was provided to the country office prior to the visit.

Annex 1 – Table 3: Developing Country Visits and Interviews

Developing Countries Where Interviews Held	Geographical Region	Low or Lower Middle Income Country (WB Web data July 2012)	Level of Private Funding in total WFP Prog, (2004-11)	Purpose of Private Funding	Special features
Bangladesh	Asia	Low	1.0%	Development	Project Laser Beam site
Egypt	Near and Middle East	LMI	1.5%	Development	Good local private funding
Ethiopia	Africa	Low	2.2%	Emergency	New protein supplement development project. Large WFP emergency programme
Haiti	Latin America and Caribbean	Low	12.0%	Emergency	Very high private funding for emergency
India	Asia	LMI	0.9%	Development	Effort to mobilize local fund raising not successful; innovative support to Government
Indonesia	Asia	LMI	5.2%	Development	Site of Project Laser Beam; high local fund raising
Kenya	Africa	Low	4.7%	Development and emergency	Frequently visited country – large WFP emergency programme
Nicaragua	Latin America and Caribbean	LMI	1.7%	Development and emergency	Reliance on private for school feeding
Senegal	Africa	LMI	0.0%	Negligible funding	Very low levels of private funding
Sudan (% funding inc. S. Sudan)	Near and Middle East	LMI	3.2%	Emergency	Very large WFP emergency programme

13. Regional Bureaux visits which concentrated on discussions with WFP staff but also allowed interviews with comparators and companies were selected to be fully representative of Regions and to be combined with country visits. They covered Bangkok, Cairo, Johannesburg, Nairobi and Panama.

14. Interviews with WFP Staff in person and by phone covered:

- a. Senior staff in HQ, including Deputy Executive Directors and Directors responsible for operational and administrative areas, selected regional bureaux; and the Washington and New York liaison offices;
- b. Staff of ten country offices and five regional bureaux;
- c. WFP CPP staff in HQ, Bangkok, London, New York, Washington and Jakarta;
- d. WFP Liaison Offices in New York and Washington DC; and

- e. A purposive sample of WFP staff in Headquarters who have been particularly involved with private-sector cooperation were interviewed using structured check lists, with core questions and additional questions appropriate to their discipline.
15. Private sector: Interviews with a purposive sample of private-sector corporations to cover different forms of cooperation, durations and depths of relationship with WFP and sectors such as logistics and nutrition, largely by phone (21 companies). Interviews were conducted mostly by phone and were with:
- a. Spokespersons of the companies which have engaged most extensively in technical partnerships with WFP or have funded WFP most extensively;
 - b. Persons from the private sector seconded to WFP;
 - c. National private-sector representatives identified during the five country visits and the Regional Bureaux visits in Johannesburg, Nairobi and Panama.
16. Independent Foundations and Donor NGOs: In addition to the interviews of comparators, some of whom have been donors to WFP, interviews and information was planned to be obtained from donors to WFP among foundations and NGOs. In the event it proved possible to interview only two and information was obtained from a further two.
17. Representatives of Friends of WFP were interviewed in person in Washington DC and Rome and by phone in Japan (thus only Hong Kong, which is not currently active, was not interviewed);
18. National Government representatives, encompassing:
- a. WFP Executive Board Members: Interviews with a representative sample of Board Members, particularly to determine their overall view of the strategy and of WFP/private-sector cooperation (outgoing Chair, and from Lists A, B1, B2 and C [Developing Countries (4)] from Lists D and E [Economically Developed Countries (4)]);
 - b. National Governments in Country: Interviews with representatives of national governments during five country visits. Interviews were designed not just to see counterparts who have worked on particular WFP/private-sector activities, but also with government officials or who could give an overview of their government's policy position as it relates to WFP's area of work and any strategic issues that have emerged from experience to date with WFP/private-sector partnerships on WFP private sector cooperation.
19. Comparator Organizations: Interviews through visits with comparator organizations in the UN system (UNICEF and UNHCR) and through visits, phone calls and study of their published material with NGOs that have important parallels with WFP for fund-raising modalities and ethics and are the largest direct actors in emergencies (CRS, Oxfam, Save the Children, World Vision, Médecins Sans Frontières and the Red Cross³).
20. The Global Compact: The UN Global Compact Office was visited to confirm the most recent developments with respect to the compact and the Standards and Codes under development and in force.
21. All interviews took place using standard interview protocols. Those interviewed were selected in such a way as to ensure that a suitable cross-section of views on each of the areas of investigation were obtained. All interviewees and questionnaire respondents were

³ Identified as largest Humanitarian Assistance NGOs from ALNAP-ODI publication: The state of the Humanitarian System – Assessing Performance and Progress, January 2010.

assured of confidentiality and have thus not been referred to by name or organizational identity in the text of this report. Basic information was assembled for study prior to the interview, for example Haiti and Kenya have been the subject of recent country portfolio evaluations and Nicaragua and Kenya were included in the evaluation of P4P. Wherever possible, donor agreements, etc. were studied prior to interviews. Interviews were conducted by one or two team members, in the case of telephone interviews often supported by the research support member of the team. Interviews were reported on common formats, to facilitate their use in preparing the working papers and the draft report. Scoring scales were included in the summary framework to facilitate clarity and a level of comparability of interviewees' judgements. Papers were prepared on country and regional office visits. Sample interview check lists are provided as an Appendix to this Annex.

Analysis of Secondary Data:

22. Financial and numerical data: It was not possible to obtain financial data at the level of detail originally specified in the Inception Report. The basic trend and definitive figures for WFP income from private sources (non-governmental) 2004–2011 were taken from the published data in the WFP Annual Performance Reports. This was supplemented for detailed trend data by extract from the WFP central database on country budget allotments (2004–11). For the current detailed situation of donations and their use 2009–11, the CPP database was used. CP web data was also used for information on web-based fund raising.

23. Annex 4 provides data, supplementary to that in the main evaluation report. The numerical and financial data analysed in the evaluation was as follows:

- a. WFP private resources mobilized –trend data for:
 - i. incoming contributions since 2004 (the first Strategy);
 - ii. allocation of resources by developing country; and
 - iii. management fee income;
- b. WFP private contributions for 2009–11 by source, purpose, modality of fund raising and cash or in-kind;
- c. WFP CPP income expenditure, draw down of the Private-Sector Special Account and staffing;
- d. Data available from WFP Friends, which was rather limited; and
- e. Data available on the context of overall global patterns of private and voluntary giving available from the OECD and US and UK sources.

24. Audit of Private-Sector Funding: A risk-based internal audit of private-sector funding which addressed many administrative and financial questions covered by the evaluation was being completed at the same time as the evaluation. The main conclusions of this audit were shared with the evaluation team and the audit was provided the draft evaluation report.

25. Literature and Document Review: A literature search and review was carried out and a bibliography is included as Annex 6. The base documents for the evaluation were the:

- a. Private-Sector Fundraising and Partnership Strategy, WFP EB February 2008;
- b. New Partnerships to Meet Rising Needs – Expanding the WFP Donor Base, WFP EB October 2004.

26. Use was made where possible of previous WFP evaluations which had relevance to the private sector, including; Joint Global Logistics Cluster Evaluation (Draft), WFP, 2012; Haiti: An Evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2005–2010), WFP, 2011; Kenya: An Evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2006–2010), WFP, 2011; WFP's Agriculture and Market Support in Uganda (2009–2014): A Strategic Evaluation (mid-term), WFP, 2011; and WFP 2008–2013 Purchase for Progress (P4P) Initiative: A Strategic Evaluation (mid-term), WFP, 2011.

27. The wide range of documents consulted and utilized by, the team, included in addition to the above:

- a. WFP strategy and policy documents in addition to those for the private sector;
- b. WFP Executive Board documentation;
- c. Project documents, reports and review meeting documentation on private-sector projects for the countries being visited and for the thematic working papers;
- d. Strategy, policy and other documents of comparators on fundraising modalities and ethics;
- e. Global compact documents; and
- f. Literature on and further examples of:
 - i. Ethics of private-sector resource mobilization;
 - ii. Modalities of private-sector resource mobilization.

Dialogue and opportunity for WFP managers and staff to challenge the findings and recommendations:

28. Sufficient time and discussion was provided for WFP managers and pertinent staff to be briefed on findings and recommendations of the evaluation in developing the evaluation report, to challenge those findings and recommendations that they consider unsubstantiated and possibly to suggest additional data. This strengthened the evaluation report, allowing the evaluation team to identify discrepancies in the financial data originating from various sources in WFP and to better verify and explain their findings. It also allowed WFP management to build an understanding of the evaluation and begin thinking through implementation actions it considers may be warranted on the basis of the evaluation. Briefing and discussion was organized as follows:

- a. a facilitated one day workshop for key HQ staff;
- b. debriefings for HQ based managers and regional and country offices utilizing phone hook-ups;
- c. discussion of the main findings and recommendations with senior management; and
- d. a round of written comments on the draft report and a separate round of written comments on the Executive Board Summary.

Appendix to Annex 1 – Sample Interview Check Lists

WFP Executive Board Interview Checklist of Questions

- Does your government have any overall policy position with respect to partnership with the corporate sector and to fund-raising from the corporate sector and the general public by UN programmes and organizations?
- What priority do you consider private-sector partnership and fund raising from the general public should play in WFP's overall strategy in mobilizing resources to meet its objectives?
- Does your delegation have any views on partnerships which are acceptable or desirable and those which are not?
- Has the Board been adequately informed and been able to offer adequate guidance to management on the place of private-sector partnership and fund raising from the general public in WFP?
- Do you have any perspective on:
 - The results of private-sector partnership and fund raising from the general public to date?
 - The internal WFP institutional and administrative arrangements for private-sector partnership?
 - Any particularly positive or negative examples of partnership.

WFP Country Office Checklist of Questions

- How does private-sector funding relate to WFP's work in the country funded from official government sources?
- Organizational structure/arrangements in the office for donor relations, including those with the private sector?
- What have been the most important private-sector inputs and why – what did these activities consist of and what were their benefits? Are the benefits sustainable?
- What negative impacts have been seen from WFP's work with the private sector (if any)?
- How does private-sector support for emergencies differ from support provided for non-emergencies in terms of overall support provided, types of support provided, predictability and reliability of support, types of partners etc?
- Is there any evidence of improvements in WFP staff's own capacities as a result of private-sector partnership (acquisition of new skills, recruitment from the private sector)?
- Are private-sector funds complementing or distracting from the mainstream of WFP's work?
- How does WFP's organizational culture affect its ability to work with the private sector?
- What is the overall proportion of staff effort going into private-sector work and how does this compare with the amount of private-sector funding?
- Was efficiency positively or negatively impacted overall by private-sector resources, taking into account the costs in time as well as the benefits realised – Are reporting and

accounting requirements of private-sector projects more or less demanding than those for governmental donors?

- Are there any types of direct involvement, you would prefer more than others by the private sector (technical inputs – for what, cash, complementary investment such as in food processing or feeder roads, in kind donations – of what)? Why is one type more useful than another or one type less advantageous than another?
- Does the private sector have a role in opening up new opportunities and ways of doing things?
- How does private-sector support affect WFP's ability to work within the UN Country Framework and/or any Joint Appeal?
- Is WFP's image affected in any way positively or negatively by private-sector engagement or by the private-sector sponsored activities?
- Is there untapped potential from the private sector or general public in the country itself (local private sector), if so in what way?
- Are there any useful lessons from other UN agencies or NGOs active in the country on how to work with the private sector?

HQ WFP Staff Check List of Questions

- **The Strategy:** To the extent that you are aware of the Strategy for Private-Sector Partnership and Fund Raising, does it provide an adequate basis for collaboration with the private sector and general public?
- Is there adequate Board and senior management guidance on working with the private sector?
- **Results:** With what private-sector inputs have you been directly involved if any – what did the activities consist of and what were their benefits? Are the benefits sustainable?
- What negative impacts have been seen from WFP's work with the private sector (if any)?
- What categories of country and types of intervention is private-sector support most helpful for?
- Has any category of private-sector resources, contributed more to results than any other (technical inputs (personnel), money from corporations and foundations for specific interventions, commodities, in-kind assistance, untied money)?
- Has the private sector had a role in opening up new opportunities and ways of doing things?
- Is there any evidence of improvements in WFP staff's own capacities as a result of private-sector partnership (acquisition of new skills, recruitment from the private sector)?
- Are private-sector funds complementing or distracting from the mainstream of WFP's work?
- Is WFP's image affected in any way positively or negatively by private-sector engagement or by the private-sector sponsored activities?
- **Modalities** What are the strengths and weaknesses of WFP's internal arrangements for working with the private sector (procedures, organizational structure, role of the

Communications, Public Policy and Private Partnerships Division (CP), due diligence requirements, firewall between commercial and private relationships)?

- How does WFP's organizational culture affect its ability to work with the private sector?
- Was efficiency positively or negatively impacted overall by private-sector resources, taking into account the costs in time as well as the benefits realised?
- Does private-sector support affect WFP's ability to work within the UN Country Framework and/or any Joint Appeal?
- **Potentials:** Any perspectives on how WFP private-sector partnerships could be better developed in future.

Corporations and Foundations Check List

Key Questions:

- What is the philosophy and strategy of the company or (foundation) in development and humanitarian assistance?
- How the relationship with WFP developed (its history)?
- What have been the main results of the relationship with WFP in terms of benefits for people in developing countries and to WFP?
- What are the interests of your company or (foundation) in the partnership – for companies, How does the partnership relate to your business interests?
- Is the WFP partnership unique and how does it compare with other partnerships?
- What have been the problems with partnership if any, and has the input from, and procedures of, WFP been adequate? and
- How do you see the partnership developing for the future?

Detailed points:

- What led you to work with WFP and who and where were the initial contacts?
- What is the history of the relationship?
- Do you view the relationship with WFP as a partnership and if so what is the value of this partnership for your entity?
- What is your entity's strategy overall for philanthropy, activism, or other 'good works' (corporate responsibility)? How does this engagement fit into that overall strategy of the company (note this question is only valid for companies and company foundations)?
- Why did your organization choose to partner with WFP?
- Do you have other social and sustainability international partners and do they have similarities with WFP as to mission and goals (UN, NGOs, etc.)? How do these compare with WFP as partners?
- What has been the most successful cooperation with WFP and have there been disappointments and what were they and why?
- If you have more than one modality of cooperation with WFP (technical consultancy partnership, in-kind, funding, joint partnerships with other agencies) how would you compare the efficiency and effectiveness of these?
- Who are key players on both sides and have these changed over time (how directly do you relate to CPP or do you deal primarily with other parts of the organization – are there any issues in lines of communication)?

- What are the elements / factors of success and how do you measure success? What are the key indicators that are tracked??
- Do you have any issues in the administrative, financial or reporting arrangements for WFP which you would like to change?
- Do you envisage your relationship with WFP expanding or contracting and why and what activities would you like to expand or contract with WFP and why?
- Do you have any other comments?

Annex 2: Questionnaire and Interview Analyses

Table of Contents

Questionnaires	16
Introduction	16
Analysis of Questionnaire Responses	17
Senior Staff and Management Questionnaire Responses	17
CP (Communications and IT– not Private Sector) Questionnaire responses	20
Corporations questionnaire	23
Summary Analysis of Interviews with Representatives of 15 Companies	25

Questionnaires

Introduction

All questionnaires contained numerical fields to allow scoring and comment fields. Questionnaires were provided for all categories of respondents in Survey Monkey for internet response and in an accompanying Word version to allow the whole questionnaire to be printed out and reviewed. WFP staff responses were all in Survey Monkey. All other respondents were given the choice of replying on the Word Version or through Survey Monkey. All questionnaire responses were treated in confidence and respondents were not normally identified.

Questionnaires were sent to:

- Senior staff and management: 64 responses received from staff, 51.6% of whom are based at WFP headquarters, 35.9% at country level, 7.8% in regional bureaux and 3.1% in liaison offices.
- Private Partnerships Unit (CPP): only five replies received from some 30 staff and consultants. i.e. only 17% response rate.
- Communications: Public Policy and Private-Sector Partnerships Division (CP) excluding CPP, i.e. primarily communications, 25 responses.
- Partner Corporations: 13 responses out of 22 corporations receiving questionnaires.
- Partner Foundations: one response from three foundations receiving questionnaires.
- Friends of WFP: three responses from three questionnaires sent.

All questionnaires were reviewed for qualitative information but only those with a sufficient number of responses to be statistically significant were used quantitatively in the analysis for the evaluation:

- Senior staff and management
- Communications: Public Policy and Private-Sector Partnerships Division (CP) excluding CPP

- Partner Corporations

The results of this analysis are reproduced below.

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

Senior Staff and Management Questionnaire Responses

Current Posting of Respondent	Percentage
HQ Rome	50.8
Regional Bureau	7.9
Country Office or sub-office	36.5
Liaison office	3.2
Other	1.6
Total	100.0

Prime Area of management responsibility of Respondent	Percentage
Operations	23.8
Finance and Administration	15.9
Policy	6.3
External relations	4.8
Communications	4.8
Overall management of an office	44.4
Total	100.0

Rate the degree to which you are currently involved in the following aspects of private-sector partnership and fundraising in your current job	A lot %	Some %	Little %	None %
Strategic direction for private-sector partnership and fundraising	6.7	28.3	35.0	30.0
Initiating new relationships with private-sector organizations or individuals	9.8	31.1	31.1	27.9
Maintaining private-sector partnerships	6.6	31.1	32.8	29.5
Implementing projects that are funded or supported by private-sector resources	10.3	27.6	20.7	41.4
Providing administrative or financial support services for private-sector partnerships	8.5	20.3	11.9	59.3
Advocacy and publicising WFP with the private sector	13.1	26.2	27.9	32.8
Supervising staff who work with private-sector fundraising and partnership	5.1	18.6	28.8	47.5

For the following questions, please select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement

Questions were put on a six-point scale with no midpoint. They have been analysed on three points by merging each two points of the six-point scale and as agree and disagree by analysing either side of the half way point.

Select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement	On Six Point Scale				
	1-2 Fully Agree %	3-4 Mid-point %	5-6 Fully Disagree %	1-3 Agree %	4-6 Disagree %
Score	1-2	3-4	5-6	1-3	4-6
Private-sector partnership and fund raising greatly helps WFP to achieve its humanitarian assistance objectives	48.1	40.7	11.1	74.1	25.9
Private-sector partnership and fund raising greatly helps WFP to achieve its development assistance objectives	42.3	44.2	13.5	76.9	23.1
Private-sector partnership and fund raising greatly helps WFP to enter into innovative areas of work	49.1	41.5	9.4	77.4	22.6
In my experience, the private sector has made a very significant contribution to WFP's:					
• Overall fund raising	39.2	49.0	11.8	78.4	21.6
• Response in emergencies	44.0	44.0	12.0	82.0	18.0
• Mother and child nutrition programmes (the first 1000 days)	39.5	51.2	9.3	81.4	18.6
• School feeding programmes	41.3	52.2	6.5	93.5	6.5
• Gender objectives	12.1	60.6	27.3	57.6	42.4
• Food and cash for assets programmes	15.0	62.5	22.5	65.0	35.0
• Advocacy and awareness raising	56.5	34.8	8.7	87.0	13.0
In my experience, the private sector has made a very significant contribution to strengthening WFP's:					
• Administrative systems and processes	19.5	46.3	34.1	63.4	36.6
• Staff capacities following private-sector support for staff training, etc.	39.5	34.9	25.6	67.4	32.6
• National partner capacity	13.2	55.3	31.6	47.4	52.6
• Logistics efficiency and capacity	42.9	36.7	20.4	77.6	22.4
• Emergency information and communication technology	44.4	40.0	15.6	73.3	26.7
Volunteers and secondees from the private sector to WFP:					
• Raise awareness in their organizations about WFP's work	23.5	56.9	19.6	91.3	8.7
• Add significant technical value to WFP's work	65.2	32.6	2.2	66.7	33.3
• Bring much needed capacities that WFP itself does not have	39.6	43.8	16.7	68.6	31.4
These private-sector partnerships give a good return on the WFP effort invested (value for money)					
• Provision of services like storage or equipment	42.1	42.1	15.8	81.6	18.4
• Donation of equipment	41.0	43.6	15.4	71.8	28.2
• Provision of secondees and consultants	41.3	47.8	10.9	80.4	19.6
• Provision of volunteers	29.8	55.3	14.9	74.5	25.5
• Technical collaboration	45.7	41.3	13.0	73.9	26.1
• Monetary donations from companies and foundations	52.2	39.1	8.7	82.6	17.4
• Monetary donations from the general public	50.0	34.1	15.9	75.0	25.0
• Donations of commodities (food)	22.5	55.0	22.5	60.0	40.0
Private-sector partnerships are well managed overall by WFP as an institution in terms of:					
• Strategic direction	35.3	45.1	19.6	68.6	31.4
• Partner selection	26.5	55.1	18.4	63.3	36.7

Select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement	On Six Point Scale				
	1-2 Fully Agree %	3-4 Mid-point %	5-6 Fully Disagree %	1-3 Agree %	4-6 Disagree %
Score	1-2	3-4	5-6	1-3	4-6
• Due diligence on partners	37.5	43.8	18.8	62.5	37.5
• Distribution of roles and responsibilities across WFP units and locations	24.5	36.7	38.8	42.9	57.1
• Staffing	20.8	50.0	29.2	47.9	52.1
• Delivery of development results	30.4	50.0	19.6	54.3	45.7
• Delivery of humanitarian results	31.3	45.8	22.9	58.3	41.7
Private-sector partnership management arrangements fit well in the organizational structure	31.4	35.3	33.3	51.0	49.0
Distribution of work between the Private Partnerships Unit and the rest of WFP in terms of developing and managing private-sector partnerships is good	27.1	37.5	35.4	45.8	54.2
WFP procedures and processes for administering private-sector partnerships are good	23.4	48.9	27.7	44.7	55.3
Collaboration between the Private Partnerships Unit and the rest of WFP is good	35.3	33.3	31.4	51.0	49.0
Existing distribution within WFP of the private-sector management fee is optimal (private-sector management fee is in addition to ISC)	10.0	32.5	57.5	25.0	75.0
Communication between the Private Partnership Unit and the rest of WFP about private-sector partnerships and fundraising is effective	15.4	40.4	44.2	40.4	59.6
Private-sector division staff should all be private fund raising specialists	24.0	46.0	30.0	46.0	54.0
Private-sector division staff should not be subject to field rotation	3.9	29.4	66.7	17.6	82.4
Private-sector division staff do at present all have an adequate knowledge of WFP work in the field to do their jobs well	11.5	50.0	38.5	32.7	67.3
WFP institutional arrangements are effective for raising private-sector money at host country level	12.5	35.0	52.5	27.5	72.5
WFP institutional arrangements are effective for raising private-sector money internationally	20.8	60.4	18.8	64.6	35.4
The private-sector partnerships are well supported by WFP staff at large	25.5	48.9	25.5	63.8	36.2
WFP should place more emphasis on private-sector fund raising for:					
• Unallocated, unearmarked funds	86.3	13.7	.0	98.0	2.0
• Stabilizing resource levels through long-term commitments	71.7	18.9	9.4	90.6	9.4
• Stabilizing resource levels through increasing the number and diversity of donors	69.2	23.1	7.7	88.5	11.5
WFP should invest more resources in developing and managing private-sector partnerships	43.1	39.2	17.6	70.6	29.4
WFP effectively safeguards its reputation by ensuring compliance with ethics and standards in its relationships with the private sector.	40.7	44.4	14.8	64.8	35.2
WFP's work with the private sector really makes me feel proud of the organization	32.7	48.1	19.2	57.7	42.3

Number the following purposes of cooperation between WFP and private-sector partners in order of their usefulness	Most Useful %	Moderately Useful %	Least Useful %
Emergency response	14	8	6
Mother and child nutrition (the first 1000 days)	12	11	2
School feeding	12	11	3
Logistics	19	7	2
Food and cash for assets work	2	13	14
Advocacy and awareness raising	15	11	5
WFP strengthening of food information systems	4	9	23
Strengthening WFP's administrative and operational systems	8	7	17
Strengthening the capacities of WFP's staff	6	12	16
Information and communications technology	9	12	12
TOTAL	100	100	100

CP (Communications and IT – not Private Sector) Questionnaire responses

Where respondents are currently located (co-located)?	Percentage
HQ Rome	69.6
Regional Bureau	8.7
Country Office	8.7
Liaison office	13.0
Developed country	82.6
Developing (emerging market)	17.4

How many years respondents have been with CP?	Percentage
1–2 years	26.1
More than 2 years	73.9
Have respondents worked in WFP outside CP?	Percentage
Yes	34.8
No	65.2
If yes Length of time served outside CP	Percentage
Less than 2 years	50.0
2–5 years	25.0
More than 5 years	25.0

Role In WFP's Private-Sector Partnership and Fundraising

Rate the degree to which you (the respondent) are currently involved in the following aspects of private-sector partnership and fundraising in your current job	A lot %	Some %	Little %	None %
Strategic direction for private-sector partnership and fundraising	0.0	18.2	27.3	54.5
Initiating new relationships with private-sector organizations or individuals	4.5	22.7	18.2	54.5
Maintaining or managing private-sector partnerships	0.0	27.3	13.6	59.1
Implementing projects that are funded or supported by private-sector resources	4.5	4.5	31.8	59.1
Providing administrative or financial support services for private-sector partnerships	0.0	0.0	18.2	81.8
Advocacy and publicising WFP with the private sector	34.8	21.7	26.1	17.4

Supporting tours and visits by private sector and/or celebrities	4.3	43.5	17.4	34.8
Developing applications and/or website for public giving	9.1	4.5	18.2	68.2
Cause-related marketing	9.1	13.6	22.7	54.5
Providing administrative and secretarial support	0.0	0.0	18.2	81.8

For the following questions, please select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement:

Questions were put on a six-point scale with no midpoint. They have been analysed on three points by merging each two points of the six point scale and as agree and disagree by analysing either side of the half way point.

Select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement	On Six Point Scale				
	1-2 Fully Agree %	3-4 Mid-point %	5-6 Fully Disagree %	1-3 Agree %	4-6 Disagree %
Private-sector partnership and fund raising greatly helps WFP to achieve its humanitarian assistance objectives	57.1	38.1	4.8	95.2	4.8
Private-sector partnership and fund raising greatly helps WFP to achieve its development assistance objectives	50.0	40.9	9.1	90.9	9.1
Private-sector partnership and fund raising greatly helps WFP to enter into innovative areas of work	77.3	18.2	4.5	90.9	9.1
In my experience, the private sector has made a very significant contribution to WFP's:					
• Overall fund raising	52.4	28.6	19.0	76.2	23.8
• Response in emergencies	50.0	38.9	11.1	88.9	11.1
• Mother and child nutrition programmes (the first 1000 days)	58.8	23.5	17.6	76.5	23.5
• School feeding programmes	61.9	33.3	4.8	85.7	14.3
• Gender objectives	25.0	50.0	25.0	58.3	41.7
• Food and cash for assets programmes	12.5	62.5	25.0	50.0	50.0
• Advocacy and awareness raising	59.1	36.4	4.5	86.4	13.6
In my experience, the private sector has made a very significant contribution to strengthening WFP's:					
• Administrative systems and processes	0.0	63.6	36.4	36.4	63.6
• Financial systems and processes	0.0	70.0	30.0	40.0	60.0
• Staff capacities following private-sector support for staff training, etc.	29.4	64.7	5.9	76.5	23.5
• National partner capacity	30.0	60.0	10.0	50.0	50.0
• Logistics efficiency and capacity	31.3	62.5	6.3	93.8	6.3
• Emergency information and communication technology capacity	42.1	52.6	5.3	89.5	10.5
• Capacity for Private-Sector Fund Raising	57.1	33.3	9.5	90.5	9.5
These private-sector partnerships give a good return on the WFP effort invested (value for money)	31.6	42.1	26.3	31.6	68.4
Private-sector partnerships always have a positive effect on WFP's image and never have a negative one	13.6	36.4	50.0	40.9	59.1

Select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement	On Six Point Scale				
	1-2 Fully Agree %	3-4 Mid-point %	5-6 Fully Disagree %	1-3 Agree %	4-6 Disagree %
Consultants and secondees from the private sector to WFP:					
• Bring needed capacities that WFP itself does not have	50.0	44.4	5.6	83.3	16.7
• Raise awareness in their organizations about WFP's work	68.4	26.3	5.3	89.5	10.5
• Add significant technical value to WFP's work	41.2	52.9	5.9	76.5	23.5
Volunteers from the private sector to WFP:					
• Bring needed capacities that WFP itself does not have	43.8	43.8	12.5	68.8	31.3
• Raise awareness in their organizations about WFP's work	55.6	38.9	5.6	88.9	11.1
• Add significant technical value to WFP's work	40.0	53.3	6.7	66.7	33.3
WFP institutional arrangements are effective for raising private-sector money at host country level	6.7	40.0	53.3	40.0	60.0
WFP institutional arrangements are effective for raising private-sector money internationally	42.1	42.1	15.8	68.4	31.6
The private-sector partnerships are well supported by WFP staff at large	21.1	52.6	26.3	63.2	36.8
WFP should place more emphasis on private-sector fund raising for:					
• Unallocated, unearmarked funds	68.4	21.1	10.5	89.5	10.5
• Stabilizing resource levels through long-term commitments	75	20.0	5.0	95.0	5.0
• Stabilizing resource levels through increasing the number and diversity of donors	73.7	21.1	5.3	94.7	5.3
WFP should invest more resources in developing and managing private-sector partnerships	33.3	57.1	9.5	61.9	38.1
WFP effectively safeguards its reputation by ensuring compliance with ethics and standards in its relationships with the private sector.	42.1	21.1	36.8	57.9	42.1
WFP's work with the private sector really makes me feel proud of the organization	20.0	55.0	25.0	55.0	45.0
Private-sector partnerships are well managed overall in by WFP as an institution in terms of:					
• Strategic direction	45.0	35.0	20.0	65.0	35.0
• Partner selection	9.1	59.1	31.8	36.4	63.6
• Due diligence on partners	36.8	36.8	26.3	47.4	52.6
• Distribution of roles and responsibilities across WFP units and locations	23.5	41.2	35.3	41.2	58.8
• Staffing	17.6	47.1	35.3	47.1	52.9
Private-sector partnership management arrangements fit well in the organizational structure	22.2	66.7	11.1	66.7	33.3
The private-sector partnerships are well supported by WFP staff	26.3	47.4	26.3	57.9	42.1
Existing distribution within WFP of the private-sector management fee is optimal (private-sector management fee is in addition to ISC)	20	60	20	60.0	40.0
WFP procedures and processes for administering private-sector partnerships are good	37.5	43.8	18.8	62.5	37.5
Collaboration between the Private Partnerships Unit and the rest of WFP is good	36.8	36.8	26.3	63.2	36.8

Select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement	On Six Point Scale				
	1-2 Fully Agree %	3-4 Mid-point %	5-6 Fully Disagree %	1-3 Agree %	4-6 Disagree %
Communication between the Private Partnership Unit and the rest of WFP about private-sector partnerships and fundraising is effective	33.3	38.1	28.6	57.1	42.9
Distribution of work between the Private Partnerships Unit and the rest of WFP in terms of developing and managing private-sector partnerships is good	30.8	38.5	30.8	69.2	30.8
Internal administrative arrangements in the private-sector division are good	33.3	50.0	16.7	33.3	66.7
Internal managerial arrangements and lines of reporting in the private-sector division are good	27.3	27.3	45.5	45.5	54.5
The present geographical distribution and grouping of private-sector division staff is optimal	14.3	61.9	23.8	47.6	52.4
Private-sector unit staff should all be private fund raising specialists	23.8	52.4	23.8	52.4	47.6
Private-sector unit staff should not be subject to field rotation	26.3	36.8	36.8	47.4	52.6
Private-sector unit staff do at present all have an adequate knowledge of WFP work in the field to do their jobs well	29.4	29.4	41.2	41.2	58.8
Fund Raising: the modalities of WFP are now optimal for:					
• Raising funds internationally from the general public	50.0	30.0	20.0	65.0	35.0
• Raising funds from companies	50.0	35.0	15.0	75.0	25.0
• Raising funds from high net worth individuals	25	37.5	37.5	50.0	50.0
• Raising funds from foundations and funding NGOs	13.3	60	26.7	53.3	46.7
• Raising funds in the developing countries where WFP works	6.3	43.8	50.0	31.3	68.8
Technical Partnering: the modalities of WFP are now optimal for:					
• Enduring technical partnering with companies	33.3	55.6	11.1	77.8	22.2
• Enduring technical partnering with foundations and funding NGOs	12.5	87.5	100	87.5	12.5
WFP arrangements for communication with private-sector partners are good	45.0	45.0	10.0	75.0	25.0

Corporations questionnaire

Capacity in which replying to the questionnaire	Percentage
Senior Management in the Company or Company Foundation	46.2
Focal Point for WFP in the Company or Company Foundation	53.8
Total	100

Type of support provided to WFP	Percentage
Mostly Funding	46.2
Mixture of Funding and Supply of technical assistance	15.4
Mostly supply of consultants	30.8
Complete mix	7.7
Total	100

Importance of WFP as international partner	Percentage
One among many	7.7
One among several	15.4
Principal Partner	76.9
Total	100.0

Select the one choice that best reflects your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement	On Six Point Scale				
	1–2 Fully Agree %	3–4 Mid-point %	5–6 Fully Disagree %	1–3 Agree %	4–6 Disagree %
Compared with other partnerships we have, the partnership with WFP:					
• Has delivered major benefits to the poor and malnourished	66.7	33.3	0.0	91.7	8.3
Has made a major contribution to the delivery capacity of WFP	69.2	23.1	7.7	92.3	7.7
• Is innovative	61.5	38.5	0.0	84.6	15.4
• Is fully in line with the company's social responsibility goals	92.3	7.7	0.0	100.0	0.0
• Is aligned well with the company's business interests and has benefited business development	30.8	53.8	15.4	76.9	23.1
• Has a good working modality	69.2	23.1	7.7	84.6	15.4
• Is efficient – gives value for money	76.9	15.4	7.7	76.9	23.1
• Is responsive to our interests	61.5	30.8	7.7	84.6	15.4
• Is fully accountable	81.8	18.2	0.0	81.8	18.2
We consider the relationship with WFP to be long-term	91.7	00.0	8.3	91.7	8.3
We wish to expand the WFP relationship	36.4	54.5	9.1	90.9	9.1
We would like to see major changes in how the WFP relationship is organized	15.4	53.8	30.8	53.8	46.2
Our overall level of satisfaction with the WFP relationship is very high	61.5	38.5	0.0	76.9	23.1
* Questions were put on a six-point scale with no midpoint. They have been analysed on three points by merging each two points of the six point scale and as agree and disagree by analysing either side of the half way point.					

Place the following possible difficulties in raising funds or other forms of partnership for WFP in their order of importance as a problem	Percentage of Respondents Who Considered Issue		
	Major Problem %	Moderate Problem %	Lesser Problem %
Agreeing an MoU	18.8	3.8	7.9
The level of the WFP management fee	3.1	3.8	21.1
Application by WFP of due diligence criteria	3.1	19.2	10.5
Agreeing on how WFP's name logo or reference to the relationship may be used in marketing	15.6	0.0	15.8
Agreeing on reference to the company in a project	15.6	7.7	10.5
Using the company's products in a project	9.4	7.7	10.5
Lack of willingness to consult with the Company on individual projects by WFP	3.1	23.1	10.5
Lack of adequate reporting by WFP	6.3	23.1	7.9
Long delays in making decisions in WFP	25.0	11.5	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Summary Analysis of Interviews with Representatives of 15 Companies

The interview scores for the 15 companies interviewed were considered to provide a basis for summation and were used to supplement the qualitative judgements obtained from the questionnaire responses. The corporate summation is provided below.

In addition to notes on each interview, country interviews and corporate interviews were also scored on key points. As countries were purposely selected for interview against specific criteria (category of country, amount of private-sector support received and as representative of different types of support), the scores were not regarded as a basis for comparable analysis but as a method to permit the evaluators to crystallize their judgments.

Areas of enquiry in interview which were graded (Boston Consulting Group, Cargill, Caterpillar, DSM, FEED, Kemin, Maersk, PepsiCo, Street King, TNT, Unilever, Vodafone, Walmart, Yum! Brands, Zynga)	Poor, little, not good or negative %	Some, neither good or bad, weak or strong %	Good, high, better than comparators %
Relationship with WFP is long-term	8.3	41.7	50.0
Expand or reduce the WFP relationship	23.1	23.1	53.8
The partnership with WFP well or badly:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is aligned with company's business interests and benefits business development 	7.7	7.7	84.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> responsive to company interests 	23.1	61.5	15.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> good working modality 	21.4	50.0	28.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> accountable 	25.0	37.5	37.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> efficient – gives value for money, level of bureaucracy 	46.2	46.2	7.7
Strength/weakness for us of WFP relationship is:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brand image 	30.0	30.0	40.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate morale 	46.2	30.8	23.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market entry/expansion 	70.0	10.0	20.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning for our staff 	36.4	36.4	27.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning for our company 	28.6	28.6	42.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doing public good 	0.0	18.2	81.8
Overall level of satisfaction with WFP relationship (low or high)	14.3	64.3	21.4

Annex 3 Suggestions Included in the Evaluation in Addition to the Recommendations

Para 74: **A wider concept of partnership and involvement of the private sector has started to spread further in WFP's work on preparations for major emergencies in Africa**, which is modelled on pandemic disease emergency with cross-boundary implications. The role the private sector would have to play in maintaining essential services has now been recognized and at the most recent WFP workshop for Southern Africa, a South African Bank was included in the team to address maintenance of essential financial services. **More effort to consciously analyse the scope, and indeed the necessity, for inclusiveness of the private sector in this way would be desirable.**

Para 84: **Reputational Risk and Conflict with WFP Objectives:** The potential of a relationship to raise funds is always going to be an important factor in deciding whether to pursue a relationship with a company. There are however, also **questions of the extent to which WFP may work against its own basic objectives (e.g. promoting improved nutrition) by associating itself with a particular product for purposes of fundraising. What is called for is good judgement, as well as the application of reputational risk criteria.**

Para 85: Questions of balance in benefit to the company and contribution to WFP objectives, need clarity on acceptance of the principle that, in line with the UN Secretary General's 2009 Guidelines, there is full recognition that in **partnership there is mutual benefit, but WFP needs more clarity on how this works in practice**, for example on:

- a. The extent to which WFP welcomes private involvement in policy development where there is a benefit to the company. All the evidence available to the evaluation has indicated that the DSM support to nutrition policy development and advocacy on that policy was positive and the policy fully in line with WFP's basic position, however some have questioned the ethical principle of a company's support in this area and WFP needs clarity on whether companies should be involved in policy development at all and whether they should be involved in policy development when a certain policy direction could potentially develop their markets, as has been the case with DSM;
- b. The extent to which a relationship can allow for market development. WFP works with companies, national and international, in efforts which further WFP's objectives, but may result in the company expanding a market for its products.
 - i. Support of programmes, for example in nutrition, in areas which are not top priority in terms of absolute proportions of malnourished but where there are significant pockets of malnourishment and market potential for the company, whether these be urban slums or middle-income countries. If WFP does not wish to pursue such objectives for overall reasons of policy, it has to be accepted that this will limit access to several existing and potential corporate partners;
 - ii. The evaluation saw no examples of direct product promotion, outside the association in cause related marketing and WFP does not permit private donors to provide branded products to its programme activities, for instance, school feeding or mother and child health programmes, in order to avoid providing any potential

market advantage and because it could be construed as WFP product endorsement. The evaluation found that comparators, including UN agencies, were in practice more flexible than WFP in accepting donations for similar purposes (several NGO comparators reported that they considered it a significant opportunity for specific corporate relationships). In WFP it has been a point of contention with some private companies and may have affected at least one food company's withdrawal from school feeding. WFP now needs to weigh the cost of its present policy, which can limit food companies' interest in supporting projects against the potential benefits, recognising that in cause-related marketing and CFR it is also associated with the market for a product and in the acceptance of services where brands are sometimes prominently displayed, WFP is not applying the same criteria on brand promotion;

- c. Saying no and reputational risk: WFP often does advise donors of services and small quantities of commodities of other organizations which would be more suitable recipients than WFP. The evaluation came across one case of a donation of over a million dollars in a major emergency where there would have been less misunderstanding if WFP had said no in the first place. There is, understandably, a reluctance to reject higher-profile commodity or service donations because refusal can be misinterpreted by the donor and the press with negative effects on WFP's reputation".

Para 126: In-kind consultancy and some payment for services by receiving units. There is normally no management fee paid for in-kind contributions of consultancies to WFP. It is suggested that requesting units would value the contribution more if they had to cover part of the cost and, rather than cost sharing with the donor (as is done by other BCG partners), this could be a reimbursement of ISC equivalent (or more) to the General Fund.

Para 131: Recording gifts in-kind: WFP is now planning to record in its accounts extraordinary gifts in kind (EGIK), which consist mostly of human resources and free publicity, with a major effort to cost them at the values provided by the corporations. These contributions are substantial (up to US\$50 million per year, depending upon how they are calculated). Although the effort in WFP provides admirable transparency and recognition of the donors, the effort involved in accurate accounting may not be justified by the gains and a simpler qualitative and estimate system of reporting adopted, especially as recent experience has been that donors often do not provide a figure despite several requests.

Para 132: Twinning: there is an inconsistency in WFP rules on "twinning," where transport of a commodity donation from a developing country government can be transported using the cash donation of another government. This cannot be done if the donation is from a developing country private-sector donor, however large and potentially useful the donation. This anomaly, which required complex and time-consuming work around in a case reported to the evaluation, needs to be removed.

Para 135: Officially updating main targets and modalities: Since the agreement of the Strategy, there has been evolution of CPP organization and the modality of concentration of effort in partnerships and fundraising with corporations. This has not been formulated in an enhanced strategy or plan discussed and formally agreed by management. Updating and issue of a management directive, including targets, every two years would lend clarity and authority to work with the private sector and private fund raising.

Para 136: **Reporting to the EB:** reporting to the EB has been through “informal consultations” with PowerPoint presentations. In most organizations of the UN system where strategies on particular topics have received formal board approval, there is a formal periodic analytical update to the board on progress.

Para 139: **Areas to be strengthened in future PS strategy** include:

- e. Conceptually separating and defining partnership and fundraising and distinctly addressing partnerships with corporations that are mutually beneficial to WFP and the companies involved;
- f. recognizing that WFP can play a role in mobilizing the private sector to contribute to the achievement of WFP’s broader objectives in humanitarian assistance and development, in addition to its role as a provider of direct support to WFP-specific activities;
- g. prioritizing areas for partnership in terms of the partnership potential to address WFP’s strategic objectives;
- h. providing guidance and criteria for country focus, taking account of potentials as well as needs;
- i. including stronger guidance on modalities and potentials for partnership and fundraising with different categories of partners; and
- j. defining the scope and limits of partnership with private corporations in terms of WFP objectives, activities and reputational risks.

Para 145: **Loan repayment should not commence in 2013:** the loan from the General Fund was only partially drawn down but if repayment were to commence in 2013 as originally envisaged, it would negatively affect the operational resources available for private-sector fund raising.

Para 150: **Fund Raising from the General Public and the need for investment:** if, as recommended, WFP places greater emphasis on fund raising from the general public, it will need to balance its expectations with how much it is prepared to invest. Either WFP can:

- further emphasize fund raising through the social media with greater targeting and emphasis on repeat giving (less tied to emergencies) and some greater focused local efforts possibly through Friends of WFP; or
- WFP can invest substantially with the aim of building a significant income stream, as UNHCR has done, but the emphasis will still need to be on those markets with greatest immediate potential.

Para 158: **Revised Strategy and Practical Guidance on limitations to partnerships:** when WFP limits certain categories of partnership for overall reasons of policy, it has to be accepted that this reduces access to several existing and potential corporate partners. WFP thus needs to be clear in its revised Strategy and develop practical guidance on such issues as:

- the extent to which it is acceptable for a company to assist WFP in policy or national institutional development, especially where this may also develop its markets in countries (the only examples reviewed by the evaluation where there was a potential market opening were in nutrition where the results had been positive and fully in line with WFP objectives);

- programmes in areas which are not top priority in terms of absolute proportions of malnourished but where there are significant pockets of malnourishment and market potential for the company, whether these be urban slums or middle-income countries;
- acceptance of the use of branded products, on which WFP places more restriction than both NGO and, it appears in practice, UN comparators; and
- ground rules for cause related marketing and consumer facing relationships which take account of wider concerns of relationship to WFP objectives and reputational risk.

Para 159: **Geographical targeting for fund raising:** for funding from all sources, potential countries for WFP to raise funds are first and foremost the traditional developed markets where there are large quantities of money being given and a tradition of giving. There is potential in middle-income developing countries for fund mobilization but this generally needs to be for use in the country itself or in the region. Country and regional offices need to be empowered to make use of these opportunities.

Para 160: **Potential for inter-agency cooperation in private resource mobilization:** there is potential for inter-agency cooperation in private resource mobilization and some NGOs have suggested this on specific projects. In UN system collaboration a bureaucratic approach needs to be avoided, cooperating where possible, for example in information sharing and joint efforts for gaining tax relief. The natural partners of WFP for this are UNICEF and UNHCR rather than the other Rome-based agencies, which currently do not have major private fund mobilization efforts.

Para 163: **Characteristics of viable partnerships:** when working in partnership with corporations and foundations, the objectives being pursued within the partnership and the modalities to be employed in pursuit of those objectives must be made very clear. Least difficulties occurred in partnerships when:

- all partners saw clear advantages to them in the relationship;
- partnerships had clearly defined goals and modalities that were agreed by all parties;
- the managerial arrangements were well defined and management of projects was with the appropriate technical operating units of WFP;
- complexity was avoided;
- the number of partners was relatively small (depending on the nature of the partnership, the effective working maximum seemed to be four or five, with difficulties of management and of agreement on goals increasing steadily with the number of partners); and
- partnerships had critical mass in terms of resources and potential for impact, where work involved in maintaining the partnership (including accounting, reporting and providing publicity expected by the partners) did not impose excessive proportional costs on the relationship.

Para 170: **Charging overhead costs on Partnerships:** partnerships, as distinct from donor relationships, where resources come from both parties, will need to be treated differently from those which are primarily for fund raising. Consideration should be given to charging overhead costs only on the monetary portion of the contribution passing through WFP in the case of such partnerships.

Par 175: **Computer systems for recording contributions:** WFP central systems have been designed for large contributions. The recording and tracking of all small grants could be integrated in the same business module as employed by CPP for the private sector.

Para 176: **Link between private resource mobilization and communications:** CPP will need to maintain a strong link to the unit responsible for Communications for all aspects of fund raising from the general public and cause-related marketing. The same appeals and advocacy need to be reflected in both WFP's publicity and fund mobilization.

Para 177: **Division of work and investment in non CPP Units:** there should be clear delegations of authority and guidance to field offices and HQ technical units for fund mobilization, including initial contacts, national level relationships and maintenance of collaborative partnerships. Support needs to be budgeted to build capacity, especially at field level in those countries having national potential. Inefficient duplication in maintenance of relationships should also be avoided in such areas as logistics, nutrition and information and communications technology.

Para 178: **Organization and capacity issues:**

- CPP staff have inadequate understanding of WFP and staff dealing with corporations and foundations do need to have a good understanding of the organization and its work. This can probably only be gained through several months of secondment in a variety of field locations. This is also the case for staff of Friends of WFP.
- Some of the decentralized staff of ERD and CPP should have shared responsibilities.
- A support facility for country offices and a pool of staff able to assist country, regional and liaison offices needs to be developed. There needs to be more job security and continuity of staffing in CPP, which will be facilitated by the proposed change in budgeting arrangements.

Para 179: **Development of Friends of WFP:** the division of work and the role to be performed by Friends of WFP could be further developed in selected locations, if the substantial start-up investment funds are budgeted for. Inefficiency and duplication of effort between Friends and CPP needs to be avoided. A prerequisite for this is a memorandum of understanding which provides clarity on the relationship with WFP and facilitates the application of common policies.

Para 187: **Containing Risk of backdoor entry to partnership by companies:** companies donating purely services in-kind may not currently be subject to due diligence or sign memoranda of understanding. This could provide a back-door entry into partnership. To date, this has not occurred in any way considered to pose a risk, but procedures need to be introduced to contain risk – procedures that are not a bureaucratic barrier to small initial collaborative efforts. Para 129. Similar considerations apply to partnerships which are operated through Friends of WFP, where the Friend is legally the collaborator but WFP usually becomes the implementer.

Annex 4: Additional Secondary Source Tabular Data on WFP Private and Voluntary Resources and on the Resource Mobilization Context

Private and Voluntary Contributions to WFP	32
Annex 4 Table 1: Private Contributions to WFP 2004–11 (million US\$).....	32
Annex 4 Table 2: Top 20 Countries for Receipt of Private Contributions by WFP 2009–11.....	32
Annex 4 Table 3: Top 20 Countries for Proportion of Private Contributions in the Total Budget Receipts from WFP (2009–11).....	33
Annex 4 Table 4: Top 18 Countries Receiving Budget Allotments from Private Resources by WFP 2004–11*	33
Annex 4 Table 5: Channels for Receipt of Resources by WFP 2009–11.....	34
Annex 4 Table 6 Top 20 Private and Voluntary Contributors to WFP (2009–11).....	34
Annex 4 Table 7: Top Ten Corporate and Corporate Foundation Donors to WFP (2009–11).....	35
Annex 4 Table 8: Top Five Independent Foundation (non-corporate) Donors to WFP (2009–11).....	35
Annex 4 Table 9: Top Five NGO Contributors to WFP (2009–11).....	35
Annex 4 Table 10: WFP Private and Voluntary Funds by Region of Origin.....	35
Annex 4 Table 11: Top 20 Countries for Origin of WFP Private Resources (2009–11).....	36
Annex 4 Table 12: Friends of WFP USA Resources and Donors (2004–11)	36
Annex 4 Table 13: Staffing of the WFP Private Partnership Unit (CPP) 2008–11.....	37
The Private and Voluntary Giving Context	37
Annex 4 Table 14: Comparator Private Revenue Percentage of Total in 2010.....	37
Annex 4 Table 15: Non-governmental (non-official development assistance) from OECD Countries to Developing Countries (2010) (billion US\$).....	38
Annex 4 Table 16: Origins of all private giving for all purposes in the USA 2010.....	38
Annex 4 Table 17: Origins of private resources given to developing countries in the USA.....	38
Annex 4 Table 18: Commitment of General Public to Donating Cash for all Charitable Purposes by Region.....	39
Annex 4 Table 19: Trend in US Foundation (corporate and private) Grants (billion US\$).....	39
Annex 4 Table 20: Trend in Median US Corporate Giving – Selected Companies	39

Private and Voluntary Contributions to WFP

Annex 4-Table 1: Private Contributions to WFP 2004–11 (million US\$)

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
WFP total contributions	2 206	2 766	2 705	2 705	5 042	4 022	3 810	3 675
Private contributions**	17	74	56	49	144	104	103	86
Private-sector contributions as a % of total contributions	0.8%	2.7%	2.1%	1.8%	2.9%	2.6%	2.7%	2.3%
Target for 2017 (US\$270 million) as a % of WFP total contributions				10,0%	5,4%	6,7%	7,1%	7,3%
% achievement, 2017 target				18,2%	53,2%	38,7%	38,2%	31,9%

Source: WFP Annual Performance Reports

**For consistency, in 2005 includes US\$50 million from the American Red Cross and in 2006 US\$0.5 million from the International Committee of the Red Cross, which were not included in the private sector in the Annual Performance Report Total

Annex 4-Table 2: Top 20 Countries for Receipt of Private Contributions by WFP 2009–11

Country	Percentage of Total (2009–11)
Haiti	29%
Somalia	20%
Kenya	7%
Pakistan	4%
Ethiopia	2%
Indonesia	0%
Malawi	2%
Egypt	2%
Japan	2%
Niger	2%
Bangladesh	2%
Cambodia	2%
India	2%
Philippines	2%
Nicaragua	2%
Nepal	1%
Bhutan	1%
Lesotho	1%
Laos	1%
Tanzania	1%

Source WFP CPP Data Base

Annex 4 - Table 3: Top 20 Countries for Proportion of Private Contributions in the Total Budget Receipts from WFP (2009–11)

	Percentage of Total 2009–11
Japan – Tsunami and nuclear emergency	100.00%
Palestinian Territory	100.00%
Bhutan	54.72%
Sao Tome and Principe	44.26%
Indonesia	35.93%
India	28.86%
Gambia	21.09%
Iran, Islamic Republic of	20.70%
Cape Verde	20.61%
Egypt	18.38%
Timor-Leste	17.12%
Benin	17.04%
Haiti	14.50%
Malawi	11.42%
Lesotho	10.96%
Somalia	10.00%
Cambodia	9.60%
Swaziland	7.21%
Cuba	6.82%
Honduras	6.32%

Source: WFP Central Budget Allotment Database

Annex 4 Table 4: Top 18 Countries Receiving Budget Allotments from Private Resources by WFP 2004–11*

Country	Average 2004–11	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Haiti	19%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	1%	67%	13%
Somalia	13%	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%	55%	0%	4%
Indonesia	8%	0%	15%	39%	8%	6%	3%	2%	1%
Kenya	7%	7%	2%	6%	7%	7%	4%	3%	27%
Sudan	5%	25%	17%	15%	5%	4%	0%	0%	1%
Pakistan	4%	0%	12%	4%	0%	0%	1%	8%	6%
Niger	4%	2%	12%	3%	4%	13%	1%	1%	4%
Malawi	3%	2%	10%	9%	3%	1%	3%	1%	3%
Ethiopia	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	9%	4%	1%	1%
Nicaragua	3%	8%	3%	2%	10%	1%	1%	2%	3%
Myanmar	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	1%	0%	3%
Egypt	2%	0%	0%	1%	10%	1%	3%	1%	3%
Palestinian Territory	2%	31%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Cambodia	2%	0%	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%
Philippines	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	3%	1%	1%
Burkina Faso	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	1%	0%	0%
India	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	4%
Bangladesh	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%

* Note this table refers to allotment data and percentages thus differ slightly from those for contribution data for 2009–11

Source: WFP Central Budget allotment database

Annex 4 Table 5: Channels for Receipt of Resources by WFP 2009–11

Channel	Average 2009–11
WFP – Direct	70%
CPP	46%
Web (CPP)	3%
Regional/Country Offices	21%
Friends of WFP	28%
USA	22%
Japan	5%
Italy	1%
Hong Kong	0%
Intermediaries/Pass-throughs	2%

Annex 4 Table 6: Top 20 Private and Voluntary Contributors to WFP (2009–11)

Private and Voluntary Sources		Percentage of Total Private and Voluntary Donations (2009–11)
1	CARE USA	14.1%
2	Red Cross USA	11.9%
3	YUM Brands	11.2%
4	Howard Buffet Foundation	6.4%
5	US Entertainment Industry Foundation	3.2%
6	TNT	3.1%
7	Unilever	3.0%
8	DSM	2.8%
9	Vodafone	1.8%
10	Thai TV3	1.7%
11	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	1.4%
12	Caterpillar	1.2%
13	Cargill	1.2%
14	LG Electronics	1.2%
15	GAIN	1.0%
16	Red Cross Australia	1.0%
17	Nationale Postcode Loterij (Netherlands) LOTERIJ	0.9%
18	Network of Networks of HIV Positives	0.8%
19	PepsiCo	0.7%
20	International Paper	0.7%

Source WFP CPP Data Base

* Note The Table does not include 2008 when the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation provided US\$ 70 million to CPP

Annex 4 Table 7: Top Ten Corporate and Corporate Foundation Donors to WFP (2009–11)

Corporation (Company)	Percentage of Corporate Donations (2009–11)
YUM Brands	29.0%
TNT	8.1%
Unilever	7.8%
DSM	7.1%
Vodafone	4.7%
Thai TV3	4.4%
Caterpillar	3.2%
Cargill	3.1%
LG Electronics	3.1%
PepsiCo	1.8%

Source WFP CPP Data Base

Annex 4 Table 8: Top Five Independent Foundation (non-corporate) Donors to WFP (2009–11)

Independent Foundation	Percentage of All Donations by Independent Foundations (2009–11)
Howard Buffet Foundation	48.0%
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	10.6%
US Entertainment Industry Foundation	24.0%
GAIN	7.5%
Children Investment Fund	4.8%

Source WFP CPP Data Base

Annex 4 Table 9: Top Five NGO Contributors to WFP (2009–11)

NGOs	Percentage of All Contributions by NGOs (2009–11)
CARE USA	48.8%
Red Cross USA	41.2%
Red Cross Australia	3.3%
Network of Networks of HIV Positives (Ethiopia)	2.9%
Terre des Hommes	0.7%

Source WFP CPP Data Base

Annex 4 Table 10: WFP Private and Voluntary Funds by Region of Origin

Region	Percentage of Contributions 2009–11
North America	65%
Europe	17%
Asia	11%
Near ME	1%
Other/ Unknown	6%

Source CPP Data Base

Annex 4 Table 11: Top 20 Countries for Origin of WFP Private Resources (2009–11)

Country of Origin of Resources	Percentage of Resources 2009–11
USA	65.1%
Netherlands	11.2%
Japan	5.3%
United Kingdom	3.0%
Republic of Korea	2.6%
Australia	1.8%
Thailand	1.8%
Switzerland	1.2%
Egypt	0.7%
Nigeria	0.6%
Italy	0.6%
Germany	0.5%
Indonesia	0.4%
Honduras	0.4%
Hong Kong	0.3%
UAE	0.3%
Brazil	0.3%
Singapore	0.3%
France	0.3%
Iran	0.2%

Source WFP CPP Data Base

Annex 4 Table 12: Friends of WFP USA Resources and Donors (2004–11)

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Donations (million US\$)	4.5	7.7	9.9	14.5	21.3	13.5	31.2	27.9
Value of In Kind (million US\$)							0.6	5.7
Number of Individual Donors	6,792	14,358	11,330	16,719	55,448	50,471	36,823	34,101
Number of In Kind Donations							27	45

Source Friends of WFP USA Reports

Annex 4 Table 13: Staffing of the WFP Private Partnership Unit (CPP) 2008–11

Location	Rome	New York	Washington DC	Bangkok	London	Sydney	Tokyo	Seoul	Hong Kong	Beijing	Jakarta	Cairo/Dubai	Total
2008 Total	18.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		23.7
Director	1.1											0.0	1.1
Professionals and consultants	13.4			2.0				2.0					17.4
Support staff	4.2			1.0									5.2
Interns													0.0
2009 Total	27.0			3.8			1.0	2.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	35.3
Director	1.4								0.5				1.9
Professionals and consultants	18.9			2.8				2.0				1.0	24.7
Support staff	5.3			1.0			1.0						7.3
Interns	1.3												1.3
2010 Total	32.3	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.0	41.7
Director	1.9												1.9
Professionals and consultants	22.1	1.0		3.0				2.0	0.5		0.5	1.0	30.1
Support staff	4.5			1.0			0.4						5.9
Interns	3.8												3.8
2011 Total	31.3	2.0	3.7	4.5	0.7	0.0	1.4	3.6	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.5	49.6
Director and above	1.8		0.3										2.1
Professionals and consultants	20.5	1.8	3.2	3.5	0.7		1.4	1.6	0.5		0.5	1.5	35.1
Support staff	5.7	0.3	0.3	1.0				2.0					9.2
Interns	3.3												3.3

Source WFP CPP

The Private and Voluntary Giving Context

Annex 4 Table 14: Comparator Private Revenue Percentage of Total in 2010

Comparator organization	Revenue from Private Contributions and General Public (million US\$)	Total Revenue (million US\$)	Private and individual contributions % of total
WFP	143	3,810	3.75%
UNICEF	854	3,711	23.01%
UNHCR	111	2,088	5.32%
Catholic Relief Services	224	823	27.22%
Save the Children	371	619	59.94%
Oxfam	487	1,234	39.47%

Source: Each organization's 2010/2011 annual reports

Annex 4 Table 15: Non-governmental (non-official development assistance) from OECD Countries to Developing Countries (2010)(billion US\$)

United States	39.0	Ireland	0.3
United Kingdom	4.2	Norway	0.2
Japan	3.3	Sweden	0.2
Canada	2.0	Austria	0.2
Germany	1.4	Denmark	0.1
France	1.0	Finland	0.0
Australia	1.0	Republic of Korea	0.0
Netherlands	0.9	New Zealand	0.0
Italy	0.6	Portugal	0.0
Switzerland	0.6	Greece	0.0
Belgium	0.5	Luxembourg	0.0
Spain	0.3	TOTAL	22.8

Source: Hudson Institute – Center for Global Prosperity

Annex 4 Table 16: Origins of all private giving for all purposes in the USA 2010

Origin of private giving USA	Percentage
Individuals and Charitable Bequests	81%
Private Foundations	14%
Corporations	5%
Total	100%

Source: Hudson Institute – Center for Global Prosperity

Annex 4 Table 17: Origins of private resources given to developing countries in the USA

Origins of private donations to developing countries USA in 2010	Percentage of Total
Corporations	19%
Private, Voluntary Organizations	36%
Religious Organizations	18%
Independent Foundations	12%
Volunteerism	10%
Academic Institutions	5%
Total	100%

Source: Hudson Institute

Annex 4 Table 18: Commitment of General Public to Donating Cash for all Charitable Purposes by Region

Region	Percentage of Population Giving 2011
Australasia	67%
North America	64%
Western, Southern Europe	49%
South Eastern Asia	49%
Eastern Asia	37%
Southern Asia	35%
Middle East	32%
Central America	31%
South American, Caribbean	28%
North Africa	27%
Central and Eastern Europe	19%
Central Asia	18%
Sub-Saharan Africa	17%
Total	29%

Source: Charities Aid Foundation – UK

Annex 4 Table 19: Trend in US Foundation (corporate and private) Grants (billion US\$)

2009	2010	2011	Change between 2009–11
590	644	646	+9.5%

Source: Foundationcenter.org 2012 Foundation Growth and Giving Estimates

Since peaking in 2007 and crashing in 2008 due to the economic crisis, foundations (both corporate and private) have increased year over year between 2009–11 and have returned to pre-crisis levels

Annex 4 Table 20: Trend in Median US Corporate Giving – Selected Companies

2009	2010	2011	Change Between 2009 and 2011
Million US\$			
26	19.3	22.1	-15%

Source: Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy Annual Reports: Survey of nearly 150 corporations in the Fortune1000 who provided information on their annual giving. Note some recovery in 2011

Annex 5: Persons Interviewed

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
Communications Public Policy and Private Partnerships Division (CP)	Nancy Roman	CP Director	CP – Washington DC	WFP
	Monica Marshall	Head CPP	CPP (now Bangkok)	WFP
	Sandra Westlake	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Officer	CPP Rome	WFP
	Ashraf HAMOUDA	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Officer	CPP Rome	WFP
	Marco Selva	Donor Relations Officer	CPP Rome	WFP
	Maya El Hage	Finance Officer CPP	CPP Rome	WFP
	Anne Kohli	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Officer	CPP Rome	WFP
	Zhen-Zhen Huang	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Off	CPP	WFP
	Sarah Borchers	Online Fundraising Manager	CPP Rome	WFP
	Kye Young	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Officer	CPP Rome	WFP
	Patricia Artadi-Facultad	Partnership Manager	CPP Bangkok	WFP
	Parichat Burnanatanit	National Officer	CPP Bangkok	WFP
	Zhen-Zhen Huang	Partnership Manager	CPP Bangkok	WFP
	Mutinta Chimuka	Global Lead project Laser Beam (PLB)	CPP Jakarta	WFP
	Derval Usher	Consultant	CPP Jakarta	WFP
	Alan Brown	Private-Sector Relations Officer	CPP London	WFP
	Patrick McKenna	Partnership Manager	CPP London	WFP
	Isabel Burchard	Partnerships Manager	CPP New York	WFP
	Fatimah Gilliam	Head of Finance and Fundraising, North America, Private Partnerships	CPP New York	WFP
	Greg BILIONIS	Senior Partnerships Manager	CPP New York	WFP
	Nicolas Demey	Partnerships Manager	CPP New York	WFP
	Dana Vettel	Consultant	CPP New York	WFP
	Natalie Vaupel	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Off	CPP Washington	WFP
	Challiss McDonough	Senior Spokeswoman	CPC Nairobi	WFP
Caroline Hurford	Public Affairs Officer	CPC London	WFP	
Bettina Luescher	Senior Public Affairs Officer	CPC New York	WFP	
Alejandro LOPEZ-CHICHERI	Regional Public Information Officer	CPC New York	WFP	
Antonio Ruiz Zwollo	Head of Technology and Dep. Mgr. of Operations	CP	WFP	
Inigo Scott	Consultant	CP	WFP	
Antje Mershel	Former CPP Due Diligence Officer			
WFP Headquarters (Other departments)	Amir Abdulla	Deputy Executive Director and COO, ER	External Relations Department (ER)	WFP
	Wolfgang Herbinger	Director ODL	Logistics Division (ODL)	WFP
	David Kaatrud	Director, ODL	Logistics Division (ODL)	WFP
	Thomas Thompson	Head, ALITE and Cluster Units	Logistics Division (ODL)	WFP
	Matteo Perrone	Logistics Officer	Logistics Division (ODL)	WFP
	Pierre Carrasse	Chief, ODLA	Logistics Division (ODL)	WFP
	Peter French	Chief, ODLT	Logistics Division (ODL)	WFP

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
	Jacob Holder	Logistics Officer	Logistics Division Transport (ODLT)	WFP
	Peter Scott Bowden	Head, Pandemic Response Unit	Logistics Division	WFP

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
WFP Headquarters (Other departments)	Motohiro Ogita	Regional Procurement Officer	Procurement Unit	WFP
	Bartolomeo MIGONE	General Counsel and Director, LEG	LEG (Legal Office)	WFP
	Yoshi Makino	Head of LEGC	Contractual and Constitutional Law Branche (LEGC)	WFP
	Ariona Aubrey	Legal Officer	LEGM	WFP
	Torben Due	Director of Operations	Operations Department (OD)	WFP
	Peter Rodrigues	Sr. Programme Adviser	Operations Department (OD)	WFP
	David RYCKEMBUSCH	Consultant	Cash for Change Service (ODXC)	WFP (was BCG)
	Lucy Elliot	Director	Office of Internal Audit (OSA)	WFP
	Elena Figus	Internal Auditor	Office of Internal Audit (OSA)	WFP
	Sankara Bhaskaruni	Audit Manager	Office of Internal Audit (OSA)	WFP
	Martin Bloem	Chief PSN	Nutrition and HIV/AIDS Service (PSN)	WFP
	Robert OPP	Director, Business Innovation and Support	Business Innovation and Support Branch (RMI)	WFP
	Sean O'BRIEN	Director RMB	Budget and Programming Division (RMB)	WFP
	Serena Baldelli	Budget Officer RMBB	Budget and Programming Division Trust funds (RMBB)	WFP
	Trudy Bower	Grants Manager	Grants Management Unit (RMBG)	WFP
	Kartini OPPUSUNGGU	Programme Adviser, KM and Performance Reporting	Performance and accountability Management Division (RMP)	WFP
	Pedro GUAZO	Director RMF	Finance and Treasury Division (RMF)	WFP
	Domenico SCALPELLI	Deputy Director ERD	Government Donor Relations Division (ERD)	WFP
	Erika Joergensen	Secretary to the Executive Board	Executive Board Secretariat (ERB)	WFP
	Anueja GOPALAKRISHNAN	REACH Programme Officer	Office of the Executive Director (EDD)	WFP
Ernesto Baca	CIO and Director, ODI and ODM	ICT (Partnership w. Vodaphone)	WFP	

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
	Joseph Choi	External Relations Officer	ICT (Partnership w. Vodaphone)	WFP
	Robert Opp	Director, Business Innovation and Support	RM	WFP
	Laurent Bukera	Chief	RMBP	WFP

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
WFP Headquarters (Other departments)	Caroline Hurford	Senior Public Affairs Officer	OEDC	WFP
	Arianna Weicz	Chief (one truth/Business Objects) IT		WFP
	Anna Majkowski	Chief, HR Information/Reporting	Info Systems Support and Reporting Branch (HROI)	WFP
	Emily Sidaner		Programme Design Service, School Feeding (ODXP)	WFP
	Mari Hassenen	Performance Management		WFP
	Franco FERRENTINO	Systems Accountant (Data Warehouse)	Accounts (RMS)	WFP
	Anthony TYRRELL	Chief, RMFFC	Contributions/Project Accounts Branch (RMFFC)	WFP
	Giovanna PONZI	Finance Assistant	Contributions/Project Accounts Branch (RMFFC)	WFP
	Aaron SHARGHI	Info and Knowledge Management Officer	Government Donor Relations Division (ERD)	WFP
	Patrick MULLEN	Data Analyst	Government Donor Relations Division (ERD)	WFP
	Margot van der Velden	Chief, Nutrition, MCH and HIV/AIDS	Programme Design Service, nutrition, ODXP	WFP
	Lynnda Kiess	Programme Adviser, ODXP	Programme Design Service, nutrition, ODXP	WFP
	Natasha Nadazdin	Programme Adviser	Programme Design Service, nutrition, ODXP	WFP
	Emilie SIDANER	Programme Officer	School Feeding Service (PSS)	WFP
	Bishow PARAJULI	Chief of Staff and Director, EDD	Office of the Executive Director (EDD)	WFP
	Chris Kaye	Director, RMP	Performance and Accountability Management Division (RMP)	WFP
	Amir Abdulla	Deputy Executive Director and COO, ER	External Relations Department (ER)	WFP
	Maria Jaen	Donor and Private-Sector Relations Off NOB	ERD	WFP
	Sara Sarno	Donor and Private-Sector Relations UNV	ERD	WFP
	Al Kehler	Chief	ODXP	WFP
	Dierk Stegen	Chief, ODLS	ODLS	WFP
Denis Vidal	Chief Programming Officer	RMBP	WFP	
Gian Carlo Cirri	Chief	PSS	WFP	

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
WFP Country Offices	Christa Rader	Country Director	Country Office Bangladesh	WFP
	Taskina Huq	Project Laser Beam	Country Office Bangladesh	WFP
	Britta Schumacher		Country Office Bangladesh	WFP
	Cynthia Jones	Deputy Country Director	Country Office, Brazil	WFP
	Gianpietro Bordignon	Country Director Egypt	Country Office, Egypt	WFP
	Nora Nairi	Senior Staff Assistant	Country Office Egypt	WFP
	Souraya Saoud	VAM	Country Office Egypt	WFP
	Amani Gamafeldin	Programme Officer	Country Office Egypt	WFP
	Abdou Dieng	Country Director	Country Office, Ethiopia	WFP
	Lynne Miller	Deputy Country Director	Country Office, Ethiopia	WFP
	GianMichele DeMaio	Head Relief Section, Dpty Hd of Programme	Country Office, Ethiopia	WFP
	Janne Suvanto	Deputy Country Director	Country Office, Haiti	WFP
	Mihoko Tamamura	OMB	Country Office India	WFP
	Coco Ushiyama	Country Director Indonesia	Country Office Indonesia	WFP
	Giulia Baldi	Kepala Programme	Country office Indonesia	WFP
	Pippa Bradford	Deputy Country Director Kenya	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Oyinkan Odeinde Hallgreen	Senior Officer, Head of Logistics	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Romina Woldemariam	Programme Officer	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Sam Okara	WFP Programme Officer (Refugees)	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Aya Shneerson	Programme Officer	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Josephine Mahiga	Janabi, Head of Refugee Operations	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Koryun Alaverdyan	Programme Coordinator PRRO	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Charles Nguru	NPO Country Programme	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Alex Mwundi	Programme Officer, NPO School Feeding (formerly Ministry of Education)	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Mary Muchoki	School Feeding	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Maria Tsvetkova	Resource Management Analyst	Country Office Kenya	WFP
	Helmut Rauch	Country Director Nicaragua	Country Office Nicaragua	WFP
	Rosario Sanabria	Programme Officer NOC	Country Office Nicaragua	WFP
	Marcela Mayorga	Programme Assistant	Country Office Nicaragua	WFP
	Mariaelena Velazquez		Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
Mariella Barreto	Head of the Unit, Senior Finance Assistant	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP	
Carolina Moran	Senior Finance Assistant	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP	

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
WFP Country Offices	Orelia Mercado	Finance Assistant	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Laurie Cabrera	Human Resources	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Mrs. Lizmaria Ubeda	Office Liaison	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Carlos Ortiz	Field Monitor Assistant SC G	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Luis Dávila	Programme Assistant	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Karla Somarriba	Programme Assistant	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Jason Jones	MandE Assistant,	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Mariella Borretto	Head of Finance Nicaragua, Senior Finance Assistant	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Liz María Ubeda	Office Liaison	Country Office, Nicaragua	WFP
	Inge Breuer	Country Director	Country Office Senegal	WFP
	Corinne Fleischer	Deputy Regional Director	Country office, Khartoum, Sudan	WFP
WFP Regional Bureaux and Liaison Offices	Laura Melo	Programme Adviser	Regional Bureau, Panama (P4P)	WFP
	Mads Frandsen	Donor Relations Officer	Liaison Office Washington DC	WFP
	Jayne Adams	Chief	Regional Bureau, Panama	WFP
	Kenro Oshidari	Regional Director Asia	Regional Bureau Bangkok	WFP
	Motohiro Ogita	Regional Procurement Officer, Regional Bureau for Asia	Regional Bureau for Asia	WFP
	Zhen-Zhen Huang	Partnership Officer, Private Partnerships for Asia	Regional Bureau for Asia	WFP
	Jesse Wood	Donor Relations Officer	Regional Office for Eastern and Central Africa	WFP
	Neil Murphy-Dewar	ICT Officer	Regional Office for Eastern and Central Africa	WFP
	Birgitta Bauer	WFP HIV/AIDs Technical Support Team	Bureau for Southern Africa, Eastern and Central Africa	WFP
	Mustapha Darboe	Regional Director	Regional Bureau for Southern Africa	WFP
	Brenda Barton	Deputy Regional Director	Regional Bureau for Southern Africa	WFP
	Pierre Honnorat	Logistics Officer	Regional Bureau for Southern Africa	WFP
	Claudia Altorio	Public Information	Regional Bureau for Southern Africa	WFP

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
WFP Regional Bureaux and Liaison Offices	Gemmo Lodesani	Regional Director, OD-PANAMA	Regional Bureau Panama	WFP
	Jaime Vallaura	Deputy Regional Director	Regional Bureau Panama	WFP
	Pedro Medrano	Director	ODIS, New York	WFP
	Gordana Jerger	Senior Adviser	WFP in New York	WFP
	Allan Jury	Director	Liaison Office Washington	WFP
WFP Executive Board Members	Shobhana Kumar Pattanayak	President of the Executive Board	Executive Board	WFP
	Marc Jurgens	Executive Board member for South Africa and Counsellor for Multilateral Affairs	Executive Board	WFP
	Mounghi Medi	Executive Board Member for Cameroon	Executive Board	WFP
	Daisuke Saiga	Executive Board Member for Japan	Executive Board	WFP
	Miguel Ruíz-Cabañas Izquierdo	Executive Board Member and Ambassador of Mexico	Executive Board	WFP
	Arsen Vartonyan	Alternative Representative Russian Federation	Executive Board	WFP
	Jim Harvey	Permanent Representative of the UK to WFP and former EB Chair	Executive Board	WFP
	Ann Adair Heuchan	Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada	Executive Board	WFP
	Miliça Nauman	Manager, Food Assistance Unit Canada.	Executive Board	WFP
	Germany	Written response received	Executive Board	WFP
Friends of WFP	Catherine Dickhage	Director, Italian Committee for WFP		Italian Friends of WFP
	Rick Leach	President and CEO		Friends of WFP –USA
	Alma Jane Shepard	VP for Development		Friends of WFP –USA
	Hitomi Yokote	Executive Officer		Japan Association of WFP
GAIN , National Foundations, Donor NGO	Ms. Dora Panagides	Head of Fortification Programmes		GAIN
	Mr. Amaud Lailou	Programme Officer		GAIN
	Birgit Poniatowski	Partnerships Manager		GAIN
	Petra Costerman Boedt	Regional Director East Africa		Terre des Hommes
	Nenny Soemazinata	Managing Director		Putera Sampoerna Foundation – Indonesia

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
Private-sector Companies	Jens Munch Lund-Nielsen	Lead Group Adviser, CSR, Group Sustainability		A.P. Moller – Maersk
	Federico Lalatta Costerbosa	Partner and Managing Director		BCG
	Monica Regazzi	Partner and Managing Director		BCG
	Max Reimpell	Consultant doing a study in the WFP Regional Office for Southern Africa		BCG
	Michelle Grogg	Senior Director, Corporate Contributions and Partnerships		Cargill
	Ben Lambert	Grants manager		Caterpillar Foundation
	Fokko Wientjes	Sustainable Development and Programme director DSM/WFP partnership		DSM
	Ms. Minerva Al-Affi			DSM, Cairo
	Robin Landis	Outposted WFP officer		HIV/AIDs – North Star Alliance
	Mr. Mike Nolt	CEO Mercedes – Star Care Egypt.		Mercedes – Star Care Egypt
	Ms. Sina Hobous	CSR Manager		National Bank of Egypt
	Ms. Shereen Shaheen			PepsiCo
	Silvia Cruz-Vargas	Managing projects at the PepsiCo Foundation and working in Global Citizenship and Sustainability.		PepsiCo
	Catherine Patterson	Director of Global Citizenship and Sustainability		PepsiCo
	Kristina Fell and Laura Bush	Vice President of Operations		FEED
	Chris Nelson	CEO		Kemin
	Dheni Prasetyo	Ka Sub Div Perencanaan dan Promosi		Palang Merah Indonesia
	Ms. Omneya Hanaa	Manager		Star Care Egypt
	James Weiss	COO, Street King LLC and Adviser		Street King
	Yunaimer Dinarte	Coordinador de Asuntos Corporativos Nicaragua		Supermercados Unidos de Nicaragua (Wal-Mart)
Perry Jeine	Group Director Corporate Responsibility		TNT (USA)	
Laurens Ruster	Global Programme Manager Partnerships, Corporate Responsibility		TNT	
Kobus Fourie	CEO Southern Africa		TNT	
Mary Mashiane	CSR Manager – Southern Africa		TNT	
Abdallah Alwardat	Programme Adviser		TNT – WFP partnership for subsidies bread supply chain review	
Patricia O'Hayer	Vice President of Communications		Unilever HQ	

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
Private Sector Companies	Waila Wisjnu	Assistant Manager of PHE Programme		Unilever Indonesia
	Sinta Kaniawati	General Manager Unilever Indonesia Foundation		Unilever Indonesia
	Leo Indarwahono	PHE Programme Manager		Unilever
	Noha Saad	CSR and Foundation Senior Manager		Vodafone – Egypt
	Lauren Turnbull	CSI and Sponsorship Manager Africa		YUM Concessionaire Southern Africa!
	Laurie Schalow	Vice President, Public Affairs		YUM!
	Tjibo Mothobi	CEO		Global Business Coalition for Health
Government Ministries	Mohamed Hamman			Ministry of International Cooperation, Egypt
	Anwar El-Nakeeb	Economic Adviser		Minister of Supply and Internal Trade, Egypt
	Nila F. Moelek	Utusan Khusus President		Kantor Utusan Khusus Presiden Republik Indonesia, Untuk Millenium Development Goals
	Diah S. Saminarsi	Assistant to Special Envoy on Programme Planning and Community Partnership		Office of the President's Special Envoy on MDGs, Republic of Indonesia
	Norma Ortiz	Director of the Integrated School Nutritional Programme of the MINISTRY of Education (PINE/MINED)		Ministry of Education, Government of Nicaragua
	José Benito Aragón	Asesor de la Secretaría de Relaciones Económicas y Cooperación		Secretaría de Relaciones Económicas y Cooperación
	Reda Abou Serie Ms. Nermine El Noomany			MOE, Egypt MOE, Egypt

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
NGO Comparators	Zorayda Gómez	Asesora de Gestión de Fondos		Visión Mundial Nicaragua
	David Leege	Deputy Director Programme Quality and Support Dept.		CRS
	Tom Shaw	Senior Technical Adviser – Microfinance		CRS
	Mark Melia	Interim Executive VP of Charitable Giving		CRS
	Marc D'Silva	Private Sector		CRS
	Kevin Kostic	Charitable Giving		CRS
	Jennifer Tierney	Development Director		Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF)
	Zuleyka Maynard	Resource Mobilization Senior Officer		International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
	Olaug Bergseth	Strategic Partnerships and Int'l Relations		International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
	Dheni Prasetyo	Head of Planning and Promotion Sub Division		Red Cross Indonesia
	Vinod Parmeshwar	Associate Director Markets and Innovation		Oxfam America
	Sam Connor	Director Philanthropic Partnerships		Save the Children
	Matthew Wingate	Programme Funding Director UK		Save The Children
	Kit Manning	Manager	New Business Development	Oxfam America
Walter Middleton	Partnership Leader, Food and Livelihood Security		World Vision International	

	Person	Position	Organizational Unit	Organization
UN Comparators	Karolina Mzyk			UNDP
	Alex Stein	Executive Director		UN Global Compact Foundation
	Matthias Stausberg	Head of Public Affairs and Media Relations, Spokesperson		UN Global Compact
	Melissa Powell	Head of Strategy and Partnerships		UN Global Compact
	Thierry Delvigne	Chief, Communications and Partnerships		UNICEF
	Tim Hunter	Fundraising Director		UNICEF
	Leila Pakkala	Director	Private Fundraising and Partnerships	UNICEF
	Jorge Olague	Regional Chief	Private Fundraising and Partnerships	UNICEF
	Maria Machicado	Regional Chief, Private Fundraising and Partnerships		UNICEF
	Frieda Addienayuni	Fund Raising Officer		UNICEF – Indonesia
	Charlie Hartono Lie	Corporate Fund Raising		UNICEF – Indonesia
	Christina Schaake	Senior Officer		UNHCR
	Christophe Glenisson	Private-Sector Fundraising officer, Asia and Pacific		UNHCR
	Chris Innes	Chief, National Private-Sector Fundraising Network		UNHCR

Annex 6: Bibliography

- Antellini Russo, F. and Zampino, R. 2012. Infrastructures, Public Accounts and Public-Private Partnerships: Evidence from the Italian Local Administrations, *Review of Economics and Institutions*.
- ARC. 2012. The American National Red Cross Board of Governors Philanthropy Committee Charter.
- Argandoña, A. 2009. Ethical Management Systems for Not-for-profit Organizations. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Unternehmensethik- Journal for Business, Economics and Ethics*, Rainer Hampp Verlag, vol. 10(1), pages 132–146.
- Asian Development Bank. 2006. ADB's Financing Partnership Strategy, Mandaluyong City, Philippines.
- Balletto, R. and Wertheimer, S. 2010. Chapter 17: Emergency preparedness tools and activities in Latin America and the Caribbean, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*.
- BBVA. 2008. BBVA, working towards a better future for people – Corporate Responsibility Report.
- Bendell, J. 2011. *Evolving Partnerships: A Guide to Working with Business for Greater Social Change*. Greenleaf.
- Berlin Civil Society Centre. 2005. International IGNO Accountability Charter. Berlin, Germany.
- Binder, A., Palenberg, M., Martin Witte, J. 2007. Engaging business in development: results of an international benchmarking study. Global Public Policy Institute (GPPI) Research Paper No. 8. Berlin.
- Borwankar, A. and Ramakrishna Velamuri, S. 2007. The potential for management development in NGO/private-sector partnerships, *Journal of Management Development*, 28(4), 326–343.
- Boston Consulting Group. 2012. BCG 2012 workplan.
- Boston Consulting Group. May 31, 2011. Impact survey of BCG-supported projects, World Food Programme 2007–2009.
- Boston Consulting Group. Feb-12. The BCG/WFP Partner Team as of December 2011.
- Boston Consulting Group. 2010. Making a Difference, BCGs Partnerships and Projects for Social Impact, 2010 edition.
- Bounie, D., Bienfait, C., Prigge, S. and Salvignol, B. 2010. Chapter 12: Food technology for safe and nutritious food, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*.
- Bull, B., McNeill, D. 2007. Development Issues in Global Governance: Public-Private Partnerships and Market Multilateralism, *Warwick Studies in Globalisation*. Oxon (United Kingdom), Routledge, 215 p.
- Buse, K. and Harmer, A.M. 2007. Seven habits of highly effective global public-private health partnerships: practical and potential, *Social Science and Medicine*, 64, 259–271.

- Buse, K. Walt, G. 2000. Global public-private partnerships: Part 1 – a new development in health? World Health Organization. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*; 78(4), p549.
- Bush, S. and Hopkins, A.D. 2011. Public-private partnerships in neglected tropical disease control: the role of non-governmental organizations, *Acta Tropica*, 120S, S169–S172.
- CARE. 2010. CARE USA Annual Report, 2010.
- CARE. 2011. Maternal Health: The Power of Partnership, Findings from the CARE Learning Tour to Bangladesh.
- CARE. 1997. CARE USA’s Program Division – Partnerships Manual.
- CARE. 2008. Community tourism.
- CARE. 2006. Report on CARE’s First Regional Conference on: “Private-sector Partnerships in Latin America and the Caribbean”.
- CARE. Sowing a Healthy Future in Cambodia: a Private/Public Sector Partnership Initiative.
- Cargill. 2011. Annual Report "Working to feed the world".
- Cargill. 2006. Final Report “Smart Schools Make Smart Kids”.
- Cargill. 2006. Smart Schools Make Smart Kids Project Expansion with Cargill’s Support.
- Catholic Relief Services. 2012. Overview of Charitable Giving at CRS.
- Catholic Relief Services. 2010. Catholic Relief Services – United States Conference of Catholic Bishops – Financial Statement Report.
- Catholic Relief Services. 2010. CRS Annual Report.
- Charities Aid Foundation. 2010. UK Global Giving .
- Clarke, L. 2011. Responsibility and International Organizations under International Law for the Acts of Global Health and Public-Private Partnerships, *Chicago Journal of International Law*, 12(1), 55.
- Clause, V. 2012. The Market Opportunity for Mobile Agriculture. GSMA – Development Fund – mAgri – Blog. <http://www.gsma.com/developmentfund/the-market-opportunity-for-mobile-agriculture-highlights-from-mobile-world-congress-2012/>
- Clay, J. 2005. Exploring the Links Between International Business and Poverty Reduction: A Case Study of Unilever in Indonesia, an Oxfam GB, Novib, Unilever, and Unilever Indonesia joint research project report.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Nota Integrativa al Bilancio d’esercizio.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Rendiconto.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Stato Patrimoniale.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Relazione Del Collegio Sindacale.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Memorandum of Understanding Comitato Italiano per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Statuto.

- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2010. Copia di Atto.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP) 2009. Rendiconto_31122009_14052009.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP) 2009. Stato Patrimoniale_31122009_14052009.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2009 Nota Integrativa_31122009_14052010.
- Comitato Italiano Per Il Programma Alimentare Mondiale (WFP). 2009. Statute – Relazione del Collegio Sindacale.
- Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy. 2009–2011. Annual Reports .
- Curtis, V. , Garbrah-Aidoo, N., Scott, B. 2007. Masters of Marketing: Bringing Private-Sector Skills to Public Health Partnerships. *Am J Public Health*. 2007 April; 97(4): 634–641.
- De Pee, S., van den Briel, T., van Hees, J. and Bloem, M.W. 2010. Chapter 11: Introducing new and improved food products for better nutrition, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*. De Pinho Campos, K., Norman, C.D., Jadad, A.R. 2011. Product development in public/private partnerships for public health: A systematic review using qualitative data, *Social Science and Medicine*, 73, 986–994.
- Diriba, G. *et al.* 2010. *Operational Guide to Strengthen Capacity of Nations to Reduce Hunger. A Toolbox for Partnership, Capacity Development and Hand-Over Activities*, Hand-Over and Partnership Branch. Programme Division, Rome, WFP. 117 p.
- DSM. 2009. DSM extends its fight against ‘hidden hunger’ with scientific breakthrough.
- DSM. 2011. New solutions needed to achieve the UN Millennium Development Goals.
- Dyer, J. H., Powell, B. C., Sakakibara, M., and Wang, A. 2006. Determinants of Success in R&D Alliances. NISTIR 7323. National Institute of Standards and Technology. Gaithersburg, MD. USA.
- Erdelmann, F., Njoroge, M. and Isler, A. 2010. Chapter 13: The evolution of food assistance for HIV care and treatment 2000 to 2009: a decade of institutional innovations, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*.
- FAO. 2010. Symposium on Private-Sector Contributions to the Delivery of Food Security.
- Ferroni, M. and Castle, P. 2011. Public/Private Partnerships and Sustainable Agricultural Development, *Sustainability*, 3, 1064–1073.
- Forrer, J. and Kee, J. E., 2010. Public/Private partnerships and the public accountability question, *Public Administration Overview*, 70(3), 475–486.
- Foundationcenter.org. 2012 Foundation Growth and Giving Estimates; Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy.
- Foundationcenter.org. 2012. Foundation Growth and Giving Estimates.
- Friends of WFP USA. 2010. Annual Report (2009 And 2010).
- Friends of WFP USA. 2010. Annual Report "Nourish to empower".
- Friends of WFP USA Annual Report (2008).

- Friends of WFP USA. 2006. WFP USA Letter and Certificate of Tax exemption 501(c)(3).
- FSG. 2012. Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Companies: Fighting Poverty and Making Profits at the Same Time? FSG Global Health Blog. <http://www.fsg.org/KnowledgeExchange/Blogs/GlobalHealth/PostID/286.aspx>.
- GAIN. 2010. Gain in Africa.
- GAIN. 2010. Gain in Asia.
- GAIN. 2011. About the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN).
- GAIN. 2011. Essential Fats Are Crucial for Healthy Children.
- GAIN. 2010. AIM: Amsterdam initiative against malnutrition.
- Ghere, R.K. 2001. Ethical futures and public/private partnerships: peering far down the track, *Public Organization Review*, 1(3), 303–320.
- Heinz. 2012. Heinz Micronutrient Campaign: History of the Heinz Micronutrient Campaign.
- Heinz. 2012. Heinz Micronutrient Campaign: Heinz Micronutrient Campaign Partners.
- Holloway, R. 2001. Ethics in Fundraising. Global Connections, August 2001. On Blackboard: Course Documents: Planning and Managing Fundraising folder. Resource Alliance.
- Hoxtell, W., Preysing, D., Steets, J. 2010. Coming of Age: UN Private Sector, in *2000 UN Global Compact*, UN, NY.
- ICRC. 2006. Business and international humanitarian law – an introduction to the rights and obligations of business enterprises under humanitarian law.
- ICRC. 2010. 2010 Financial and Funding Information Overview.
- ICRC. 2002. Ethical principles guiding ICRC's partnerships with the private sector.
- ICRC. 2011. ICRC Corporate Support Group.
- ICRC. 2011. ICRC Finance and administration report.
- ICRC. 2009. The ICRC Its mission and work.
- IFAD. 2010. IFAD's Engagement with the Private Sector in Rural Poverty Reduction.
- IFRC. 2009. Secretariat Planning and Resource Mobilization Guidelines.
- INSEAD. 2004. The TPG WFP Partnership: Learning how to dance. 704–042–1. INSEAD. Fontainebleu, France.
- INSEAD. 2004. Moving the World: The TPG/WFP Partnership Looking for a Partner. 02/2004–5187. INSEAD, Fontainebleu, France.
- INSEAD. 2009. Safety in Numbers: reducing road risk with Danida's multi-sector partnership. 5589 TN Teaching Note, INSEAD, Fontainebleu, France.
- INSEAD. 2009. When the music changes, so does the dance: the TNT/WFP Partnership, 'Moving the World' Five Years on.
- INSEAD. 2008. Paving the Road to Healthy Highways: a Partnership to Scale Up Hiv/AIDS Clinics in Africa.
- IRRC. 2012. Policy for Corporate Sector Partnerships.

- Jackson, B., Hlahla, M. 2001. South Africa's infrastructure service delivery needs: The role of and challenge to public/private partnerships, *Civil Engineering : Magazine of the South African Institution of Civil Engineering*; 9(3), 41.
- Jamali, D. and Keshishian, T. 2008. Uneasy alliances: lessons learned from partnerships between businesses and NGOs in the context of CSR, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 277-295.
- Kilgrou, D. 2001. Globalization and corporate responsibility, *Canadian Speeches* 15 (1).
- Linka, S.J.T., 2001. Public/private partnerships: Stimulating competition in a dynamic market, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 19, 763-794.
- Merschel, A. 2012. Due Diligence Research in Private Partnerships Division of the UN World Food Programme – Critical Review and Recommendations. WFP, Rome.
- Nestle. 2012. The Challenges of Achieving Greater Transparency.
- North Star Alliance, 2011. Annual Overview 2010.
- North Star Alliance: Info 2011.
- Nptrends.com: <http://www.nptrends.com/nonprofit-trends/2010-online-giving-trends.htm>.
- OCHA and World Economic Forum. 2012. Guiding Principles for Public/Private Collaboration for Humanitarian Action. United Nations Office for Humanitarian Affairs.
- ODI. 2003. Humanitarian NGOs: Challenges and trends, *Humanitarian Policy Group Briefing*, 12.
- OECD/DAC: 2012 Web Statistical Tables <http://www.oecd.org/dac/aidstatistics/>.
- Otsuki, K. 2011. Sustainable partnerships for a green economy: A case study of public procurement for home-grown school feeding, *Natural Resources Forum*, 35, 213-222.
- Oxfam. 2011. Oxfam Annual Report 2010-2011.
- Oxfam. 2007. The Private Sector and Humanitarian Relief.
- Parkan, B. 2008. On Multinational Corporations and the Provision of Positive Rights, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85, 73-82.
- Pfeiffer, J., Johnson, W., Fort, M., Shakow, A., Hagopian, A., Gloyd, S. 2008. Strengthening Health Systems in Poor Countries: A Code of Conduct for Nongovernmental Organizations. *Am J Public Health*. 2008 December; 98(12): 2134-2140.
- Poulton, C. and Macartney, J. 2012. Can Public-Private Partnerships Leverage Private Investment in Agricultural Value Chains in Africa? A Preliminary Review, *World Development*, 40(1), 96-109.
- Quinn, E. 2010. Chapter 19: Logistics for food assistance: delivering innovations in complex environments, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*.
- Red Cross Federation. 2011. Wide Resource Mobilization Strategy: Resourcing our Shared Future. International Federal of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Geneva, 2011. www.desaprender.org/blogs/167/post/371/download.
- Reich, M.R. 2000. Public-private partnerships for public health, *Nature Medicine*, 6(6), 617-621.

- Rocha, J.L. and Christoplos, I. 2001. Disaster Mitigation and Preparedness on the Nicaraguan Post-Mitch Agenda', *Disasters*, vol. 25, no. 3, 2001, pp. 240–250.
- Rondinelli, D.A. 2003. Partnering for Development: Government/Private-Sector Cooperation in Service Provision. In Rondinelli, D. and Shabbir Cheema, G., Eds. *Reinventing Government for the Twenty-First Century: State Capacity in a Globalizing Society*. Kumarian Press, Bloomfield CT, USA. P. 219.
- Runde, D., Wise, H., Saito Carson, A., Coates, E. 2011. *Seizing the Opportunity in Public/Private Partnerships Strengthening Capacity at the State Department, USAID and MCC*. CSIS Center for Strategic Studies and International Studies.
- Russo, F. A. and Zampino, R. 2012. Infrastructures, public accounts and public private partnerships: evidence from Italian local administrations, *Review of Economics and Institutions*, 3(1), 1–28.
- Sarmiento, J.M. 2010. Do public/private partnerships create value for money for the public sector? The Portuguese experience, *OECD Journal on budgeting*, 2010/1.
- Save The Children. 2011. Save the Children Annual Report.
- Save the Children. 2010. Save the Children federation financial statement.
- Save The Children. 2011. Code of Ethics and Business Conduct.
- Save the Children. 2010. Save The Children Partner Survey Report.
- Save the Children. 2012. Fundraising Frequently Asked Questions.
- Shaoul, J, *et al.* 2012. Accountability and corporate governance of public private partnerships, *Crit Perspect Account*, doi:10.1016/j.cpa.2011.12.006.
- Simmonds, B. 2000. Trends in public/private partnerships, *Journal of Leisure Property*, 1(1), 66–74.
- Southern Africa Institute of Fundraising. 2006. International Statement of Ethical Principles in Fundraising.
- SPHERE. 2011. Sphere Handbook.
- Swaminath, A. 2009. A Way to Effective Service Delivery in Fragile States. *Public/Private Partnerships*, World Bank, Washington.
- Tennyson, R. 2003. *The partnering toolbox*. The International Business Leaders Forum and the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition.
- Clinton Global Initiative/Dalberg Task Force on Program Delivery. 2006. From Talk to Walk: Ideas to Optimize Development.
- Economist. 2011. Identifying a billion Indians. *The Economist* 27 January 2011.
- Turner, J.L. 2003. Cultivating environmental NGO/business partnerships. *The China Business Review*, 22–25.
- UN. 2000 guidelines on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Business Community, issued by the UN Secretary-General 17 July 2000.
- UN. 2001. Towards global partnerships: cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners, in particular the private sector, Report of the Secretary-General.
- UN. 2009. Guidelines on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Business Sector, Issued by the UN Secretary-General.

- UN Global Compact Ten Principles.
<http://www.unglobalcompact.org/aboutthegc/thetenprinciples/index.html>
- UN Global Compact. 2008. The United Nations and the private sector: a framework for collaboration, Global Compact Office.
- UN/Global Compact/Unilever/Dalberg. 2011. Catalyzing Transformational Partnerships between the United Nations and Business.
- UNHCR. 2011. Agenda Item 4 - ii - (EC/62/SC/CRP.30) Report on UNHCR's resource mobilization strategy, including private-sector fundraising strategy: 52nd Meeting of the Standing Committee (20–21 September 2011).
- UNHCR. 2011. Funding UNHCR's programmes.
- UNHCR. 2011. UNHCR Global Appeal 2012–2013: Identifying needs and funding requirements.
- UNHCR. 2009 Report on UNHCR Resource Mobilization Strategy, including private-sector fund raising to the Standing Committee of the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme, 24 August 2009 (restricted): <http://www.unhcr.org/4abb8db09.html>.
- UNICEF. 2009. UNICEF Strategic Framework for Partnerships and Collaborative Relationships –Executive Board Annual Session 8–10 June 2009 ECOSOC /ICEF/2009/10 Issued 26 March 2009.
- UNICEF. Economic and Social Council. 2012. UNICEF Private Fundraising: 2012 workplan and proposed budget.
- UNICEF. Economic and Social Council 201 2011.
- UNICEF. 2011. Division of Private Fundraising and Partnership 2010 Annual Report .
- UNICEF. Economic and Social Council. 2010. UNICEF: Private Fundraising: 2010 workplan and proposed budget.
- UNICEF. 2010. Division of Communication Annual Report 2010.
- UNICEF. 2010. UNICEF Annual Report 2009.
- UNICEF. 2001. UNICEF Guidelines and Manual for Working with the Business Community – Identifying the Best Allies, Developing the Best Alliances.
- UNICEF and Save the Children. 2012. The Children's Rights and Business Principles Initiative, Respecting and Supporting Children's Rights while Advancing Business and Promoting a Sustainable Development Agenda.
- UNICEF and Save the Children. 2012. Children's rights and business principles.
- Unilever. 2009. Unilever: Support for School Meals and Awareness-Raising.
- Unilever and WFP. 2011. Together for Child Vitality Annual Report 2010.
- UN Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) 2009 Review of Management and Administration of the World Food Programme (WFP) Yishan Zhang and Nikolay Chulkov, UN Joint Inspection Unit, JIU/REP/2009/7.
- Utting, P. and Zammit, A. 2006. Beyond Pragmatism: Appraising UN/Business Partnerships. *MBR Programme Paper*, No. 1., UNRISD.

WANGO. 2004. Code of Ethics and Conduct for NGOs – Compliance Manual. World Association of Non-Governmental Organizations .

WFP. 2008. WFP’s Private-Sector Partnership and Fund Raising Strategy, WFP/EB.1/2008/5-B/1.

WFP. Annual Performance Reports 2004–2011.

WFP. 2008. WFP Strategic Plan 2008–2013, WFP/EB.A/2008/5-A/1/Rev.1.

WFP. 2010. Resourcing for a changing environment, WFP/EB.1/2010/5-B/Rev.1.

WFP. 2000. A Resource mobilization Strategy for the World Food Programme, WFP/EB.3/2000/3-B.

WFP. 2004. New Partnership to Meet Rising Needs – Expanding the WFP Donor Base, WFP.EB.3/2004/4-C.

WFP. 2005. Funding for Effectiveness, WFP/EB.2/2005/5-B.

WFP. 2009. School Feeding Policy, WFP/EB.2/2009/4-A.

WFP. 2009. WFP Gender Policy Corporate Action Plan 2010–11, WFP/EB 2/2009/4-C.

WFP. 2012. Update on the Implementation of the WFP Gender Policy: corporate Action plan 2010–11, WFP/EB.A/2012/5-F.

WFP. 2011. Draft Nutrition Policy, Informal Consultation on Nutrition, 31 Oct 2011.

WFP. 2012. Joint Global Logistics Cluster Evaluation (Draft).

WFP. 2012. Haiti: An Evaluation of WFP’s Portfolio (2005–10).

WFP. 2011. Kenya: An Evaluation of WFP’s Portfolio (2006–2010).

WFP. 2011. WFP's Agriculture and Market Support in Uganda (2009–2014): A Strategic Evaluation (mid-term).

WFP. 2011. WFP 2008 – 2013 Purchase for Progress (P4P) Initiative: A Strategic Evaluation (mid-term), WFP, 2011.

WFP. 2012. WFP Strategic Evaluation from food Aid to Food Assistance, Working in Partnership.

WFP. 2011. Annual Evaluation Report, WFP 2012.

WFP. 2012. WFP's operational relationship with NGOs and the National Red Crescent Societies – Annual Report 2011.

WFP. 2012. Full Cost recovery and associated costs (internal document).

WFP. 2010. Strategic Resource Allocation Committee (SRAC) Terms of reference (internal).

WFP. 2012. WFP Organizational chart April 2012.

WFP: 2009 Harnessing the Private Sector for Hunger Solutions .

WFP. 2012. Procedures for the valuation and registration of Gift-In-Kind (GIK) donations.

WFP. 2012. Private partnership Unit (internal report).

WFP. 2012. CP Donation process (internal document).

WFP. 2012. Due Diligence Report (Template – internal).

WFP. 2012. Private Partnerships Donor Approval Process (internal document).

WFP. 2012. Best Practices in Public/Private Partnerships, Private Partnerships Unit (internal document).

WFP. 2012. Why partner with WFP? Private Partnerships Unit.

WFP. 2012. Roles and Responsibilities – Private Partnerships Unit (internal document).

WFP. 2012. Framework for Private-Sector Activities (internal document).

WFP. 2012. UK Trusts and Foundations Fund Raising Manual (18/7/2012) – (internal document).

WFP. 2011. WFP and the Private Sector: Forging New Opportunities for the Hungry: 2011 Update.

WFP. 2011. WFP and the private sector 2011 Results.

WFP. 2009. Annual Report 2009, Private Partnerships Division (internal document).

WFP. 2010. WFP and the Private Sector: Forging New Opportunities for the Hungry: 2010 Update.

WFP. 2010. Online fundraising report (internal document).

WFP. 2011. Rebalancing the private partnerships division to double expected funding to US\$ 400 million by 2017 – DRAFT (internal document).

WFP. 2011. Global Online Fundraising Strategy Priority Markets and Goals for 2011–2017 (internal document).

WFP. 2010. Private-Sector Fundraising 2010 Results (internal document).

WFP. 2005. Private-Sector donor guidelines (internal document).

WFP. 2012. FACTSHEET: The Logistics Emergency Team (LET) Initiative.

WFP. 2012. A comprehensive attempt to strengthen TPDS through biometric technology – A pilot project by WFP in Rayagada district, Egypt.

WFP. 2012. Enrolment process at DPL – trial run: India.

WFP. 2012. Executive Brief: Egypt – Operational Issues, price volatility and shortfalls.

WFP. 2012. WFP News – Music Artist 50 Cent 'Inspired' By Trip To Horn Of Africa.

WFP. 2012. LG and WFP Partnership in Ethiopia – Hope Villages for poverty alleviation and rural development.

WFP. 2011. Report for Caterpillar: Equipment Supporting WFP Logistics in 2011.

WFP. 2011. UPS Foundation support to WFP Logistics – 2011 Annual report.

WFP. 2010. Project Laser Beam: Potential Areas for Support.

WFP. 2010. Project Laser Beam Report.

WFP. 2010. Project Laser Beam Report – Management Annex.

WFP. 2011. Egyptian Private Sector Join Hands With WFP To Provide Assistance to Vulnerable Egyptians.

WFP. 2011. Vodaphone WFP partnership – final report "Groundbreaking IT emergency platform in support of the entire humanitarian system".

WFP. 2009. DSM/WFP Partnership.

WFP. 2009. TNT/WFP Partnership Fact Sheet.

WFP. 2009. LG and WFP Partnership Fact Sheet.

WFP. 2009. Nationale Postcode Loterij and WFP Partnership Fact Sheet.

WFP. 2009. Pepsico Foundation/WFP Partnership Fact Sheet.

WFP. 2009. WFP/UNILEVER Partnership Fact Sheet.

WFP. 2009. YUM!/WFP Partnership Fact Sheet.

WFP. 2011. WFP, PepsiCo and USAID Fight Child Malnutrition In Ethiopia.

WFP. 2011. WFP News – Somali Refugee Mothers Give Plumpy'Sup The Thumbs Up.

WFP. 2011. WFP News – Drew Barrymore Visits Drought-Stricken Kenya.

WFP. 2010. Special Operation Indonesia 200082 – Logistics and Emergency Telecommunications Clusters Support to the Humanitarian community's Response to West Sumatra Earthquakes in Cooperation with the Government of Indonesia.

WFP. 2012. Bangladesh Country Programme 2012–2016 EB 2/2011/8 1.

WFP. 2010. Project Laser Beam – a public/private-sector partnership to eradicate child malnutrition.

WFP. 2010. SPR2010: Emergency Food Assistance to Victims of Hurricane Felix.

WFP. 2010. SPR2010: IR-EMOP-NICO-Assistance to Population Affected by Floods, Nicaragua.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Protecting and Rebuilding Livelihoods in the Arid and Semi-Arid Areas of Kenya.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Nutritional Rehabilitation in Indonesia (Project number: 100692).

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Inter-Agency Passenger Services for the Somali Region of Ethiopia.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Ethiopia Logistics Augmentation for Somali Region Operations.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Ethiopia Responding to Humanitarian Crisis and Enhancing Resilience to Food Insecurity.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Regional Emergency Preparedness Operation to Preposition High Energy Biscuits in Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Capacity Building of Integrated Micronutrient Programmes in the Central American Region.

WFP. 2010. SPR 2010 Capacity Building and Technical Assistance in Support of Food-Based Social Protection Programmes.

WFP. 2009. Experiences in Partnership for Capacity Development between WFP and the Government of Indonesia.

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Logistics and Emergency Telecommunication Clusters Support to the Humanitarian Community's Response to the West Sumatra Earthquakes in Cooperation with the Government of Indonesia.

WFP. 2009. Experiences in Partnership for Capacity Development between WFP and the Government of Egypt.

WFP. 2009. SPR2009: Emergency Food Assistance to Victims of Hurricane Felix.

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Nutritional Rehabilitation in Indonesia (Project number: 100692).

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Regional Emergency Preparedness Operation to Preposition High Energy Biscuits in Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Capacity Building of Integrated Micronutrient Programmes in the Central American Region.

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Capacity Building and Technical Assistance in Support of Food-Based Social Protection Programmes.

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Logistics Augmentation for Somali Region Operations.

WFP. 2009. SPR 2009 Responding to Humanitarian Crisis and Enhancing Resilience to Food Insecurity.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Responding to Humanitarian Crises and Enhancing Resilience to Food Insecurity.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 WFP Logistics Support Unit: Indonesia.

WFP. 2008. WFP Logistics Support Unit.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 WFP Air Support of Humanitarian Relief Operations in response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Assistance to Recovery and Nutritional Rehabilitation (Project number: 10069.1): Indonesia.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Nutritional Rehabilitation in Indonesia (Project number: 10069.2).

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Regional Emergency Preparedness Operation to Preposition High Energy Biscuits in Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Assistance to Strengthen Disaster Preparedness and Mitigation among Marginalized Populations (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua).

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Capacity Building of Integrated Micronutrient Programmes in the Central American Region.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Capacity Building and Technical Assistance in Support of Food-Based Social Protection Programmes.

WFP. 2008. SPR 2008 Emergency Food Assistance to Victims of Hurricane Felix.

WFP. 2007. PRRO – Indonesia – Assistance for recovery and nutrition rehabilitation, WFP/EB.A/2007/9-B/.

WFP. 2007. SPR 2007 Assistance to Recovery and Nutritional Rehabilitation (Project number: 10069.1): Indonesia.

WFP. 2007. Final report on the Ethiopia Drought Insurance Pilot Project.

WFP. 2007. SPR 2007 Nutrition rehabilitation (Project number: 10069.2): Indonesia.

WFP. 2007. SPR 2007 Regional Emergency Preparedness Operation to Preposition High Energy Biscuits in Latin America and the Caribbean Region .

WFP. 2007. SPR 2007 Capacity Building of Integrated Micronutrient Programmes in the Central American Region .

WFP. 2007. SPR 2007 Capacity Building and Technical Assistance in Support of Food-Based Social Protection Programmes .

- WFP. 2007. TNT and UPS support UN humanitarian hubs in Panama and Ghana.
- WFP. 2007. SPR 2007 Emergency Food Assistance to Victims of Hurricane Felix.
- WFP. 2006. Final Report: "Smart Schools make Smart Kids" – WFP Nicaragua.
- WFP. 2006. SPR 2006 Regional Emergency Preparedness Operation to Preposition High Energy Biscuits in Latin America and the Caribbean Region.
- WFP. 2006. SPR 2006 Capacity-Building of Integrated Micronutrient Programmes in Central America and Belize.
- WFP. 2006. SPR 2006 Capacity Building and Technical Assistance in Support of Food-Based Social Protection Programmes.
- WFP. 2005. SPR 2005 Assistance to Recovery and Nutritional Rehabilitation (Project number: 10069.1): Indonesia.
- WFP. 2005. SPR 2005 Capacity Building and Technical Assistance in Support of Food-Based Social Protection Programmes.
- WFP. 2004. SPR 2004 Relief Food Assistance for Ethiopians Internally Displaced by the Ethiopia/Eritrea Border Conflict.
- WFP. 2004. Standard Project Report 2004 – Country Programme Egypt 2002–2006.
- WFP. 2004. SPR 2004 Assistance to Recovery and Nutritional Rehabilitation (Project number: 10069.1): Indonesia.
- Widdus, R. 2005. Public/private partnerships – an overview, *Transactions of the Royal Society for Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 99S, S1-S8.
- Witte, J.M., Reinicke, W. 2005. *Business Unusual: Facilitating United Nations Reform Through Partnerships*. Global Public Policy Institute (GPPI); The United Nations Global Compact. United Nations (UN), New York. 96 p.
- World Vision International. 2011. Accountability Report.
- World Vision International. 2010. INGO Accountability Charter – World Vision Compliance.
- World Vision International. 2011. Annual Review 2010.
- World Vision International. 2009. Voluntary Disclosure Report.
- Yu, E. 2010. Chapter 18: Information and communications technology in food assistance, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*.
- Zhang, Y., Chulkov, N. 2009. Review of Management and Administration in the World Food Programme (WFP). Joint Inspection Unit, United Nations.

Annex 7: The Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact

The UN Global Compact's ten principles in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption enjoy universal consensus and are derived from:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- The International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
- The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development
- The United Nations Convention Against Corruption

The UN Global Compact asks companies to embrace, support and enact, within their sphere of influence, a set of core values in the areas of human rights, labour standards, the environment and anti-corruption.

Human Rights

- Principle 1: Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and
- Principle 2: make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.

Labour

- Principle 3: Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
- Principle 4: the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour;
- Principle 5: the effective abolition of child labour; and
- Principle 6: the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

Environment

- Principle 7: Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;
- Principle 8: undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and
- Principle 9: encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

Anti-Corruption

- Principle 10: Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.

Source: <http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html>

Annex 8: Evaluation Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference of the Evaluation can be found on the WFP website at <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/tor/wfp247171.pdf>

It should be noted that as a result of the Inception Report a number of elements in the evaluation were adjusted. In particular:

- an additional evaluation question was included: “How can WFP’s Strategy and approach to private-sector fund raising and partnership be improved for the future?”;
- rather than developing specific country and partnership case studies a more holistic approach was agreed and working papers produced on a series of cross-cutting and subject matter topics.

Annex 9: Evaluation Team Members Curricula Vitae

John Markie – Team leader	63
Andrew (Drew) Tulchin (Private Resource Development)	66
Annemarie Hoogendoorn (Nutrition Evaluation)	70
Gregory Vaz (Logistics Evaluation)	76
Laure Belotti (Research Support)	83

John Markie – Team leader

John Markie is an evaluation specialist with a wide knowledge of international development and its institutional architecture. He has a particularly deep understanding of issues and challenges in agriculture, food security, rural development, policy dialogue and institutional strengthening. He has worked at senior levels of evaluation and policy formulation, including management of a substantial evaluation office in FAO and management and guidance of the Independent External Evaluation of FAO and its follow-up, with direct reporting on policy matters to governing bodies. To all his work, John brings strong analytical, leadership and writing skills, as well as an ability to listen, apply judgment and political awareness. His overall evaluation experience encompasses:

- Evaluation of the totality of the UN-FAO where he had overall responsibility for both the evaluation office and the independent external evaluation of FAO with the follow-up action plan completed in 2008;
 - all levels of evaluation from the project to the global, including impact assessment, in particular for evaluation of agriculture, food security and rural development, encompassing evaluation of development strategies and programmes, institutions, policies and policy assistance and emergency assistance;
 - work at the interface between, evaluation, management consultancy and audit, including: operational capacities in emergencies (FAO), decentralization (UNDP and FAO) and resource mobilization and management (GEF);
 - development of evaluation policies and standards, including the new CGIAR institutional framework and policy for evaluation;
 - policy formulation and policy guidance to the most senior management and the governing body of FAO;
 - direct experience in local and national level evaluation capacity building; and
 - inter-governmental negotiations.
-
- 1981–2008: As **Director of Evaluation** and previously a senior staff member in the Evaluation Office of FAO, John Markie, transformed FAO’s evaluation office from an internal unit concentrating on project evaluation to an office, undertaking major institutional evaluations, with an independent mandate and dual reporting to the Member Countries in the board (FAO Council) and the executive head. In this capacity he managed a total budget of some US\$ 6 million per annum. An in-depth independent evaluation

found this evaluation office to be one of the most professional in the UN system. In addition to responsibility for the strategy, programme and overall management of FAO's evaluation programme, John took direct responsibility for the design, conduct and writing of numerous major institutional evaluations which are all public documents, including those of:

- Technical Cooperation Programme;
 - Decentralization;
 - Policy assistance;
 - Support to agricultural research;
 - Special Programme for Food Security;
 - 2003–05 Desert Locust Campaign;
 - Communicating FAO's messages;
 - TeleFood Fund Raising Programme;
 - Food safety and standards;
 - Seeds programme; and
 - Publication activities.
-
- Between 2005–2008 for the **Independent External Evaluation of FAO** (US\$ 8 million), John guided and managed the process. This evaluation is one of the largest and most complex undertaken to date in the international system. It covered not only FAO's programme effectiveness and efficiency but also its management and governance and its place in the changing international political economy. John guided the inter-governmental negotiation process that led to the evaluation. He also oversaw and provided quality assurance of its detailed design. At the request of the Governing Bodies and management, John subsequently supported and managed the negotiation process in FAO Governing Bodies to produce the comprehensive evaluation follow-up "Immediate Plan of Action for FAO Renewal" which was agreed by the FAO Conference in November 2008.

 - Between 2004 and 2007 John served as chair of the **United Nations Evaluation Group's (UNEG's)** working group to develop a constitution for that body which is now operative; served as co-chair of the group working on evaluation of UN system harmonization and alignment under the Secretary-General's "Delivering as One" initiative; co-chair of the group developing UN wide proposals for evaluation; and participated actively in developing evaluation standards of excellence for the UN system.

 - **Since retiring from FAO in 2008, John has undertaken consultancy on:**
 - Global Environment Facility (GEF): assessment of resource mobilization and resource management and a country study of performance for the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF as part of the overall comprehensive evaluation of that Facility. This work also provided insight into the workings of the World Bank;
 - FAO: Led evaluation of the business model and processes for FAO's emergency work;
 - FAO: Evaluation of Growing Connection (FAO Private-Sector Fund Raising);
 - SIDA (ITAD): Evaluation of capacity building of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vietnam;
 - UNDP: Led the inception phase for the evaluation of UNDP's regionalization;
 - CGIAR: Leader of a small team which proposed new evaluation arrangements, policies and standards for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). The policy was approved by the CGIAR Fund Council;
 - WFP: Leader of the evaluation of WFP's private-sector partnership and fund mobilization strategy; and

- John's most recent peer reviewed published paper in 2009 was on the global architecture for food and agriculture and most recent published paper was an analysis of the usefulness of the Independent external evaluation of FAO.
- **1970–1980:** John Markie **began his working life managing a regional development initiative for 600 new settler families in Uganda**. This afforded him invaluable firsthand experience with the obstacles poor people confront in seeking to improve their lives. **His first post in the UN system with the Committee for the Promotion and Advancement of Cooperatives (COPAC)** afforded him experience of servicing an inter-agency UN committee, which also included NGOs. At that time, he published on increasing development effectiveness through participatory approaches and greater attention to the institutional strengthening of people's organizations.

Values: In all his work, John strives to combine intellectual rigour and balanced judgement with:

- a consultative and inclusive approach;
- realism; and
- a profound belief in making our world a better place for all, especially the poorest.

Geographical Experience: John's work has taken place in many countries on and all continents of the world. This included working in Uganda for three years and extensive participation in missions to Africa, Asia the Near East and Caribbean (with most countries visited) and some experience of Latin America.

Qualifications: University of Nottingham, UK. Upper second B.Sc. Honours degree. Main subjects: agricultural economics (with a dissertation on agricultural trade), farm management, agronomy, animal husbandry.

Languages: English (mother tongue), Italian (good), French (reading and modest working spoken).

Computer Skills: Proficient in a wide range of packages.

Qualifications

International consultant with 15 years of professional experience. He holds an MBA in finance and marketing from a US institution. Consultant has familiarity with international donors including USAID, GTZ, GIZ, EU and WB group. Published numerous white papers, industry reports, and presented internationally, content is available at: KDID, MicroLinks, Development Gateway, Microfinance Gateway, and Social Enterprise Associates. Previous work with DAI includes as a sub-contractor in Afghanistan and other partnerships in development. Languages include native English, fluent in Spanish, conversational French, passable Portuguese, and some Japanese.

Sector Topics: include development finance, microfinance, access to finance, financial inclusion, food security, value chains, livelihoods, entrepreneurship, rural and agricultural markets, Small and Medium Enterprise (SME), public/private partnerships, post-disaster /conflict, environment, waste reduction, sustainability, civil society and public health.

Consulting Specializations: monitoring and evaluation, rapid assessments, market studies, product development, business and strategic planning, financial projections, change management, human resource development, audits, training, MIS/IT/ICT, surveys, pro-poor strategies, risk management, programme design, proposal development and raising capital.

Geography: Consultancies in 40 countries across five continents include: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, China, Chile, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tajikistan, the United States, Vietnam, and Zambia.

Recent consulting engagements

MANAGING CONSULTANT – SOCIAL ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATES, 2007
Washington, DC

Boutique management consulting firm focused on banking and development finance. Engagements include:

- **AED ARIES Project, USAID.** In Afghanistan, facilitated national meeting with Central Bank, donors, banks, and government ministries to foster business enabling environment for rural development. Authored national 5 year blueprint strategy paper for national investment and mobilization of private sector.
- **Banyan Global, for USAID SHOPS Fund,** conducted evaluations in five African countries of national policy, private-sector environment, and private investment to foster greater bank investment in the health sector.
- **Chemonics (USAID DCA Guarantee Fund).** Conducted review for renewal of funding for Haitian national entity SOFIHDES. Provided evaluation of institution with assessment of operations and recommendations.
- **Environmental Defense Fund – Mexico.** Worked with team to conduct national financial analysis. Identified funding agencies to mobilize affordable financial services

leveraging US\$5 million investment from US foundation for low income people in rural fishing communities .

- **JBS International/Aguirre Division, in Haiti.** For USAID, conducted national assessment on TVET to identify private-sector funding sources and opportunities for 25,000 jobs within three years.
- **Katalysis Bootstrap Fund.** Conducted national evaluations in Central American of financial demand – with consideration of investment environment, policy recommendations and new entrants.
- **Organic Exchange.** For Shell Foundation, led team to evaluate international membership organization to increase private-sector involvement to double organic cotton production worldwide within five years.
- **Plan International/Canada Africa Fund:** Niger and Senegal. Conducted national evaluations how donor fund investment can enable 100,000 new jobs for young adults (15–25) within three years.
- **Private Investor: Africa – eight countries.** Evaluated national markets for potential private investment in banking entities. Assessment included regulatory policies, market conditions and growth potential.
- **Shorebank Pakistan for KASHF Bank.** Developed rural market entry strategy and designed loan product. Reviewed survey to 900 clients, mapping for regional advancement and operational strategy.

SELECT Professional experience

DIRECTOR – ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT GROUP, 2006–2007 Arlington, VA
US financial institution serving immigrants in Washington, DC

- Managed and trained staff of eight; loan portfolio of US\$2.5 million; balance sheet of US\$6 million in assets
- Liaison to donors and funders: increased budget by 15% in six months
- Established 12 public/private partnership agreements to double number of clients served

PROGRAMME OFFICER – GRAMEEN FOUNDATION, 2003–2005 Washington, DC
International foundation working in more than 30 countries worldwide

- Founding staff person of Capital Markets Group: established risk management system; contributed to launch of Growth Guarantees, a US\$60 million plus fund. Researched new investments market worldwide
- Transactions: contributed to 20 deals totalling US\$100 million. Led equity investment in securitizations
- Managed initiative: ‘High Growth Partner Project’. Designed programme; evaluated 45 entities/16 countries. Led selection of 14 partners from due diligence; established 5-year donor agreements.

DIRECTOR, BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT – PRISMA FINANCE, 2001–03 Seattle, WA
US finance company with international subsidiaries

- Co-authored business plan: prize winner and published by the Global Social Venture Competition
- As part of a team, raised US\$1.2 million in private equity for investment fund
- Evaluated eight countries for new market entry; assessed 20 potential partners; launched new subsidiary

FINANCIAL ANALYST – COSANT (failed Bluetooth wireless start-up), 2000

- Produced 12 industry financial market analyses; created customer models with cost/benefit scenarios
- Managed US\$3.4 million equity investment, handled legal documents and communicated with board

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT – FAMILY ECOLOGY, 1996–98 Oakland, CA

- Evaluated community led sustainability projects; all projects met performance goals
- Facilitated environmental education projects in 12 communities for multi-lingual inner city families

**TEAM LEADER – AMERICORPS' EAST BAY CONSERVATION CORPS, 1994–95
Oakland, CA**

- Leadership Department: launched new department. Trained eight staff, led marketing and negotiated sales
- Community Service: conducted programme evaluation for services; managed 10 staff on 25 projects

**VISTA – AMERICAN RED CROSS AND ALAMEDA COUNTY FOOD BANK, 1993 LA
and Oakland, CA**

- Provided earthquake relief work in Los Angeles; raised 323,000 pounds of food during Holiday Food Drive

EDUCATION

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, MBA with concentration in Finance – 2000 Seattle,
WA**

- Received Innovation and Entrepreneurial Leadership Award from Graduate Business Foundation
- Team Project Consultant: evaluated financial strategies for six NGOs
- Net Impact Marketing Intern: for Shopforchange.com, negotiated 12 new on-line relationships

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, BA, Cum Laude – 1992 St. Louis, MO and Brighton, UK

- Double major in History and International Relations

- Year abroad at Sussex University (England) School of International Development; received honours

SKILLS AND INTERESTS

- Community Involvement: Permaculture Agriculture Credit Union Board Vice Chair, Global Social Enterprise Competition Advisory Board, Net Impact – Lifetime Member, William James Foundation Sustainable Business Plan Competition Judge and Santa Fe Community Foundation Future Chair
- Enjoys travel: worked in 30 countries on five continents; visited 48 US states; and hopes to visit Antarctica
- Languages: fluent in Spanish; conversant in French; knowledgeable in Portuguese
- Ultimate Frisbee: charity tournaments organizer. Raised more than US\$100,000 for local non-profits

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Materials available online at www.socialenterprise.net/resources.html

- Author, *Investing in Mobile ICT Devices for Agriculture in Africa*. USAID, 2011
- Columnist, *Affordably Financing the Sustainable Village*. The Greenfire Times. Sept, 2011
- Author, *Investing in Value Chains and Local Food Sheds*. Food Chain Systems, 2011
- Trainer and Curriculum Author, *Scaling up International Enterprises*, SEEP Network, 2010
- Writer, *Financing Green Small Businesses*. The Greenfire Times. Nov, 2010
- Editor and contributor to more than a dozen publications for the USAID Financial Services Grant Program (IGP) with SEEP Network, microLINKS, 2009 and 2010
- Co-Author. *Crossfire: Business Incubators*. Enterprise Development and Microfinance, 2009
- Co-Author. *Environmental Mortgages*. Conservation Letters, 2009
- Author, SEEP Survey Summary Findings, *Microfinance Reporting Standards Industry Survey*, 2008
- Researcher, *Compelling Returns, A Guide to Socially Responsible Investing*, TIAA-CREF, 2008
- Faculty Member, *Business Programming and Evaluation Activities*, Kinship Fellows, 2008
- Author, *Serving Millions, Not Hundreds, with Financial Services*, 2007
- Co-author, *Five Strategies to Minimize Foreign Exchange Risk*, SEEP Progress Note #13, 2005
- Reviewer, *Triple Bottom Line: Does it add up?* Small Enterprise Development Magazine, 2005

- Panel Convener, *Microfinance and Social Measurement*; wrote summary paper, SEEP, 2003
- Project Manager and Author, Ford Foundation funded article, *Microfinance and the Double Bottom Line*, posted on United Nations' website; published in IMP-ACT CD on Social Impact; award winner from BYU's Center for Economic Self-Reliance, 2003
- Co-author, PRISMA business plan, prizewinner Global Social Venture Competition, 2001

Hoogendoorn, Annemarie (Nutrition Evaluation)

A. KEY QUALIFICATIONS

A senior international professional who combines technical expertise in humanitarian aid and development assistance in the areas of Food Security and Nutrition with a Business Science perspective on policy and management issues. She has over 20 years of professional experience with various UN organizations and NGOs, including extensive field experience and a wide range of missions for programme/project identification, formulation, mid-term review and evaluation. Through her company Nectar Consulting, Annemarie undertakes short-term assignments that entail all phases of the project cycle including information systems, MandE, policy development and advocacy, and design and facilitation of training courses.

B. EDUCATIONAL RECORD

University degrees

1999–2002 *M.Sc. Business Science, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands*
(Distinction); Major: Strategic Management

Minors: Management of Change, Financial Management

1985–1988 *M.Sc. Human Nutrition, Wageningen University, The Netherlands* (Honours);
Majors: Nutritional Epidemiology, Home Economics

Minors: Communication science, Medical Anthropology, Research Methodology for Social Sciences

1981-1985 *B.Sc. Human Nutrition, Wageningen University, The Netherlands*

Diploma courses

1999 Marketing Management, Open University Netherlands

1998 Organization Assessment and Organization Design, Open University Netherlands

1995 Health Economics, Erasmus University Rotterdam

- 1994 Personnel Management, Open University Netherlands
- 1993 Bookkeeping, Open University Netherlands
- 1992 Women and Development Policy, University of Amsterdam
- 1992 Organization Science, Open University Netherlands
- 1991 Writing Scientific Articles, WHO/INCAP, Guatemala
- 1988 Teaching skills, Wageningen University
- 1988 Project Planning, Execution and Evaluation, Wageningen University

Other short courses

- 2006 Participatory Capacity Building, Facilicom Nijmegen
- 2002 Negotiation, Nedworc Utrecht

C. NECTAR CONSULTING (2002 – present)

- WFP, DR Congo (DRC), Team leader mid-term evaluation 2011 Emergency Operation (US\$25 million; general food distribution, food for work, emergency school feeding, targeted nutrition support, support to victims of sexual gender-based violence) in the LRA-affected Haut and Base Uélé districts in Eastern DRC, as input for design of the successor programme for 2012 and beyond; 09–10/11.
- WFP, Sierra Leone, Team leader final evaluation of the WFP Sierra Leone urban and peri-urban safety net interventions (€2.7 million; school feeding, supplementary feeding, food support to HIV affected households, cash for work) funded by the EC Thematic Fund and the agricultural development projects (€5.4 million; food for work and food for training) funded by the EC Food Facility in response to the international Food Price Crisis; 07–08/11.
- WFP, Kenya, Nutrition and HIV expert in the team undertaking the Portfolio Evaluation WFP Kenya 2006–2010 with a focus on (a) the strategic alignment with Vision 2030 and other national policy frameworks and with partners' policies and strategies; (b) review of the drivers behind shifts in strategic choices; and (c) assessment of the performance and results of the WFP portfolio; 02–04/11.
- EC Delegation, Malawi, Team leader evaluation for the EC Delegation in Malawi of the Sustainable Nutrition Rehabilitation Programme (SNRP, 2006–2010, €6.4 million) implemented by five INGOs. The SNRP was composed of a national component on nutritional surveillance and a community component on crop diversification, establishment of saving groups, hygiene and nutrition education and treatment of malnutrition; 09–10/10.
- DG ECHO, Kenya, Team leader evaluation of DG ECHO 2008–2009 drought-response activities (€47.7 million; food aid, nutrition interventions, food security support, disaster risk reduction, water and sanitation) in the arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya; 04–06/10.
- WFP, Sudan, Team member end-evaluation EMOP 10760.0 (US\$921 million, Jan – Dec 2009), with specific focus on the general food distribution and blanket supplementary

- feeding programmes in Darfur; 01–03/10.
- WFP, Ethiopia, Evaluation team member responsible for the nutrition aspects of the relief and recovery components in the US\$1.3 billion PRRO 2008–2010, with particular focus on the targeted supplementary feeding programme (TSF) implemented alongside the UNICEF-supported Enhanced Outreach Strategy (EOS) as an innovative holistic approach to malnutrition and child survival; 11–12/09.
- DG ECHO, Thailand, Team leader Livelihoods Vulnerability Analysis in Burmese Refugee Camps in Thailand, studying the household food economy and livelihood strategies of different wealth groups in four selected camps in the border zone, with the aim to formulate alternatives to the current blanket full food ration distribution; 09–10/09.
- ICCO/TEDDO, Uganda, Team leader end-evaluation Strategic Plan 2004–2009 (food security and livelihood support, peace building, local governance, institutional strengthening) of the Church of Uganda (COU) in Teso Sub-Region; 06–07/2009.
- SHO (Dutch Consortium of NGOs for fundraising on Humanitarian Assistance), Netherlands, Meta-evaluation of SHO humanitarian assistance October 2005–March 2009 for victims of the 2005 South Asia Earthquake. Structured review of existing evaluation reports and round of interviews to assess the quality of the funded projects (all humanitarian sectors, total value €41 million); 04–05/2009.
- EC Evaluation Unit, Ethiopia/Mozambique, Senior Expert Cat. I on Food Security and Nutrition in the Evaluation on the impact of EU policies on African partner countries' ability to achieve MDG 1 (part of the larger EC 2009 Policy Coherence for Development Review); Team leader Mozambique and Ethiopia case studies; 01–03/2009.
- Particip GmbH, Netherlands, Quality Assurance Final Evaluation Report DG ECHO's Actions in Colombia 2005 – 2007; 09/2008.
- WFP, Occupied Palestine Territories, Consultant for a Food Safety Nets study in relation to the impact of the soaring food prices on household food security, including assessment of appropriateness of existing safety nets to mitigate the food price crisis and identification of appropriate programming options for WFP; 06–07/2008.
- USAID, Ethiopia, Team leader End-of-Project Evaluation Urban Agriculture Programme for HIV/AIDS Affected Women and Children, as part of the USAID/Ethiopia Health, AIDS, Population and Nutrition Sector Evaluation; 05–06/2008.
- DG ECHO, Zimbabwe, Team leader Real Time Evaluation of Ready-to-Use Food Support in a Home Based Care programme of CARE International, including formulation of policy recommendations on the potential future role of DG ECHO in food/nutrition sector interventions within HIV responses in Southern Africa; 11/2007 – 04/2008.
- ICCO/TEDDO, Uganda, Facilitator of the participatory Mid-Term Review of the Church of Uganda (CoU) development programme in Teso Sub-Region; 09–10/2007.
- DG ECHO, Haiti, Team member Ex-Ante Evaluation Humanitarian Situation Analysis, focusing on food security and nutrition needs assessment; 05–07/2007.
- EC/DG ECHO/USAID/DFID, Zimbabwe, Team member Joint Donor Review Food Aid in Zimbabwe focusing on review of the humanitarian food aid response and food security/early warning systems; 10/2006 – 02/2007.
- WFP, Indonesia, Team member focusing on the nutrition component in the Mid-Term Review WFP PRRO Indonesia (2005–2007); 08–09/2006.
- WFP, Netherlands (home-based), Author desk review/inception report for the Thematic Evaluation of Emergency School Feeding programmes; 05/2006–08/2006.
- MoH Eritrea/ICCO, Eritrea, Team Leader Assessment of the utility of the National

- Nutrition Surveillance System (NSS); 03–04/2006.
- WFP, Rome, Peer reviewer Evaluation WFP India Country Programme; 02–06/2006.
- ICCO, Madagascar, Team Leader Mid Term Review SaF/ICCO Food Security Programme co-financed by the EC Food Security Budgetline; 11–12/2005.
- Wageningen International, Netherlands, Support to development of a new 3-week course module ‘Monitoring and Evaluation of Food and Nutrition Security Policy Impacts’; 09–12/2005.
- ICCO, Ethiopia, Evaluator ADAA Integrated Food Security project; 08–09/2005.
- Wageningen University, Netherlands, Committee Member INREF-2 for assessment of interdisciplinary research proposals submitted by WUR graduate schools; 04–12/2005.
- WFP, Netherlands/Rome/India/Zambia, Team Leader Thematic Review WFP Mother and Child Health Nutrition (MCHN) Interventions; 01/2005 – 02/2006.
- KIT, Netherlands, Coordinator establishment Dutch Platform on Food and Nutrition Security; 05/2004 – 12/2005.
- KIT, Netherlands, Peer review National Health Policies Review Toolkit; 11/2004.
- Cordaid, Kenya, Support for start-up of the Drought Emergency Programme (DEP) implemented by six Cordaid partners and co-funded by ECHO; 09–10/2004.
- UNICEF OLS, Kenya/South Sudan, Development operational guidelines for the Capacity Building Trust Fund (CBTF) for the South Sudan Government, 07/2004.
- KIT, Netherlands, Technical Adviser development of a protocol for ‘Costing of Nutrition Interventions’ studies submitted to World Bank; 04/2004 – 04/2005.
- EC Evaluation Unit, Brussels/Malawi/Zimbabwe/Netherlands, Team Member Policy Evaluation of the EC Food Aid/Food Security Budgetline: Co-author of the synthesis report; Team Leader Zimbabwe and Malawi case studies; 01–06/2004.
- Cordaid, Pakistan, Technical backstopping AWRC Supplementary Feeding Programme in seven refugee camps around Peshawar, including the coordination of two nutrition surveys and writing of a project proposal to the EC Delegation in Kabul; 11/2003.
- Cordaid, Netherlands / Ethiopia / Kenya / Angola, Team leader Programme Review Cordaid Emergency Food Aid and Nutrition interventions; 04–12/2003.
- ICCO, Sudan, Evaluator ADRA Merowe MCH and Food Security Project; 03/2003.
- Cordaid, Zambia / Malawi, Backstopping Supplementary Feeding Programmes of three Cordaid partners in response to the drought emergency; 11–12/2002.
- ICCO, Malawi, Technical support proposal writing Joint Food Security Programme by four national ICCO partners for the EC NGO CfP 2002/03; 08/2002 and 01–02/2003.
- Cordaid, DR Congo (DRC), Field mission for project identification followed by writing of a proposal to ECHO for a Food Security and Nutrition project to be implemented by two catholic dioceses in Kasai Occidental Province; 04–05/2002.

D. EMPLOYMENT RECORD (1988 – 2002)

2001 – 2002 (10 months) Kluwer, ‘Senior Officer Personnel Information and Control’, Netherlands

- Project leader revision personnel administration system
- Establishment of personnel management information system based on SAP-HR
- Analysis of costs and returns of the personnel information database SAP-HR
- Production of the 2002 Budget for the Personnel Section (55 fte; US\$ 20 million)

**1998 – 1999 (17months) ETC Crystal, ‘Consultant Food Security/Food Aid’,
Netherlands**

- DANIDA, Azerbaijan/Georgia/Armenia, Team member Evaluation Humanitarian Programmes funded by DANIDA for period 1994–98, 03–06/1999.
- Cordaid, Honduras / Nicaragua, Project identification for Post-Mitch rehabilitation, 01/1999.
- DIA (SOH), Benin, Evaluator Cebedes Food Security / Nutrition Project, 10/1998.
- MSF-Holland, China, Evaluator Floods assistance project 1998, 09/1998.
- DIA (SOH), Bolivia, TL evaluation PROMENU NGO Nutrition Network, 07–08/1998.

1995 – 1998 (30months), Netherlands Refugee Foundation (SV), ‘Programme Officer Africa/Latin America’, Netherlands

- Management of a portfolio of about 50 funded projects (e.g. credit schemes, health and nutrition, education, social services, agriculture), with a value of US\$3 million per year.
- Missions to Mexico/Guatemala, Ethiopia/Uganda, Ivory Coast/Guinea Conakry/Sierra Leone, Rwanda/Tanzania, South Sudan/Kenya.

1994 (5months) UNHCR, ‘Food and Nutrition Coordinator’, Tanzania

- Co-ordination, planning and monitoring of food distribution and nutrition programmes executed by 13 local/international NGOs in the Rwandan and Burundi refugee camps in Ngara and Karagwe district in Tanzania.
- Chairperson Working Group ‘Quantity and Quality of General Rations’ (Machakos Conference on Refugees Nutrition, 12/1994).

**1993 – 1994 (12months) SCF – UK ‘Health and Nutrition Coordinator Darfur’,
Sudan**

- Managing SCF health/nutrition interventions (20 staff members) for drought victims and displaced people in Darfur, including participation in the establishment of a nutritional surveillance/early warning system for rural Darfur.
- Organization of a five-day seminar for 30 people (local staff of 12 NGOs and UN organizations) working in food and nutrition programmes in Sudan.

**1992 – 1993 (7months) MSF–Holland ‘Regional nutritionist Horn of Africa’,
Nairobi**

Technical adviser on nutrition surveys and supplementary/therapeutic feeding programmes in Ethiopia, North Kenya (Sudanese refugees) and Somalia.

**1990 – 1991 (12months) WHO/PAHO ‘Associate Officer Nutrition’,
Guatemala**

Development of proposals for an INCAP/Department of Human Nutrition of Wageningen Agricultural University joint research programme into nutrition, physical activity and risk factors for coronary heart disease in Guatemala.

1989 – 1990 (12months), WHO ‘Associate Officer Nutrition South East Asia’, New Delhi

- Assisting the Regional Adviser to establish a regional nutrition network.
- Technical assignments: a) participation in a mission to Thailand and Indonesia for evaluation of nutrition courses at NIN, India, b) organization of a nutritional status assessment course for staff of a UNICEF Vitamin A study in Nepal, c) data-analysis for a regional WHO study into the role of psychosocial aspects in malnutrition, and d) participation in a WHO evaluation mission to Nepal on district health care.

1988 – 1989 (6months) MSF–Holland ‘SCC Nutrition Coordinator’ Sudan

Management of the nutrition department (16 staff members) of the Sudan Council of Churches (SCC) for feeding programmes, nutrition surveys and health education activities in a PHC programme for displaced in seven settlements around Khartoum, Sudan.

1988 (6months), IAC, ‘Junior Staff member’ International Course in Food Science and Nutrition, The Netherlands

E. FREELANCE ASSIGNMENTS (1995–2000)

- DIA (SOH), Burkina Faso/Togo/Benin, Evaluation of the IBFAN Regional Office for francophone Africa, July 2000.
- ECHO, Tajikistan, Team member Evaluation ECHO Programme 1998–2000 in Tajikistan, focusing on the Food Sector executed by five ECHO partners (German Agro Action, Aga Khan Foundation, Mission East, IFRC and WFP) with a total budget of 16.5 million ECU, Jan–Feb 2000.
- DIA (SOH), Kyrgyzstan, Food Security Fact-Finding Mission, May 1996.
- IAC, Netherlands, Guest lecturer ‘Nutrition in emergency situations’ in the International Course ‘Food and Nutrition Programme Management’, Nov 1995.
- Vastenactie/CEBEMO, Ethiopia, Fact Finding Mission South Ethiopia focusing on gender issues and pastoralists, Oct 1995.
- DIA (SOH), Burkina Faso/Swaziland/Togo/Gabon/Namibia/South Africa, Evaluator of the two IBFAN (International Baby Food Action Network) regional networks in Africa, July – Sept 1995.
- EC DG-I, Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan, Food Assessment Mission Central Asia, May 1995.

F. LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

	<i>Read</i>	<i>Write</i>	<i>Speak</i>
Dutch	(mother tongue)		
English	excellent	excellent	excellent
French	good	fair	fair
Spanish	good	fair	fair
Portuguese	fair	basic	basic

Gregory Vaz (Logistics Evaluation)

- **Date of birth:** April 27, 1950
- **Passport holder:** Canadian

- **Education:**

Institution [Date from – Date to]	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained:
York University (1978–80)	MA Sociology
Queen's University (1981)	MA Public Administration
University of Ottawa (1984–86)	MBA International Business (Course Completion)

- **Language skills:** *Indicate competence on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 – excellent; 5 – basic)*

Language	Reading	Speaking	Writing
English	Mother tongue		
French	3	1	5
Thai	5	3	5

- **Membership of professional bodies:**
- **Other skills:** Fully computer literate
- **Present position:** Independent Consultant
- **Key qualifications:**
 - Humanitarian programme management;
 - Supply chain management;
 - Mentoring, capacity building and institutional strengthening;
 - Humanitarian-Military liaison.

- **Specific experience in the region:**

Country	Date from – Date to
ANGOLA	1992–93, 2003
MOZAMBIQUE	1987–89
MADAGASCAR	2008
CAMBODIA	1991, 2007
INDONESIA	1999–2000, 2006
PAKISTAN	2006, 2010–11
THAILAND	2005, 2006–7

Professional experience

Date from – Date to	Location	Company and reference person (name and contact details)	Position	Description
2010–11	Islamabad Pakistan	Malteser International Dr. Juergen Clemens HP: +49 (0) 175 7217216 juergen.clemens@malteser-international.org	Emergency Programme Coordinator	Responsible for managing Malteser's post 2010 flood response emergency programming. Achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed the implementation and monitoring of NFI, food and cash distribution projects in Swat and Kohistan districts. • Initiated agriculture CFW and income generating projects, implemented through local partner organizations. • Successfully negotiated government permission to rehabilitate flood damaged schools. • Advised senior management on organizational, programmatic and policy issues.
2008	Antananarivo, Madagascar	UNICEF Madagascar Mr. Beyene Arega HP: +261 20 32 05 426 57 barega@unicef.org	Emergency Logistics Consultant	Assessed supply chain operations and recommended improved ways of working in UNICEF's Antananarivo and field offices. Achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advised on the distribution of high energy biscuits. • Supervised the physical inventory and reorganization of the Antananarivo warehouse. • Negotiated conditions of use of a provincial government's warehouse. • Debriefed the pilot of the vaccination programme helicopter and recommended improved ways of managing UNICEF's helicopter asset.

Date from – Date to	Location	Company and reference person (name and contact details)	Position	Description
2006–07	Bangkok, Thailand	OXFAM GB Mr. Francis Lacasse flacasse@oxfam.org.uk	East Asia Regional Logistics Adviser	Responsible for providing supply chain operations management, capacity building and strategic advice to the Oxfam offices in the S.E. Asian region. Achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed the distribution of Oxfam and UNICEF NFI's in response to the Yogyakarta earthquake of June 2006. • Managed all logistics of the UNICEF/Oxfam flood assessment in central Thailand in October 2006. • Managed procurement and distribution of materials for shelter and latrine construction during the initial response to the Philippines typhoon of December 2006. • Developed policy and procedures for the procurement/distribution of Tamiflu to Oxfam's regional country offices. • Managed the procurement of Tamiflu for the Thailand Regional Management Centre. • Assessed and recommended improvements to the logistics' capacities in five East Asian Oxfam country offices. • Delivered supply chain management capacity building to Oxfam Vietnam and Oxfam Cambodia NGO partners. • Assessed the emergency response capacity of a provincial chapter of Thailand's Red Cross and implemented improved ways of working.

Date from – Date to	Location	Company and reference person (name and contact details)	Position	Description
2006	Muzaffarabad, Kashmir, Pakistan	International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) Ms. Renata Jagustovic rjagustovic@yahoo.com	Programme Manager	Responsible for managing ICMC's post 2005 earthquake emergency and reconstruction programming. Achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruited and trained field staff in project implementation, monitoring and reporting procedures. • Managed all field office administrative and supervisory activities. • Managed the development, implementation, monitoring and reporting of emergency, protection, vocational capacity building and trauma counselling programmes funded by UNHCR and Caritas Pakistan. • Managed grant monitoring and reporting to donors. • Advised senior management on organizational, programmatic and policy issues.
2005–06	Utapao, Thailand Banda Aceh, Indonesia	WHO Indonesia Dr. Maria Cristina Profili mcp@euro.who.int	Logistics Consultant (P4–1)	Seconded to CSF 536 in Utapao, the US led multinational military effort providing humanitarian relief to Tsunami affected areas of Indonesia and to the United Nations Joint Logistics' Centre (UNJLC) in Banda Aceh, Indonesia. Achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided operational and logistical support to the WHO offshore-based health assessment of the W. Coast of Sumatra. • Acted in a coordinating and liaison capacity between the multinational military and WHO on joint Indonesia Tsunami relief operations. • Developed and chaired the UN/NGO logistics cluster in Meulaboh, Aceh, wrote road and air transport assessments for UNJLC. • Managed WHO's flight operations and acted as liaison with UN and NGO logistics' organizations.

Date from – Date to	Location	Company and reference person (name and contact details)	Position	Description
2003	Luanda, Angola	Lutheran World Federation (LWF)	Programme Manager	<p>Responsible for managing LWF's programmes of humanitarian assistance to returning refugees and IDP's.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed the development, implementation and narrative reporting of projects funded by UNHCR, USAID, Euron Aid and FAO. • Managed the implementation of food for work projects of infrastructure rehabilitation and construction in refugee resettlement areas and the distribution of agriculture seeds and tools. • Advised senior management on programmatic, management and capacity building issues.
1999–2000	Kupang, W. Timor, Indonesia	Catholic Relief Services (CRS) Mr. Michael Frank mfrank@ph.seapro.crs.org	Programme Manager	<p>Responsible for managing CRS's programmes of humanitarian and development assistance in NTT Indonesia.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed operational, administrative/financial and reporting activities of field offices. • Managed food assistance and agriculture seeds and tools programming targeting 65,000 refugee beneficiaries. • Managed the procurement of food and non-food items from commercial suppliers. • Represented CRS to the humanitarian community, donors, local government and military authorities. • Monitored donor grants, wrote and presented donor funding requests. • Advised senior management on programmatic, managerial and policy issues.

Date from – Date to	Location	Company and reference person (name and contact details)	Position	Description
1992 – 93	Luanda, Angola	UNHCR Angola	Logistics Manager (P3-1)	<p>Responsible for planning and managing UNHCR's logistics programmes.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed UNHCR supply chain operations and that of all agencies implementing its programmes. • Managed the procurement of vehicle spare parts and telecommunications equipment, its warehousing and computerized accounting. • Managed all civil military liaisons between UNHCR and the Angola military. • Trained logistics' staff in supply chain and commodity management.
1992	Phnom Penh, Cambodia	UNICEF Cambodia	Logistics Consultant	<p>Advised UNICEF on their logistics needs in preparation for the repatriation of Cambodian refugees from Thailand.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified UNICEF's logistics, material and telecommunications needs in its programme of rehabilitating rural health posts. • Evaluated the utilization of UNICEF's material contributions to the Cambodian government and recommended their more effective use. • Recommended improvements to the logistics of the Cambodian Ministry of Health in its countrywide distribution of UNICEF's Essential Drugs.
1991	Phnom Penh, Cambodia	CARE Australia/Cambodia	Transportation Consultant	<p>Team member advising UNHCR Cambodia on the logistics of repatriating Cambodian refugees from Thailand.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessed existing transportation and logistics infrastructure, in previously identified areas and recommended improvements.

Date from – Date to	Location	Company and reference person (name and contact details)	Position	Description
1987–89	Maputo/Tete, Mozambique	CARE International	Field Office Manager	<p>Managed the delivery CARE International's humanitarian assistance programming to the Government of Mozambique in Tete province.</p> <p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed food aid needs assessments, supply chain operations and narrative reporting. • Managed the transportation operations of an UNHCR refugee resettlement programme. • Advised the director of the provincial government's disaster planning department on policy and operational issues. • Trained local staff and government officials in logistics procedures.

• **Other relevant information**

Professional Activities

- 2006 Logistics Workshop: IFRC Regional Logistics Unit (RLU-KL), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 6–10/11/2006.
- 2000 Member of a joint UNHCR/WFP/NGO mission assessing the nutritional status of East Timorese refugees in West Timor.

Authorship

- 2007 “Tami Flu Procurement and Distribution”, a policy document for Oxfam GB and implemented in its East Asian region.
- 2006 “Stock Pre positioning and Warehousing” a discussion paper for Oxfam GB’s East Asian regional office.
- 2003 The scope of work for the logistics portion of ECHO’s evaluation of its food aid assistance to Burmese refugees on the Thai/Burmese border.
- 2000 Briefing Notes on Emergency Preparedness, for delivery at the annual CRS SEAFOR conference in Manila, Philippines.
- 1993 "Principles of Logistics; Operations and Management", delivered to a disaster relief symposium organized by UNHCR Angola.

“GTZ Proposal to UNHCR Angola”, an assessment of a \$US2 million project proposal to provide maintenance services for UNHCR Angola's fleet of vehicles, in response to a request by UNHCR Geneva.

1991 Co-author of CARE Cambodia's "Repatriation Transportation Logistics Planning Document: Mission Report" for UNHCR Cambodia.

Laure Belotti (Research Support)

Education:

Degree	University	Year
MSc International Public Health Nutrition, Accredited by the Nutrition Society, <i>Graduated with Merit (2:1)</i> <u>Dissertation:</u> Reported folic acid and vitamin D intake in pregnant women and anticipated impact of flour fortification with folic acid	University of Westminster, UK	2010
Foundation Certificate in Health Promotion <u>Project proposal:</u> A resource pack for people living with HIV/AIDS	NHS, Brighton and Hove PCT	2009
Cert. Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods (Development Studies)	University of Sussex, UK	2008
BSc, International Development and Globalization, <i>Magna cum laude</i>	University of Ottawa, Canada	2007
French Baccalauréat, Economics and social sciences, <i>Pass</i>	Lycée Claudel, Ottawa, Canada	2004

Languages:

English	Mother tongue (reading, speaking, writing fluent) – learnt from mother
French	Fluent (reading, speaking, writing fluent) – learnt from father
Spanish	Reading basic; speaking basic

Software:

Microsoft Office, SPSS, in class Nvivo, ENA, Epi Info, WHO Anthro software

International development experience:

Food Composition Consultant (11/2011 – 01/2012), Italy
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION (FAO)

- Prepare a database matching 500 foods used by the Department of Statistics with the relevant foods in the food composition tables of countries in Latin America

- Calculate the supply for energy, carbohydrates, fat, protein, fibre, vitamin A and C, iron and calcium for these countries for every food reported.

Nutritional Assessment Consultant for updating the database of population heights for the calculation of energy requirements (01/2011 – 06/2011 and 08/2011–10/2011), Italy

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION (FAO)

- Review the current Statistics Division database of country heights and sources of data
- Using WHO, UNICEF, DHS surveys, recalculate median heights for all available age/sex groups, for each country
- Develop an algorithm for back calculating average heights from anthropometric databases that include prevalence of stunting by age/sex
- update the current database of heights where recent representative data are available

Micronutrient Recommendations Consultant (06/2011–09/2011), Italy

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION (FAO)

- As part of a report for Codex Alimentarius, research and compile revised national nutrient reference values for food labeling purposes where available, jointly with WHO
- Contribute to a joint FAO/WHO report detailing this review of existing daily vitamin and mineral intake reference values

Internships And Volunteering:

Choosing Health Eating when Really Young (CHERRY), a family centered nutrition intervention (07/2011), UK

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

- Conduct 24h recalls by phone with the mothers and fathers of 6 month to 5 year old children

Data Entry Clerk, GOCHILD Study (Maternal and Infant Nutrition Research) (01/2011), UK

UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON,

- Entered in data from 30 or so Food Frequency Questionnaires completed by pregnant women on their eating habits, alcohol intake and supplement intake

Intern – Project Assistant (06/2010 – 12/2010), UK

IMA INTERNATIONAL

- Prepare and submit to international organizations of project proposals and training in international development
- Provide logistical support for ongoing projects

Project intern with the Mtongwe Community Initiative (06/07–08/07), Kenya

FOUNDATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- Conduct a needs assessment based on local priorities
- Write a grant proposal for a health related project based on the needs assessment: “kitchen garden project” to enable people living with HIV/AIDS improve their nutrition and sell part of their produce
- Two training days on kitchen gardens, income generation and nutrition

President of the Oxfam Club (09/2005–05/2007), Canada

- Lead yearly campaigns on campus: “Make Poverty History” and “No Sweat”
- Facilitate and take minutes at weekly meetings
- Organize awareness raising events on campus

Interests and activities: reading, travelling, piano, singing, running

Rome, September 2012, OE/2012/010

Office of Evaluation
www.wfp.org/evaluation



World Food Programme