

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
Aula Delegatis – WFP Headquarters
21 February 2019
14:00 – 16:00

Note for the record

Chairperson:

- Jane Pearce, Director, RMP

EB Members:

- Mr. Yaya Adisa Olaitan, Minister and Permanent Representative of List A, Nigeria
- Mr. Luís Fernando de Carvalho, Minister Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of List C, Brazil
- Ms. Angelica Jácome, Permanent Representative of List C, Panama
- Her Excellency Marie-Therese Sarch, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of List D, United Kingdom
- Ms. Chiara Segrado, First Secretary and Deputy Permanent Representative of List D, United Kingdom

Observers:

- Mr. Siragi Wakaabu, Agricultural Attaché, Uganda
- Benoit Ngoie Lumbebey, Counsellor, Democratic Republic of Congo

Present:

- Natasha Nadazdin, Chief, RMPM
- Nancy Aburto, Chief, OSN
- Elise Benoit, Chief, RMPS
- Maria Santamarina, Programme Policy Officer, OSZ

In attendance: Caterina Kireeva, RMPM; Cecilie Gundersen, OSZ; Jonathan Dannevig, STR; Stephanie Shih, RMPM

Introduction:

- The Director of RMP introduced the meeting through a brief presentation. She discussed the analysis conducted, presented the recommended indicators and proposed to use the meeting to get feedback on the proposed indicators to move forward with the setting of targets. The list B comments provided by the representative of Afghanistan were distributed to the group (attached).

The EB members raised the following points:

Programme Output indicators

- The representative of Panama asked whether it would be useful to include revised CRF output indicator D1. Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted households

and communities and revised CRF C6. Number of tools or products developed or revised to enhance national food security and nutrition systems as a result of WFP capacity strengthening support. OSZ Programme Policy Officer indicated we would liaise with technical teams on the assets indicator but noted the limitations with target setting given the varied types of assets. Targets are also determined in consultation with the communities, which are expected to change over time. The representative UK said that valuing assets or amount of money spent on assets could be a useful way to mirror the number of people reached and the investment in Food for Assets programming. On the revised CRF C6. indicator, OSZ indicated that this is a new indicator introduced with the revised CRF so there is limited historical data available at this point to inform target setting. She highlighted that indicator 3. Total USD value of capacity strengthening transfers allows both our direct implementation and our institutional capacity strengthening portfolios, as opposed to the other capacity strengthening indicators.

- The representative of the UK emphasized that the Executive Board is looking for a tool to set WFP's strategic direction and to help WFP be more transparent and accountable.
- The representative of the UK commended the selection of programme indicators which give a broad overview of almost everything that WFP does.
- The representative of the UK emphasized the need for gender disaggregation in the data, highlighting that the representative of Afghanistan made a similar comment in his shared note. OSN Chief responded that gender disaggregated target setting may not be meaningful given that in some programmes, for instance in some nutrition programmes, pregnant and lactating women are targeted specifically. Comparing gender parity within a nutrition programme to another programme would look very different. However, she stressed that reporting will continue to be gender disaggregated.
- The representative of the UK requested to have methodologies for how targets each indicator would be aggregated and measured, including a glossary of terms. RMPM Chief agreed to share methodologies for the computing of targets and also add definitions for tier 1 beneficiaries.
- The representative of the UK highlighted indicator 1. Total quantity of food provided (MT) to targeted beneficiaries, expressing concern over the comparability of aggregating the values of different types of commodities. OSN Chief commented that quantity of food is traditionally the way WFP looks at the breadth of direct support through food assistance. Commodities are chosen to be fit for purpose depending on what the programme is responding to – for instance in one context oil could be a key commodity and in another it could not be. The representative of the UK said putting a monetary value on food could help us get there because then we are not treating a metric ton of oil in the same way. It would be useful to have in the methodology an imputed value when its delivered or when WFP purchased it, such as through a PO for a country. It is important to monitor value because contributions are paid in Direct Support Costs, based on percentage. RMP Director raised concerns over putting a target on a dollar value of food because it would differ a lot from one country to another. The target in this case would be the appeal figure which is already reported on in the annual reporting. The representative of the UK expressed that the target could be the appeal figure and show how much was received and how much was delivered. The representative of Nigeria stated that the monitoring value may fluctuate a lot if for instance there is a surplus and the price increases, WFP may not reach a set target and there may not be a way of providing an explanation for this. RMP Director explained that with commodity prices, there is a planning figure set based on 5 year historical data. A

procurement process follows, also with disaggregation between international and local purchases as part of WFP's procurement policy. These figures are already reported on in the APR. OSN reiterated that in some cases for instance, nutrition programmes cost a lot more per metric ton than non-nutrition programmes. It is a value proposition based on standards we know are needed for treatment or prevention. She expressed that we need to be wary of just thinking in terms of metric tonnage and dollars and that the numbers do not tell a meaningful story because they are unable to show the impact value on the life of the individual we serve. The representative of the UK further stressed that it would be good to have that sub-indicator for those reasons. The representative of Panama stated that aggregation would be difficult for these indicators and stressed the need to go around working backwards and build this together.

- The representative of the UK suggested that methodologies would be useful for indicators: 3. Total USD value of capacity strengthening transfers, 4. Total USD value of providing services to partners, 5. Number of partners supported (particularly in the context of UN reform and work on common services).
- The representative of the UK asked whether the reporting would be on the totals as well as the sub-set indicators. RMP Director clarified that reporting would be on both.
- The representative of the UK commended the disaggregation of unrestricted cash and vouchers for the indicator on 2. Total amount of value transferred (USD) to targeted beneficiaries, and supported the inclusion of an indicator on proportion of food assistance delivered as CBT of the total. OSZ responded that this will be discussed with technical teams but an option is to look not only at quantity of food but perhaps value for comparison.
- The representative of the UK questioned why number of rations and disaggregation by disabilities are not included in the list of indicators. OSN Chief reiterated that number of rations may not be relevant to all types of programmes – for instance, in nutrition programmes, there aren't rations but rather a treatment course. More broadly, the list presented is composed of outputs that will have targets set, but the CRF is in place and WFP will be reporting on the CRF and the wider set of indicators. On disabilities, OSZ responded that the revised CRF approved in November is the first time WFP has committed to monitoring this, so there is still a lack of historical data at a globally representative level. In terms of target setting, WFP will always consider vulnerability, so the intention of setting a target for the number of people with disabilities we assist is unclear. UK suggested to have a target instead, for instance, for the proportion of programmes that are actively monitoring disabled people.
- The representative of the UK requested to see an example of the Annual Performance Report format for the annex or chapter for reporting on targets.
- The representative of the UK requested more information on the process for adjusting targets given they are set on an annual basis.
- On footnote 2 in the initial proposal, UK noted that country offices should work within a framework of a strategic direction set out by the targets. RMP Director agreed to adjust the wording of the footnote, while stressing that CSPs will not be changed retrospectively or have to go back for Board approval. RMP Director noted that the MOPAN report would be issued in the next week, which would show the tools used to inform strategic discussion with the EB. Also there will be a country portfolio evaluation in the 4th year of every CSP which will provide strong tools to enable that discussion. The representative of Panama highlighted that while the revised CRF has been approved, internalization of indicators at country level is a process which may take time. RMP Director agreed and reassured that internalization has

already begun at country level. The representative of the UK underlined that at the end of the 2021 Strategic Plan, they would like to be able to shape future country planning, for instance that the target for School Feeding would increase or decrease.

- On the MOPAN, the representative of the UK flagged the report finding that the CRF needed to be refined. RMP Director clarified that this point was made in June 2018 before the revised CRF was approved in November and that significant progress has been made since then. She further noted that the report was positive on monitoring results.
- The representative of the UK requested clarification on whether targets would be proposed for the next meeting. RMP Director confirmed that they would.
- The representative of Nigeria commended the direction set out by WFP to achieve proposed targets. On Indicator 1. Total quantity of food provided to targeted beneficiaries, he suggested disaggregating the quantity of international versus locally procured given the plan to develop rural economies and empower smallholder farmers. On 1b. Quantity of specialized nutritious food provided, he echoed the representative of the UK's request to have methodologies/definitions provided for the indicators, because he was not clear on what constituted a specialized nutritious food. He went on to say that should not our goal be that individuals get the nutrients they need from locally produced nutritious foods and not the provision of specialized nutritious food. OSN Chief replied that this could be expanded upon in the methodologies to be shared. She agreed that the long term goal and vision is sustainable development but given that today more than 50 million children suffer acute malnutrition there is still a great need for life saving and life transforming provision of specialized nutritious foods formulated to treat this deadly condition.
- The representative of Nigeria further requested definitions for 6d. Number of persons targeted through unconditional transfers and 5. Number of partners supported, to know the objectives including whether the purpose is to track resources going to supporting partners or if there is a longer-term objective to encourage partner contribution.
- On 6a. Number of schoolchildren targeted through school feeding interventions, the representative of Nigeria asked how WFP plans to integrate work with governments on home-grown school-feeding programmes into the target setting.

Management key performance indicators

- The representative of Panama raised the importance of including gender representation as a management (KPI).
- The representative of the UK expressed concern over the transparency, accountability and ability of EB to provide strategic direction using this information, noting that some indicators such as percentage of evaluation recommendations implemented, percentage of post-delivery losses, outstanding audit recommendations would highlight management performance.
- RMPS Chief provided an overview of the 3 high level KPI with 24 components, or internal standards, that are visualized to show how WFP is performing in a given functional area. Targets are set for the different areas and reporting is on the percentage of country offices that are meeting the target or standards that are set rather than the individual values which need to remain internal given they are used for internal decision-making. RMP director added that the tool is also a great management tool for Regional Bureaus as it provides a snapshot for how a Regional Bureau or Country Office is performing.

- The representative of Panama asked whether if, for instance, the WFP Executive Director (ED) were looking at this visualization, he would be able to see that there were issues of gender representation at management level or if he would have to look by country. RMP Director responded that this information will be presented in a dashboard being developed for the ED to have a snapshot of every country and for country offices to use as a management tool.
 - The representative of Nigeria questioned the usefulness to the Board if it is a management tool and requested a further explanation bilaterally. RMP Director responded that from a governance point of view, its useful to have oversight over these functional areas.
 - The representative of the UK also emphasized that EB does not want the aggregated data, which doesn't mean much to them as Board members. She would be keen to see some component indicators pulled out and given targets that are meaningful for the board, especially in the important areas of gender parity, progress on combatting sexual harassment and sexual exploitation and abuse, post-delivery losses, and audit recommendations.
- The representative of Panama agreed with the statement of the UK and added that a mock-up or simulation of the tool would be useful. RMP Director responded that these are reported on in the Annual Performance Report, but on the targets suggested to have a bilateral correspondence to discuss and to come back with a proposal in writing before the next meeting. RMPS Chief stated that all management performance indicators are linked to internal rules and regulations of the organization that are already EB approved, most have targets already, which are the standards and WFP is measuring compliance with these standards.

Conclusion and way forward (*timeline: prior to third TAG meeting*)

- **Action:** Share methodologies of target setting for programme indicators and glossary of terms used (programme and management performance indicators)
- **Action:** Provide feedback on any questions on indicators that we were not able to answer during the meeting
- **Action:** Provide a mock-up of how reporting on targets will look for the Annual Performance Report
- **Action:** Draft a proposal separating out a few management key performance indicators in key areas and for which targets would be set; and offer a demonstration session on the 3 KPI's to show a mock-up/simulation for a fictitious country's performance
- **Action:** Targets will be proposed for the third TAG meeting