



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

**Executive Board**  
Annual session  
Rome, 23–26 June 2026

---

Distribution: General

Agenda item 7

Date: 21 April 2026

WFP/EB.A/2026/7-G/4

Original: English

Oversight functions

For decision

Executive Board documents are available on WFP's website (<https://executiveboard.wfp.org>).

---

## Summary report on the evaluation synthesis of WFP's engagement in United Nations humanitarian coordination

### Executive summary

Conducted at a time of rising humanitarian needs, declining resources and systemic reforms reshaping collective action, this synthesis draws on 65 WFP evaluations carried out between 2018 and 2025 and assesses WFP's role, strengths and challenges in humanitarian coordination with a view to informing its positioning in this evolving landscape.

The evaluations affirm WFP's foundational role in enabling collective response under emergency conditions. As cluster lead or co-lead, its agility, responsiveness and operational weight enable large-scale coordination, especially where few other organizations can. These strengths are most visible when roles are formally designated.

Where WFP's role is less clearly defined, its positioning is less consistent. Context-specific engagement can fill gaps but may also lead to individualized approaches and limited consultation.

The evaluations also highlight underused potential for WFP to strengthen the wider coordination system. Limited communication around decision-making has strained relationships and led to missed opportunities, while resource constraints have reduced WFP's ability to invest consistently in coordination.

WFP's data and analysis are widely valued, although their dissemination could better support anticipatory action, strategic planning and a stronger sense of humanitarian citizenship.

On localization, WFP has contributed through preparedness and capacity strengthening, including in terms of support to government-led clusters. Further alignment of its actions with localization goals could deepen national and local ownership and sustainability.

*In line with WFP's 2022 evaluation policy (WFP/EB.1/2022/4-C), the editing of this report has been limited in order to respect the integrity and independence of evaluation findings. As a result, some of the language in it may not be fully consistent with WFP's standard terminology or editorial practices. Please direct any requests for clarification to the Director of Evaluation.*

---

#### Focal points:

Ms A.-C. Luzot  
Director of Evaluation  
email: [anneclaire.luzot@wfp.org](mailto:anneclaire.luzot@wfp.org)

Mr F. Pompili  
Evaluation Officer  
email: [filippo.pompili@wfp.org](mailto:filippo.pompili@wfp.org)

A recurring theme is the tension between the humanitarian imperative and demands associated with coordination, as rapid independent action may undermine partnerships and perceptions of collective responsibility.

WFP's support for a collective transition out of emergencies is increasingly visible but constrained by limited frameworks, lack of early planning and external factors. As reforms accelerate and resources tighten, WFP will need a clear vision of its role in collective action, supported by shifts in its organizational culture and stronger collaboration.

The synthesis concludes with two recommendations: at the corporate level, WFP should clarify and prioritize its role in coordination mechanisms beyond the clusters that it leads; and it should create a narrative for its workforce that positions coordination as a core requirement, while preserving space for independent action when the humanitarian imperative demands it.

### **Draft decision\***

The Board takes note of the summary report on the evaluation synthesis of WFP's engagement in United Nations humanitarian coordination (WFP/EB.A/2026/7-G/4) and the management response (WFP/EB.A/2026/7-G/4/Add.1).

---

\* This is a draft decision. For the final decision adopted by the Board, please refer to the decisions and recommendations document issued at the end of the session.

## Introduction

1. Humanitarian needs are rising dramatically, while funding for humanitarian assistance is in decline. Initiatives such as UN80 and the humanitarian reset are driving major systemic changes. The imperative for efficient, coordinated and collective humanitarian action is not so much a pressing need as an inevitable and transformative change.
2. Conducted by WFP's Office of Evaluation, this synthesis<sup>1</sup> draws on 65 independent evaluations carried out since 2018 to assess WFP's role, strengths and challenges in relation to United Nations humanitarian coordination and to inform WFP's positioning within the humanitarian system, including for the 2025 humanitarian reset and the UN80 initiative.
3. The synthesis posed four questions:
  - *How has WFP positioned itself in humanitarian coordination forums?*
  - *What contributions has WFP made to humanitarian coordination?*
  - *What difference has WFP's engagement made to coordinated humanitarian action on the ground?*
  - *What factors have supported or constrained WFP's engagement in humanitarian coordination?*
4. The synthesis covers WFP engagement in United Nations humanitarian coordination mechanisms, including the humanitarian clusters under the Inter-Agency Standing Committee model where activated<sup>2</sup> and their related results. The study also covered WFP's engagement in sectoral working groups and humanitarian country teams, its approach to coordination and collaboration with other humanitarian actors, and the services it provides to partners in support of the collective response.
5. The density of evidence varied in some areas of WFP engagement in coordination systems – meaning that sometimes, fewer evaluations supported specific findings. This does not reduce the validity of the findings presented. Given the larger number of country-level evaluations available, evidence on country-level coordination features more prominently in this report.
6. To ensure relevance and reflect current organizational arrangements, regular consultations were held with internal stakeholders.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the summary report on the evaluation. The full report and all related documents are available on the WFP website: [Evaluation synthesis on WFP's engagement in UN humanitarian coordination](#).

<sup>2</sup> At the time of the evaluations, WFP led the logistics and emergency telecommunications clusters and co-led the food security cluster. These clusters have evolved since the evaluations were conducted (including through the streamlining of clusters and the merger of the logistics and emergency telecommunications clusters).

## Conclusions and supporting findings

**Conclusion 1: When WFP's role is clearly defined, the organization is a fundamental enabler of humanitarian responses.**

The evaluations show that WFP plays a foundational role in enabling collective humanitarian response under emergency conditions. It has effectively leveraged its designated role as cluster lead or co-lead, to which many of its comparative advantages are geared, in order to lead the broader humanitarian system in the implementation of emergency responses around the world. Its agility, responsiveness and capacity to meet urgent needs are widely documented. In emergency settings, where roles are formally designated and clearly defined from an operational point of view, WFP has demonstrated the leadership, decisiveness and operational weight to mobilize, coordinate and deliver assistance where few other organizations can.

7. **Its leadership of the logistics and emergency telecommunications clusters and co-leadership of the food security cluster position WFP as a critical enabler of collective emergency response.** The evaluations reported that WFP's leadership in these forums was evident, with its support assessed as substantial, timely and effective in terms of achieving objectives. The organization was recognized by partners for its flexibility, effectiveness and generosity, providing critical services to governments and other humanitarian actors and ensuring continuity of humanitarian assistance.
8. The evaluations reported that **as the leader of the logistics cluster**, WFP played a core role in facilitating the coordination of humanitarian access and the provision of logistics services, guaranteeing continuity of humanitarian operations. The logistics cluster is consistently cited in evaluations as an enabler of coordinated emergency responses, meeting the need for a systematic coordination mechanism and shared services in emergency settings.
9. **The emergency telecommunications cluster played a similarly critical role** in enabling collective humanitarian response. WFP leadership focused on ensuring that humanitarian operations remained connected and coordinated in highly challenging operating environments. Evaluations record that the supply of emergency communication systems, information and communication technology (ICT) solutions and network maintenance was key in ensuring access to life-saving information and services during crises.
10. **As co-leader of the food security cluster** with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), WFP's leadership was instrumental in driving coordination, coherence, targeting, coverage and transition in food security responses.<sup>3</sup> In the Syrian Arab Republic, for example, the cluster coordinated extensively with partners to ensure the streamlined delivery of assistance and avoid duplication. Evaluations reported that the cluster acts as a powerful enabler of humanitarian effectiveness when it fosters open, timely and strategic information sharing.
11. **WFP's leadership was found to be instrumental in catalysing collective preparedness in a range of settings.** In particular, the global logistics<sup>4</sup> and emergency telecommunication clusters dedicated significant resources to preparedness. Contributions include developing adaptable preparedness tools, fostering private sector partnerships for additional ad-hoc capacity in emergencies, and conducting logistics capacity assessments, ICT training, contingency planning and natural hazard risk analysis.

<sup>3</sup> Also noted in the *Strategic evaluation of WFP's approaches to targeting and prioritization for food and nutrition assistance*.

<sup>4</sup> The global logistics cluster field-based preparedness project seeks to increase local supply chain resilience and coordination among governments, private sector organizations and humanitarian actors.

12. However, evaluations also highlight some inconsistencies in the prioritization of coordinated preparedness efforts, including **unclear inter-agency roles in and responsibilities for preparedness; inconsistent oversight and accountability for preparedness activities; and overstretched resources**, which undermined collective action.
13. **WFP's engagement and leadership in humanitarian coordination led to concrete results improvements in the quality of the collective humanitarian response.** Evaluations record **enhanced humanitarian access** as a result of WFP's engagement in collective action, either through advocacy on behalf of the humanitarian community, as in South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine and Yemen, or through coordinated transport solutions via the logistics cluster and WFP's dedicated access capacity.
14. WFP's engagement in coordinated humanitarian action also **improved the operational efficiency of collective responses**. Joint coordinated assessments and tools shared within clusters reduced duplication, thereby improving efficiency in operational delivery, especially amid resource constraints.

**Conclusion 2: WFP's positioning is unclear when roles are less clearly defined.**

In settings where WFP's role is less clearly defined or where it operates as a team member, evaluations found its engagement to be context-specific and opportunistic – positive features – but also at times individualized. In some areas, this lack of clarity led it to step in and take the lead, driven by the humanitarian imperative, where partners lacked capacity or ability to respond. While this supported the operational response and helped to meet needs on the ground, it also created reputational risk. At times it also gave rise to insufficiently consultative or participatory approaches and, as a consequence, risked undermining the shared sense of coordination among the humanitarian community.

15. **In situations where coordination structures were mature and functioning, a clear division of labour helped to optimize use of the respective strengths of the various actors in order to maximize the effectiveness of the humanitarian response.** For example, WFP's work with refugees and migrants is established through formalized systems of collaboration, memorandums of understanding, technical agreements with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration and formal partnerships with national governments.
16. Evaluations also show examples of where **WFP increasingly assumed more prominent roles in thematic or programmatic working groups, or other coordination forums, despite not having a designated leadership role**, stepping forward in response to specific demands or on the basis of its operational strengths. In such settings, WFP demonstrated readiness to act in the absence of other humanitarian actors, playing a lead role in coordination across several thematic areas and operational circumstances, driving inter-agency-coherence.<sup>5</sup>
17. **WFP is playing an increasingly prominent role in coordinated nutrition interventions.** Evaluations reported that this is particularly the case with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) within the nutrition cluster and the multi-agency referral system. They highlight how WFP and UNICEF have collaborated to optimize community-level interventions, with a focus on ensuring continuity of care for children suffering from acute malnutrition, aiming to maximize the effectiveness of both agencies through stronger operational coordination. Evaluations note that at the global level, WFP plays a leading role in shaping nutrition policy

<sup>5</sup> Ethiopia, Iraq, Mozambique, Myanmar, the Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo and Türkiye, and *Strategic evaluation of WFP's support for refugees, internally displaced persons and migrants*.

and practice by driving technical guidance, coordination and learning through the global nutrition cluster and inter-agency task-teams.<sup>6</sup>

18. **Evaluations signal inconsistent engagement in forums on gender, protection and inclusion.** While evaluations identify positive examples of WFP's proactive engagement in the protection cluster and related working group, and successful collaboration with the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment,<sup>7</sup> they also find that in other cases WFP's engagement in such forums was limited to sharing information or it remained nominal, unless it was directly linked to specific programming areas.
19. **Overall, evaluations identified four recurring challenges regarding WFP's engagement in humanitarian coordination forums beyond the clusters it leads or co-leads:**
- **Lack of clarity regarding roles.** In some cases, WFP's early and proactive engagement in emergency response resulted in unclear assignation of operational roles among partner United Nations entities. More specifically, evaluation findings highlighted that WFP was not always effective or timely in communicating its assumed leadership role to partners.
  - **Confusion regarding cash transfers.** The absence of defined roles and WFP strategies for partnership, combined with the lack of a clearly stated positioning, sometimes risked duplication of effort and led to missed opportunities for collaboration. This occurred in the coordination of cash assistance, especially multi-purpose cash.
  - **A narrow focus and missed opportunities.** WFP's humanitarian coordination efforts were often narrow in focus,<sup>8</sup> leading to missed opportunities for strategic leadership, cross-sectoral integration and influence within broader development and resilience frameworks.
  - **A sometimes-reactive approach to partnerships.** WFP's partnership approach was found to be unstructured and reactive at times, lacking a clear prioritization strategy, which hindered its ability to proactively seek new partnerships in the area of emergency preparedness and response.<sup>9</sup>

**Conclusion 3: There is potential for WFP to support collective coordination more consistently.**

**Fundamentally, context determines WFP's willingness and ability to engage in wider coordination, including the wider enabling environment and the capacities of other actors. Evaluations report that WFP could use its strong reputation with partners and its operational size and weight more consistently in order to improve the broader coordination system.**

20. **Overall, WFP has strong reputational capital in humanitarian coordination.** Evaluations record that key stakeholders from humanitarian country teams recognize WFP as a strong and constructive partner that adds value to collective humanitarian responses.
21. **However, gaps were noted in how WFP communicated its choice of roles and actions.** While evaluations report that many of WFP's decisions in complex settings are operationally justified – and sometimes require a more discreet approach to be effective, limited communication with partners strained relationships at times. Given WFP's scale, such missed opportunities to capitalize on its positioning with respect to government and humanitarian

<sup>6</sup> *Strategic evaluation of WFP's work on nutrition and HIV/AIDS.*

<sup>7</sup> *Afghanistan, Iraq, Myanmar and State of Palestine.*

<sup>8</sup> *Bangladesh, Cameroon, Mozambique and Ukraine.*

<sup>9</sup> *Evaluation of WFP's emergency preparedness policy.*

actors can disproportionately affect the coherence and effectiveness of the collective humanitarian response.

22. **Evaluations of operations in Ethiopia and Ukraine reported United Nations system-wide challenges that hampered efforts to secure full humanitarian access stemming from underpowered advocacy or limited support to the humanitarian system.** In Ethiopia, evaluations found that WFP and other humanitarian actors made limited efforts to advocate for the lifting of access restrictions and failed to agree on what a principled approach would entail, particularly with regard to operational independence. In Ukraine, the inability to secure humanitarian corridors reflected the complex operating environment and the limited influence of humanitarian actors on access negotiations.
23. **Coordination was also challenging when compromise was required or where WFP lacked a coordination instinct.** Evaluations found WFP sometimes working in isolation, for example on cash transfers in Ukraine, with its understanding of the need for a principled stance coming into tension with the positions of other entities, such as in relation to transfer values. Likewise, in Zimbabwe, overreliance on internal capacity led to missed opportunities for collaboration in areas related to agriculture, livelihoods, early warning and anticipatory action.
24. **Dedicated and predictable funding is a fundamental enabler of effective WFP engagement in coordination systems.** The work of WFP-led clusters is hindered by scarce funding and lack of prioritization of resources for preparedness at the country and global levels.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, continued competition for resources among United Nations partners disincentivizes collaborative activity.<sup>11</sup>
25. **Some evaluations noted insufficient WFP staffing to support engagement in coordination systems.** For example, high staff turnover and limited handovers between staff impeded comprehensive coordination of emergency responses in Mozambique and Ukraine, which was exacerbated by a lack of dedicated personnel with the necessary expertise, and difficulty in securing national staff. In these cases, the situations were compounded by the short-term nature of funding dedicated to the emergency responses.<sup>12</sup>

**Conclusion 4: There is unrealized potential in data sharing and analysis.**

WFP's contributions to data, information sharing and analysis were found to be of core value to humanitarian action, globally and at the country level. They are highly valued by WFP's partners for their quality, comprehensiveness and rigour. However, evaluations indicate room to enhance dissemination to support anticipatory action and strategic planning and as a proactive contribution to the work of the broader humanitarian community.

26. **WFP's active engagement in coordination forums, especially for targeting, resulted in more focused humanitarian responses.** At the global level, WFP engagement in inter-agency collaboration strengthened targeting and prioritization in humanitarian responses, improved coordination and allowed interventions to better reach vulnerable populations. For example, although now phased out, the Joint Programme Excellence and Targeting Hub established by WFP and UNHCR in 2020 played a key role in strengthening and refining joint targeting and prioritization and reinforcing collaboration. At the country level,

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> *Mid-term evaluation of the WFP strategic plan (2022–2025)* and examples from Ethiopia and Somalia.

<sup>12</sup> *Evaluation of WFP's emergency preparedness policy*.

evaluations record more focused humanitarian responses as a result of collective work to identify the most vulnerable people.

27. **WFP's central role in generating evidence and analysis benefited the wider humanitarian system**,<sup>13</sup> including through the global clusters and other mechanisms such as the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification and the Cadre Harmonisé. In a range of settings, its leadership in food security analysis, joint assessments and harmonized targeting methods was found to have helped ensure coherent, cross-sectoral planning without slowing operational speed.
28. **However, evaluations also identified shortfalls**, including:
- **Limited information and knowledge sharing** with other actors, including on targeting and prioritization methodologies. This created challenges in settings where adjustments or withdrawal of WFP assistance significantly affected vulnerable populations and where timely information-sharing could have supported coordinated prioritization by other actors. Limited information sharing is also associated with risks of duplication of assistance.
  - **Limited collaboration with partners on the joint design of targeting criteria**, validation of beneficiary lists and adaptation of targeting frameworks in response to changing needs.
  - Systemic **challenges in the collective targeting of specific vulnerable population groups**, particularly women and girls, and people with disabilities, as indicated in inter-agency evaluations.
  - **Shortcomings in WFP and collective accountability to affected people and community feedback mechanisms**. Here, evaluations indicate promising intent from WFP's engagement in coordinated action (for example, in Lebanon and the United Republic of Tanzania), but also some shortcomings in operational delivery (in Burkina Faso and Ukraine).

**Conclusion 5: There is potential to further support localization.**

**While WFP's engagement in collective preparedness and capacity strengthening for response demonstrably supported localization, evaluations found that further alignment with these goals could deepen national and local ownership and the sustainability of interventions in line with the 2025 localization policy and the WFP strategic plan for 2026–2029, which call for strengthening the influence of local and national actors in shaping coordination platforms.**

29. **WFP engaged closely with partners to support collective action for capacity strengthening of national and local actors**. In diverse settings, WFP's engagement with national disaster management and sectoral authorities helped to strengthen local institutional capacities. WFP's dual role – as operational lead during emergencies and as a technical partner in preparedness – enabled hands-on capacity development, although the depth of the results achieved varied depending on government ownership, WFP's internal alignment and the maturity of national systems.
30. **As a result of collective efforts on strengthening capacity, in which WFP played an important role, national and local actors were better equipped to lead future responses independently**, reducing reliance on the external delivery of humanitarian responses. WFP helped to achieve concrete efficiency gains in humanitarian responses,

<sup>13</sup> Found in 16 evaluations.

strengthened coordination mechanisms and enhanced the readiness of government institutions and local non-governmental organizations to respond to crises. Evaluations found notable success stories where WFP supported government leadership in humanitarian clusters, allowing national actors to take the lead, particularly as a result of the commitment of WFP-led clusters to localizing emergency supply chain and telecommunication coordination.

31. **However, government engagement in coordination was sometimes limited, which constrained effective collaboration.** Evaluations found that government engagement in coordination mechanisms was constrained by high turnover of government staff, limited trust in coordination systems and varying degrees of national capacity. Moreover, national and local organizations sometimes remained marginalized within humanitarian coordination and decision-making despite their operational presence, knowledge of the operating environment and, sometimes, their technical capacity.

**Conclusion 6: WFP needs to navigate the tensions between the humanitarian imperative and coordination.**

The evaluations analysed illustrate how WFP frequently confronts and needs to navigate acute dilemmas arising from the humanitarian imperative to address human suffering and the demands of complex coordination mechanisms. Evaluations record that in such cases, the culture of WFP is to aim for a coordinated approach at first, such as in relation to cash transfers. Then, if burdens of coordination appear to risk delaying the delivery of assistance to people in need, the ethos of the organization is to ensure continuous delivery of humanitarian assistance, which it is unafraid to do alone if needed.

32. **WFP has to manage tensions between the humanitarian imperative, including the speed of the response, and the burdens involved in coordination.** Evaluations emphasize that WFP's work is driven by the moral obligation to safeguard humanitarian space and principles. Ensuring the continuity of humanitarian assistance is the central driver of its operations. This position has major strengths when it comes to meeting humanitarian needs and upholding the principle of humanity. Yet it also has costs in terms of limiting the depth of operational partnerships; posing risks to WFP's reputation as a strong humanitarian citizen; and reducing efficiency, when time and energy that could be spent on the humanitarian response are instead dedicated to resolving disagreements. Evaluations observe that WFP has opportunities to learn more from its own experience and to clarify the costs of lone action versus coordinated approaches.
33. **Evaluations highlight notable efforts by WFP to act in partnership both globally and locally.** The evidence indicates that WFP could further leverage its internal capacities to support coordinated humanitarian action more consistently. While it has limited control over external factors, it could strengthen its internal culture and mindset to better support coordinated humanitarian action, including by harnessing the power of the humanitarian imperative as an organizational driver of collaboration, as well as aligning organizational incentives with more collective goals.
34. **Trade-offs can arise where WFP's rapid operational pace, driven by its imperative to deliver, meets the sometimes-slower pace of coordinated action.** For example, in the early stages of the response to the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic, inter-agency disagreements arose over food security datasets, supply chain management, the construction of medical facilities and air transport, with other entities lacking WFP's mature instinct and capacity for emergency response and being slower to respond.

**Conclusion 7: More progress is needed on collective transitioning out of emergency response operations.**

Alongside coordinated emergency responses, WFP is fostering strategic collaboration to support early recovery, rehabilitate food systems and rebuild livelihoods. Its ability to pivot effectively to recovery programming is widely recorded in evaluations. However, evaluations note that while its commitment to recovery-focused approaches is evident, a lack of clear frameworks and early planning within collective approaches has constrained its ability to consistently balance immediate food assistance with longer-term resilience programming and system strengthening.

35. **WFP has made increasing efforts to support the humanitarian community in transitioning away from collective emergency responses.** Evaluations note that strategic collaboration with FAO and other partners enabled WFP to pivot from emergency response to collective support for early recovery, supporting the restoration of livelihoods and markets, agricultural recovery and food system rehabilitation.
36. **WFP consistently demonstrated strong coordination capacities during emergencies and early recovery, working effectively with governments and United Nations partners to deliver integrated responses.** For example, evaluations noted that in Mozambique and Türkiye, collaboration with FAO facilitated alignment between food assistance and agricultural recovery, while engagement with local authorities in Mozambique supported both immediate response and disaster preparedness. These examples highlight WFP's ability to mobilize partners quickly, ensure coherence across sectors and contribute to early recovery outcomes through joint programming.
37. **However, when responses move toward transition, resilience building or handover, WFP's strategic guidance and planning can at times become less consistent.** The inter-agency evaluation of the collective humanitarian response in Ethiopia found that the jointly developed strategy to shift from food assistance to resilience programming lacked operational clarity and faced contextual constraints. In Iraq, the handover of humanitarian coordination responsibilities – including cluster responsibilities – to government and development actors was poorly planned and communicated.
38. A nuanced picture emerged from the evaluation of WFP's response in Ukraine, where it proved challenging to balance food assistance and livelihood interventions within the food security cluster, given the predominance of food security needs. The lack of early planning for national co-leadership constrained the ability of the collective humanitarian system to support a transition from purely humanitarian action to recovery programming and system strengthening work.

### Looking forwards

39. The findings of the evaluations analysed reflect a central challenge: the concurrence of rising humanitarian needs and declining funding is intensifying demands for more cohesive humanitarian action. While progress continues to be made on systemic reforms such as those under the UN80 initiative and the humanitarian reset, WFP needs a clear vision of its role in collective action and its ability to adapt to shifting inter-agency roles.

## Recommendations

#	Recommendation	Responsibility	Other contributing entities	By when
1	<p><b>To better support country-level decision-making on engagement in humanitarian coordination, and in accordance with the ongoing humanitarian reset and the UN80 initiative, clarify and prioritize – at the corporate level – WFP’s role in coordination mechanisms and forums beyond the clusters that it currently leads, guided by the need to focus.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Through an update of the Executive Director’s circular on WFP’s leadership in the Inter-Agency Standing Committee clusters,<sup>14</sup> clarify the key coordination mechanisms and forums in which WFP will engage at the global and country levels, taking into account specific operational contexts, and communicate a clear corporate position.</li> <li>ii. To define successful coordination, conduct a learning exercise based on country office experiences with different approaches to humanitarian coordination in a variety of settings, identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and gaps of each approach.</li> </ul>	United Nations Engagement Division	Programme Division Supply Chain and Delivery Division Country offices	December 2027
2	<p><b>To maximize WFP’s potential for enhancing the wider humanitarian system, create a narrative for the WFP workforce that positions humanitarian coordination as a fundamental requirement, while preserving space for independent action where the humanitarian imperative demands.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. At the corporate level, develop a clear internal narrative to guide coordination-related decisions and help country offices navigate the dilemmas presented by coordination and the choices they face.</li> <li>ii. At the country level, build tailored communication approaches into annual performance plans in order to help WFP employees and partners to understand – and explain – the rationale behind WFP’s coordination choices, considering the role of country directors as cluster leads.</li> </ul>	Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer Office	United Nations Engagement Division Communications and Media Office Country offices	December 2027

<sup>14</sup> WFP. 2013. [Executive Director’s Circular: WFP Leadership in IASC Clusters](#) (OED2013/016).