Implementation status of evaluation recommendations
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Key findings

**Recommendations due for implementation in 2021**: 58 percent of 190 recommendations due in 2021 were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.¹

**Recommendations due for implementation in 2020**: Of the 198 recommendations due to be implemented in 2020, 78 percent were implemented by the first quarter of 2022, up from 56 percent implemented by the first quarter of 2021.

**Recommendations due for implementation between 2016 and 2021**: 84 percent of 1,005 recommendations due between 2016 and 2021 were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

**Implementation status of actions related to recommendations due for implementation between 2016 and 2021**: 86 percent of 2,113 actions related to recommendations due between 2016 and 2021 were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

**Recommendations due for implementation between 2016 and 2021 by evaluation category**: Of the 1,005 recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, 445 arose from centralized evaluations and 560 from decentralized evaluations; 84 percent of the recommendations from centralized evaluations and 82 percent of those from decentralized evaluations were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

**Recommendations in relation to cross-cutting priorities due for implementation between 2016 and 2021**: Between 2016 and 2021, 198 recommendations were in relation to the cross-cutting priorities of environment, gender, protection/human rights and accountability to affected populations. Of these, 160 (81 percent) were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

**Key themes**: This report also reviews the implementation status of 755 evaluation recommendations to be implemented between 2016 and 2021 in relation to four of WFP’s key thematic areas: capacity strengthening, nutrition, partnerships and school feeding. Of the 755 recommendations (including 231 relating to school feeding), 627 (83 percent) were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

**Increase in the number of evaluations**: WFP produced an average of 18 evaluations per year between 2010 and 2015, increasing to an average of 32 per year from 2016 to 2021, an increase of almost 80 percent.

¹ The final data extraction for this report took place on 25 March 2022.
Background

1. Evaluation is an integral, complementary yet distinct element of the WFP performance management system. It uses findings from mechanisms such as appraisal, monitoring, review, audit and research to generate the evidence base from which to assess WFP's performance and results and to support accountability and learning. Evaluation evidence makes a key contribution to organizational learning and the development of evidence-based programmes, plans, policies and strategies throughout WFP.

2. WFP places great value on the evaluation function, as demonstrated by the number of evaluations undertaken by the organization each year, which grew from an average of 18 between 2010 and 2015 to 32 between 2016 and 2021, an increase of almost 80 percent and reflecting WFP's intention to continue to improve and learn as the assistance it provides grows in scope and complexity.

3. WFP's Corporate Planning and Performance Division coordinates and tracks management's responses to evaluation recommendations and determines the extent to which those recommendations are being implemented and whether follow-up may be required, with the aim of promoting accountability for results. To undertake this exercise, the Corporate Planning and Performance Division consults data related to centralized and decentralized evaluations from the R2 risk and recommendation tracking system, which facilitate global analysis of implementation status. The R2 system and associated improvements in the tracking and reporting of the follow-up to recommendations are enhancing the use of evaluations for learning and accountability purposes.

4. The formal management response process comprises:
   - an indication of whether management agrees, partially agrees or disagrees with each of the recommendations in an evaluation report;
   - the formulation of time-bound action plans for responding to evaluation recommendations and the identification of the WFP offices responsible for ensuring that implementation; and
   - the monitoring and tracking of progress in the implementation of recommendations until all agreed actions are closed.

5. All WFP evaluation reports and management responses are publicly available. WFP prepares management responses to all centralized and decentralized evaluations with a view to making optimal use of evaluations and facilitating accountability.

Figure 1: Workflow for evaluation implementation and reporting
Introduction

6. Since 2016, the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group and the criteria of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) Network on Development Evaluation have been updated. The revised criteria² provide a normative framework for evaluative judgement and are widely used in development assistance evaluation and at the humanitarian-development-peace nexus.

7. This year’s report on the implementation status of evaluation recommendations coincides with the end of the period covered by the WFP evaluation policy for 2016–2021 and considers performance throughout the duration of that policy.

8. Changes in the external and internal environments make this an opportune moment for WFP to renew its commitment to learning and continuous improvement through greater use of evaluation findings.

9. The report provides information on the implementation of the 1,005 evaluation recommendations that arose from WFP centralized and decentralized evaluations and that were due for implementation between January 2016 and December 2021.³

10. The 1,005 recommendations were issued through a total of 143 evaluations, as shown in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: EVALUATIONS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS DUE BETWEEN 2016 AND 2021, BY CATEGORY, TYPE AND YEAR OF ISSUE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total centralized evaluations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total decentralized evaluations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The year indicated is the year in which the relevant evaluation reports were approved.


³ Recommendations with earlier due dates, which are all closed, are not included in the R2 system.
Methodology

11. Under the revised WFP corporate results framework for 2017–2021, management performance is measured in terms of the extent to which that performance contributes to the implementation of the strategic plan.

12. Specifically, category I key performance indicator (KPI) 3, which looks at the “overall achievement of management performance standards”, comprises a number of component indicators that measure performance in ten functional areas. Within the programme functional area, performance in evaluation uptake is measured through the component indicator “percentage of implemented evaluation recommendations”.

13. This indicator has gained in importance in recent years as the number of WFP evaluations, and thus of recommendations, has increased significantly since 2016, as shown in figure 2.

14. To strengthen the analysis of performance, in 2020, the percentage of implemented evaluation recommendations indicator was revised to ensure that all actions assigned to a given recommendation were completed before the recommendation could be considered closed, as agreed with the Office of Evaluation (OEV). Prior to 2020, the indicator measured the number of actions completed, rather than the completion of recommendations in their entirety.

15. The baseline value for the revised indicator is 56 percent implementation in 2020, as recorded in the first quarter of 2021. The year-end target is always 100 percent implementation.

16. This report considers implementation rates at two levels: completion of entire recommendations, in line with the revised indicator; and completion of the individual actions called for in each recommendation, in line with the unrevised indicator. This ensures that WFP provides full transparency and accountability at the recommendation level while also providing insight into ongoing implementation and continuing improvement over the 2016-2021 period.

17. The following factors are considered in the calculation of the first indicator, i.e., the percentage of evaluation recommendations implemented:

➢ recommendations made in WFP centralized and decentralized evaluation reports;
➢ recommendations due for implementation in a given year, as agreed in the relevant management responses;
➢ implemented recommendations counted as implemented or closed with partial implementation;
➢ unimplemented recommendations counted as overdue or closed without implementation;
➢ recommendations reported as not agreed in the relevant management responses or closed as obsolete, which are excluded from the calculation.

18. Actions associated with such recommendations are counted as closed and implemented, closed without implementation, obsolete or ongoing and thus overdue.

---

4 The ten functional areas are management, programmes, supply chain, budget and programming, human resources, administration, finance, information technology, security, and resource mobilization, communications and reporting.

5 A total of 26 not agreed and 17 obsolete recommendations have been excluded from the calculations for 2016–2021.
Implementation of evaluation recommendations due between 2016 and 2021

19. Figure 2 provides an overview of the implementation status of recommendations due for implementation between 2016 and 2021, by year due. Overall, 84 percent of the 1,005 recommendations due were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

20. By the end of 2021, 58 percent of the 190 recommendations due in 2021 had been implemented, and implementation of the 198 recommendations due in 2020 had increased to 78 percent from 56 percent at the end of 2020. In the first four years of the period (2016-2019) implementation rates ranged between 98 percent in 2018 and 88 percent in 2019.

21. Each recommendation is broken down into individual actions that must all be completed for a recommendation to be considered implemented. The following paragraphs analyse the implementation status of those actions, indicating the level of progress towards and commitment to the full implementation of recommendations.

Figure 2: Implementation of recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, by year due

Implementation of actions related to evaluation recommendations due between 2016 and 2021

22. Figure 3 provides an overview of the implementation status of actions related to recommendations due for implementation between 2016 and 2021, by year due. Overall, 86 percent of the 2,113 actions were implemented by the first quarter of 2022.

23. Each individual action represents a step towards the full implementation of a recommendation, and action implementation rates give a sense of WFP’s implementation of the recommendations despite constraints related to time, evolving priorities and resource gaps.
Recommendations that were not implemented

24. This section of the report disaggregates the implementation rates further to shed light on where and why WFP has been challenged in implementing evaluation recommendations in a timely manner.

25. Of the 1,005 recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, 170 (or 16 percent) were not implemented, as shown in figure 4. Of those, 17 were closed without implementation and 153 were still open.

Figure 3: Implementation of actions related to recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, by year due

Figure 4: Unimplemented recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, by year due
26. A review of progress updates on the 17 recommendations that were closed without implementation showed that limited funding was the most frequently cited obstacle to implementation. Those recommendations pertained primarily to school feeding/education and nutrition, which are among the areas most commonly evaluated and among those in which the most recommendations were implemented. Thirteen of the 17 recommendations that were closed without implementation were due in 2021.

27. Of the 153 recommendations that were open, 40 percent of the 533 associated actions were already implemented at the end of 2021, as shown in figure 5, confirming that the implementation of many open recommendations is under way.

Figure 5: Implementation of the actions associated with open recommendations due between 2016 and 2021

28. Implementation was reported as ongoing with no specific challenges for 96 of the 153 open recommendations. Nearly half of those 96 recommendations were due in 2021 and many were related to school feeding/education, capacity strengthening or partnerships.

29. Among the 26 open recommendations for which a progress update was provided, the challenges reported as delaying implementation included operational factors such as restrictions related to the 2019 coronavirus disease pandemic, floods, accessibility, civil unrest, unstable government or changes of government, delays in the finalization of agreements with partners and limited funding. Forty-three percent of those 26 recommendations were due for closure in 2021, and many related to school feeding/education, capacity strengthening, partnerships and nutrition.

30. Thirty-one open recommendations, to be implemented by eight WFP offices in the Western Africa region, have not yet been reported on.6 Most of those recommendations were due for implementation before 2020, suggesting that the challenge hindering their closure is a lack of reporting. WFP has recently taken steps to ensure that such reporting gaps are addressed.

Implementation of recommendations by office and type of evaluation

31. For the period between 2016 and 2021, country offices under the regional bureaux for Western Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Eastern Africa had the largest numbers of recommendations to implement, with a total of 609, or 61 percent of the 1,005 recommendations due for implementation, as shown in table 2.

---

6 The eight offices were Cameroon, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria and Togo.
32. Some of the lowest reported implementation rates were 60 percent for country offices in the Western Africa region, 60 percent for the Regional Bureau for Eastern Africa and 63 percent for offices in the Programme and Policy Development Department, compared with an implementation rate of 84 percent for WFP as a whole (see paragraph 19). It should be noted that the Regional Bureau for Eastern Africa had a much lower absolute number (five) of recommendations to implement.

33. The reasons for those low rates varied by office. Country offices in the Western Africa region, which had a total of 251 recommendations – the highest number for country offices in any WFP region – closed 14 recommendations without implementation, often due to a lack of funding, and cited operational challenges as the reason for the delay in implementing a further nine recommendations. Reporting delays also explain the low implementation rate.

34. By contrast, country offices in the Asia and the Pacific and the Middle East, Northern Africa and Eastern Europe regions implemented 93 percent of their combined 301 recommendations, and country offices under the other three WFP regional bureaux (Eastern Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and Southern Africa) implemented 94 percent of their 315 recommendations.

35. Among offices in the Programme and Policy Development Department, which had a total of 48 recommendations, 13 of the 18 overdue recommendations arose from policy evaluations, making them more challenging to implement because they required more institutional normative and structural changes than do recommendations of a more operational nature. Implementation of all 18 overdue recommendations is currently under way.

### TABLE 2: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS DUE BETWEEN 2016 AND 2021, BY HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT, REGIONAL BUREAU AND COUNTRY OFFICE REGION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead office</th>
<th>Implemented (% number in brackets)</th>
<th>Closed without implementation (% number in brackets)</th>
<th>Open (%) number in brackets</th>
<th>Total (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headquarters department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters department</td>
<td>75 (69)</td>
<td>25 (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief of Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships and Advocacy</td>
<td>100 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and Policy Development</td>
<td>63 (30)</td>
<td>37 (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>82 (9)</td>
<td>18 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Culture</td>
<td>100 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional bureau</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, Northern Africa and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>75 (6)</td>
<td>25 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>88 (14)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>60 (3)</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>87 (13)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS DUE BETWEEN 2016 AND 2021, BY HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT, REGIONAL BUREAU AND COUNTRY OFFICE REGION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead office</th>
<th>Implemented (%; number in brackets)</th>
<th>Closed without implementation (%; number in brackets)</th>
<th>Open (%; number in brackets)</th>
<th>Total (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country office region</td>
<td>84 (729)</td>
<td>2 (17)</td>
<td>14 (121)</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>93 (201)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, Northern Africa and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>93 (80)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>60 (151)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>35 (87)</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>91 (96)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>99 (141)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>91 (60)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Disaggregated by lead office assigned in the evaluation report.

36. Of the 1,005 recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, 445 arose from centralized evaluations and 560 from decentralized evaluations, as shown in figure 6. The implementation rates for the two evaluation types were similar, at 84 percent for centralized and 82 percent for decentralized evaluations.

Figure 6: Implementation of recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, by evaluation type

37. The lowest implementation rates were observed in recommendations arising from evaluations of pilots (0 percent), country strategic plans evaluations (13 percent) and decentralized impact evaluations (53 percent). These types of evaluations have given rise to few recommendations, most of which have been issued only recently; for example, there were only five recommendations from the only pilot evaluation conducted and 15 recommendations from four country strategic plan evaluations, most of them due in December 2021. As a result, the overall implementation rate of 84 percent was not significantly affected by these low implementation rates, which are expected to improve during 2022.
Implementation of recommendations relating to cross-cutting priorities

38. WFP evaluations and external reviews of the organization, such as the mid-term review of the revised corporate results framework for 2017–2021 (June 2020) and the reviews of the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network, have frequently recommended that WFP enhance its focus on cross-cutting priorities and invest further in ensuring that they are applied systematically across operations and that policy commitments are measurable and met.

39. The WFP strategic plan and related corporate results framework for 2022–2025 seek to address these concerns by ensuring increased focus on cross-cutting priorities both as a means of achieving humanitarian and development results and as goals in themselves.

40. In the context of this renewed focus, it is noted that between 2016 and 2021, a total of 198 recommendations were made in relation to the cross-cutting priorities of environment, gender, protection/human rights and accountability to affected populations. Of the 198, 160 (81 percent) have been implemented.

41. As shown in table 3, 55 percent of the evaluation recommendations due between 2016 and 2021 and relating to cross-cutting priorities concern gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Not implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/human rights</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to affected populations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. The 109 recommendations relating to gender arose from thematic and operational evaluations. WFP's performance in implementing the recommendations relating to cross-cutting priorities that arise from operational evaluations is far stronger than its performance in implementing those from thematic evaluations, as shown in annex II.

43. Qualitative analysis of the recommendations themselves shows that compared with recommendations arising from operational evaluations, those stemming from thematic evaluations tend to be more structural and systemic in nature, requiring greater corporate investment – including a commitment to hiring specialists (such as gender and protection specialists) at the country level – more and deeper gender analysis, and more consistent work in closer collaboration with national and subnational stakeholders in order to understand and address gender issues as they manifest locally and to fill strategic organizational gaps.

44. Evaluation recommendations at the operational level tend to be of an immediate practical nature directly related to beneficiary dynamics such as the need to increase the participation and representation of women in assisted communities or camps.
Implementation of recommendations relating to four key themes

45. Table 4 shows the implementation rates for recommendations relating to four of WFP’s key thematic areas. A total of 755 evaluation recommendations due between 2016 and 2021 were in those four areas, with the highest number (231) relating to school feeding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Not implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity strengthening</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School feeding</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>627</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>755</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. School feeding is one of the most frequently evaluated themes as it features in most country strategic plans and because the funding for school feeding provided by the United States Department of Agriculture McGovern-Dole programme requires that each funded project be evaluated at least twice, leading to an increase in the number of evaluation recommendations.

47. Failure to implement recommendations is often related to a lack of funding at the individual activity or project level and to other constraints. However, WFP intends to reach 100 percent implementation of the 128 outstanding recommendations during 2022.

Looking ahead

48. The evaluation function is one source of evidence for WFP and is closely linked to another source, the monitoring function. Management will continue to work with OEV to enhance the synergies between monitoring and evaluation and to strengthen capacity, particularly at the country level, where the two functions are often carried out by the same employees.

49. WFP management is committed to continuing to implement evaluation recommendations and report on the results, in collaboration with OEV and other WFP offices. The WFP strategic plan for 2022–2025 sets out six “enablers”, reflected in the seven management results set out in the corporate results framework, that will increase the organization’s ability to achieve results. One of those enablers, defined as management result 5, is evidence and learning.

50. Specific KPIs under management result 5 will capture how WFP leverages evidence and learning as enablers of effective implementation and include a KPI on the timely implementation of evaluation recommendations.

---

7 WFP does not have a standard nomenclature for relevant themes, but they often include cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and women’s empowerment, protection, accountability to affected populations, partnerships, and innovation, and could include any thematic area that is not framed as a specific activity type. For further information, please see the Evaluation Quality Assurance System technical note on decentralized evaluation types, page 3.

8 The management results areas set out in the corporate results framework for 2022–2025 are “effectiveness in emergencies”, “people management”, “engage in effective partnerships”, “effective funding for zero hunger”, “evidence and learning”, “leverage technology” and “leverage innovation”.
51. In response to OEV's review of the implementation of recommendations from global
evaluations, management has committed to carrying out a series of actions that will
sharpen the preparation process for management responses with the aim of developing
more relevant, actionable and realistic responses to evaluation recommendations.

52. Those actions will be carried out in accordance with the WFP strategic plan and corporate
results framework for 2022–2025, which underline the organization's commitment
to becoming more evidence-driven in delivering results. In addition, the WFP evaluation
policy 2022 sets out a vision of a culture of accountability and learning supported by
evaluative thinking, behaviour and systems.

Conclusion

53. The organization implemented 58 percent of the 190 recommendations due in 2021 on
time, with implementation of most of the remaining recommendations ongoing.

54. It is important to note that optimal assessment of WFP's performance in meeting its
commitment to achieving full implementation of all evaluation recommendations as agreed
in management responses requires comparison with not only the recommendation due
dates for each year but also the implementation rates over several previous years. For
example, WFP has implemented 84 percent of all the recommendations due since 2016 and
92 percent of those due between 2016 and 2019, which points to a high level of use of
evaluation.

55. The 2014 analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system may be
considered as a reference point. There, the Joint Inspection Unit – the independent external
oversight body of the United Nations system – defines a “high level of use” of evaluation as
the implementation of more than 85 percent of the recommendations due “within a
three-year period”.

56. There is therefore an element of the implementation rate that is related to the timeframe
set for the completion of recommendations, and offices often require additional time due
to evolving priorities on the ground and other constraints.

57. Under the new strategic plan, corporate results framework and evaluation policy, WFP is
even better placed to leverage the valuable evidence and lessons learned from evaluations.

---

9 “Summary report on the review of the implementation of recommendations from thematic evaluations of a strategic/global nature” (WFP/EB.A/2022/7-D).
### Implementation of recommendations due in 2021, by headquarters department and division, regional bureau and country office

1. As shown in the table below, 19 of 51 offices (37 percent) met the target of 100 percent implementation in 2021. Disaggregation is based on the lead offices assigned in evaluation reports. Offices not listed in the table did not lead the implementation of any recommendation due in 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implemented (%)</th>
<th>Closed with partial implementation</th>
<th>Open (%)</th>
<th>Closed without implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global</strong></td>
<td>54 (104)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>35 (66)</td>
<td>7 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headquarters office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Planning and Performance Division</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Office</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Division</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Division</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Executive Director</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management Support Office</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships and Advocacy Department</td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>60 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and Policy Development Department</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management Department</td>
<td>50 (2)</td>
<td>50 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Programmes</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional bureau</strong></td>
<td>43 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All regional bureaux</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country office</strong></td>
<td>57 (89)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>31 (48)</td>
<td>8 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>100 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>50 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Implemented (%)</td>
<td>Closed with partial implementation (%)</td>
<td>Open (%)</td>
<td>Closed without implementation (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>53 (7)</td>
<td>31 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>43 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia (the)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>67 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic</td>
<td>100 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>67 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>80 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>100 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>100 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX II

Implementation of evaluation recommendations due between 2016 and 2021, by cross-cutting theme and evaluation category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Evaluation category</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Not implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer modality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/human rights</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to affected populations</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country portfolio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer modality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>