

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
1	Germany	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "...ensure that it will be able to present disaggregated data on voucher and conditional and multi-purpose cash transfer and conditional cash transfer."</li> <li>• "...prioritize life-saving and emergency support as needed &amp; reflect this clearly in the SP." ... In light of the Strategic Plan's further expansion into [development], we would like to draw attention to a general risk of funding gaps if donors are not convinced by WFP's engagement in these areas."</li> <li>• "We are supportive of WFP further strengthening its dual mandate but... In areas where expertise is lacking or where the mandate clearly lies with other organizations..., strong and equal partnerships with the respective organizations should be promoted."</li> <li>• "... strong interest in discussing WFP's future involvement in climate-related activities particularly climate-risk insurance schemes... looking forward to receiving further details on the programmatic approaches in the upcoming climate policy."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 17 has been amended to reflect this comment.</li> <li>• Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8).</li> <li>• Commitment to partnership and collective action has long been core to WFP's operations. Relevant text on this issue can be found in the Executive Summary and paragraphs 4, 6, 25, 26, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 48 (b.1 and 8), 49, 50, 65, 70 (v), 71 (b.1 and 4), and Annex II (5-7). In addition, please refer to the last section of this matrix (item #20).</li> <li>• WFP will integrate actions and support to the outcomes of COP21 within WFP's strategies and policies. The draft Climate Change and Environmental policies should address this request.</li> </ul>
2	Afghanistan	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "We have read the fourth draft... and will have no hesitation whatsoever in approving it."</li> <li>• Noted that the Annex II of the 14 June draft was removed. Why?</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy on Country Strategic Plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most important issue is implementation, and the burden of it will mainly fall on country offices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat appreciates the remarks from Afghanistan.</li> <li>• With the introduction of the Strategic Outcomes through the Corporate Results Framework (CRF), the previous Annex II of the draft Strategic Plan (Examples of Strategic Outcomes and Interventions Related to WFP's Strategic Results) was no longer needed.</li> <li>• The Secretariat appreciates and shares Afghanistan's concern regarding the importance of implementing Country Strategic Plans. There are a number of corporate initiatives to support the implementation of CSPs, including technical support, resource mobilization, partnerships, staff profiling, etc. As the successful implementation of a CSP starts with the initial design phase of the CSP, support from Headquarters and regional bureau span through the process, from design to implementation to performance management. Language confirming such support has been added to the Policy of CSPs, paragraph 79: "WFP country offices are responsible for the country strategic planning process, with the support of Headquarters divisions and the relevant RB."</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
3	Cuba	<p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Paragraph 29</u>: should be made clear is that the ...government is primarily responsible [and accountable] for that exercise”</li> <li>• <u>Paragraph 41</u>: “should... reference to the multi-sectoral approach...”</li> <li>• <u>Paragraph 44</u>: “... ensure that concepts are standardized with the document being drawn up by the UNDG on outcomes and outputs for SDGs.”</li> <li>• <u>Paragraph 45</u>: It says “national partners”, it should say “government and key sectors and bodies”</li> <li>• <u>Paragraph 46</u>: “We do not really know what “mindsets” encompasses as a concept”</li> <li>• <u>Paragraph 61 (Spanish version)</u>: “...uses the word the “value proposition” of the WFP... it should say the “policy and programmes and mandates” of the WFP”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 33 has been modified to: “Working together with the other Rome-based agencies, WFP will participate in and support the facilitation of independent, country-led national zero hunger strategic reviews, including discussions of how government and national stakeholders, WFP and the country’s other partners can best support national progress towards zero hunger. Led in country by a nationally recognized convener, strategic reviews bring together a wide range of government institutions and other national, multisector stakeholders. Strategic review reports are usually produced by independent institutions, in coordination with the government and other stakeholders.”</li> <li>• Paragraph 34 to the Strategic Plan discusses the interconnectedness of SDGs. Paragraph 42 has also been modified to: “WFP CSPs contribute to the WFP Strategic Results that are relevant to and prioritized in specific countries, <i>in collaboration with multiple stakeholders and partners.</i>” Paragraph 70 also notes: “As a context evolves to recovery, the CSP enables a multi-sector approach to recovery programming, addressing risk and building resilience for food security and nutrition, which requires wide consultation and long-term collaboration.”</li> <li>• Footnote 17 (now 20) in the July draft stated “OCHA, Policy Instructions for Evaluations. <a href="https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Evaluation%20Policy.pdf">https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Evaluation%20Policy.pdf</a>. Such definition is consistent with the United Nations Development Group definition of output. <a href="https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/UNDG-RBM-Handbook-2012.pdf">https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/UNDG-RBM-Handbook-2012.pdf</a>.” To clarify this point, paragraph 45 has also been revised to start with “WFP adheres to the United Nations Harmonized Terminology for Results-Based Management adopted by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), which defines outcomes as: ‘The intended or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes in humanitarian conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.’”</li> <li>• The first sentence of paragraph 46 has been modified to: “WFP strategic outcomes are developed at the country level jointly with the government and key partners.”</li> <li>• The reference to “mindsets” was removed.</li> <li>• The reference to “value proposition” was removed.</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What shape and process does the strategic review process take?</li> <li>• Will CSPs have an initial budget or will they be approved subject to the mobilization of resources?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As discussed in previous Board informal consultations and the annual session in June, each strategic review is tailored to the country context so each takes on a different shape. Such tailored processes yield the greatest national ownership and utility. As the strategic reviews are not WFP reviews, it is not for us to prescribe any one format or approach, or even a timetable. And given they are not WFP products, they will not be presented to the Board for approval; however, references to strategic review findings, where appropriate, are included in the CSPs.</li> <li>• The Secretariat has included examples of CSPs from Zimbabwe and Indonesia to illustrate the content of a CSP, which includes a budget. All of WFP's operations and activities are done subject to resources being available. We do not have a core budget and that is not going to change, so CSPs will be subject to resources being available.</li> </ul>
4	Italy	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “[would like to see]... enhanced the linkages between peace and food security and migration”</li> <li>• Comments missing from previous informal consultations: “nutrition part of the document [missing] reference to malaria together with HIV treatment and need to improve nutrition to malaria-infected people and TB... prevention of malnutrition and training about breastfeeding are very important”</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would appreciate a clarification about how the regional / cross border operations will be included in the CPB and what are the consequences in the FFR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text with reference to the humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus has been strengthened in the Executive Summary, paragraphs 5, 7 and 11.</li> <li>• Paragraph 34 (section on Nutrition) has been amended to incorporate this comment.</li> <li>• The Secretariat anticipates that most regional operations will still be implemented through individual CSPs, each with its own Country Portfolio Budget, which will tag the response to enable roll-up as part of a regional response. Where a regional response may be more appropriately formulated and managed by the regional bureau, then a separate regional portfolio budget will be created as part of that response. Both the Policy on Country Strategic Plans and the Financial Framework Review papers discuss this as follows: “Regional initiatives, including emergency responses, are normally implemented through individual CSPs with additional or augmented WFP strategic outcomes as may be appropriate. The regional bureau coordinates the planning, design and pursuit of these strategic outcomes in the countries participating in the regional response, and develops and oversees joint resource mobilization strategies. Country-specific CSPs may include a regional strategic chapeau developed by the regional bureau. Limited regional emergency operations or other regional initiatives formulated and managed by regional bureaux will be used as and when appropriate.” (paragraph 64 of the CSP policy)</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would appreciate a clarification of resourcing issues (<a href="#">paragraph 57</a>): how will they be financed? The sentence “Resourcing issues are considered throughout the planning process.” is present in the 1<sup>st</sup> draft but it is absent in the 3<sup>rd</sup> one.</li> <li>We would appreciate a clarification of what you mean by “value proposition” (<a href="#">Paragraph 27</a>)<sup>1</sup></li> <li>We would appreciate a clarification of the role of FAO GD in rapid emergency responses: differences between 1st and 2nd draft of CSP (<a href="#">Paragraphs 74, 75, 80</a>).<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<p>“For countries involved in a regional response<sup>2</sup>, WFP Strategic Outcomes and activities related to the regional response will be included in the country’s respective country portfolio budget. A ‘tag’ for regional response WFP Strategic Outcomes/activities will be created and applied at the country office level to enable regional and global monitoring and reporting on resources mobilised related to the regional response. A regional budget structure will be adopted in situations where limited regional emergency operations or other regional initiatives are formulated and managed by regional bureaux as described in the ‘Policy on Country Strategic Plans – Fourth Draft.’” (paragraph 35 of the FFR paper)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the sentence was removed to avoid any confusion over resource-based plans, resourcing issues will be considered throughout the CSP process. The national zero hunger strategic reviews will look at thematic resource allocations and budget flows, provide cost implications, as appropriate, and identify potential resources. Consultations with humanitarian and development partners, which will inform resourcing priorities, will be critical to the formulation of CSPs.</li> <li>The Secretariat has amended paragraphs 35 and 72 where references to “value proposition” were used to clarify that it is the specific contribution WFP makes to national efforts.</li> <li>Paragraph 116 of the Policy on Country Strategic Plans provide that a “revised delegation of authority structure, which will be informed by the implementation of the CSPs with pilot country portfolio budgets over the course of 2017, will accordingly be presented to the Board at EB.2/2017 as part of the Financial Framework Review process.” As the proposed delegation of authority will be discussed with, and approved by, the Board in 2017, the language in the Policy refers to the delegation that will ultimately be approved as part of the General Regulations and Rules.</li> </ul>
5	Iceland (on behalf of the Nordic countries)	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document is still not focused enough on emergency and early recovery operations</li> <li>“We are supposed not to be in silos but in reality... we are not ready yet to totally go out of the silo between the emergency and early recovery and humanitarian here... we fear it can harm the resource mobilization for this organization”</li> <li>“[suggest]... putting more weight on the core values and not to repeat them... <a href="#">paragraph 24</a>...has a lot of good descriptions of WFP and that could be...in the overview”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8). Furthermore, commitment to partnership and collective action has long been core to WFP’s operations. Relevant text on this issue can be found in the Executive Summary and paragraphs 4, 6, 25, 26, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 48 (b.1 and 8), 49, 50, 65, 70 (v), 71 (b.1 and 4), and Annex II (5-7). In addition, please refer to the last section of this matrix (item #20).</li> <li>Comment is noted. Option is for maintaining these sections in the body of the document and not to move as Annex, given that these section provide critical background.</li> <li>Paragraph 34 (section on Food availability and markets, re SDG14) has been amended to incorporate this comment.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Though not made during the informal consultation, this comment was separately sent to the Secretariat in writing.

<sup>2</sup> For most regional responses, the regional bureau will continue to have a significant role in the coordination, support and implementation.

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Global context chapter: lessons from the mid-term review of the earlier plan, evaluation findings, external reviews &amp; assessment could go into annex</li> <li>Too little detail on SDG 14, especially on the views of the use of oceans providing solutions for food security and nutrition.</li> <li>Core values in Annex: first three paragraphs should be in the document; reference to the Right to Food and Human Rights based approaches should be added into the document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adding references to the Right to Food and Human Rights in the Strategic Plan may be counterproductive, as the debate around these subjects are highly sensitive.</li> </ul>
6	United States of America	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WFP should “articulate a leadership role that can expand beyond just a service delivery but to include monitoring and measuring food assistance results across all modalities”. Articulate how to strengthen capacity to manage and mitigate risks associated with CBTs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Last version emphasized the importance of operational outcomes that would help translate from attribution of what WFP does to contribution to the higher order results, but this version doesn't. Why?</li> <li>Transitional arrangements could be articulated more clearly, maybe even include them in the draft decision.</li> <li>More clarity on what constitutes a fundamental change and a substantive modification of a SO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 17 has been amended to reflect this comment. In addition, please refer to the last section of this matrix (item #20).</li> <li>Based on feedback from country offices, the operational outcome layer caused a lot of confusion. So the Secretariat has been working to capture what was in operational outcomes through the outputs layer and through the various categories and indicators.</li> <li>The Secretariat has further clarified the Transitional Arrangements section in paragraphs 111 to 118 and added draft decision points to address the transitional arrangements.</li> <li>Paragraph 96 has been revised to clarify a fundamental change to a CSP.</li> </ul>
7	Canada	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest including a reference to reducing unpaid women's work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment is noted.</li> </ul>
8	Finland (on behalf of the Nordic countries)	<p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would like to have more information on how CSPs will be developed in countries where government capacity to conduct zero hunger reviews is lacking and local commitment to humanitarian principles such as independence is lacking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Strategic review reports are usually produced by independent institutions, in coordination with the government and other stakeholders” (paragraph 33). Governments have the primary responsibility for implementation of the SDGs. Should a particular country or government develop or put in place its own mechanism for achieving the objective of the zero hunger reviews, then it would clearly be unnecessary and inappropriate for WFP to engage in supporting a duplicative or competing mechanism. So far, governments have generally not yet put such processes in place, and the strategic reviews to date have usually not been conducted by governments. Under any</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detail on independence, impartiality, and neutrality of assessment of humanitarian needs in Strategic Reviews</li>   <li>• <u>Paragraph 46</u>: what does “resonate with national and sub-national actors” entail?</li> </ul>	<p>scenario, Government buy-in and consultation and consequently their ownership of the review’s recommendations are critical to ensure the implementation of said recommendations. Concretely, “stakeholders” would include academia, civil society, and the private sector with participation from local representatives of international agencies and donors.</p> <p><i>“The management and implementation of strategic reviews will reflect country conditions and capacities, and should include government participation and collaboration among a wide range of public and private, national and international stakeholders”</i> (paragraph 34). The design and structure of national zero hunger strategic review processes are tailored to the country context, taking into consideration relevant national capacities, political (including domestic as well as regional and other geopolitical) dynamics, and socioeconomic conditions. Taking these factors into account ensures a well-balanced and representative multi-stakeholder process. In almost all cases, the technical analysis and production of the final report have been undertaken by independent research centres and universities.</p> <p><i>“Interim Country Frameworks will be used during the transitional period in 2018. After 2018, they will be used in exceptional circumstances when ongoing conflict or instability undermines governance, including the functioning of national institutions, making it unfeasible to develop a CSP informed by a national strategic review, and in countries where WFP has no operational presence.”</i> (paragraph 57). In contexts where a multi-stakeholder approach and strong government ownership are not possible, national zero hunger strategic reviews may not be implemented; in those cases, such as during recurring conflict, WFP will adopt an interim country framework that enables WFP to safeguard the humanitarian principles and implement an adequate portfolio of activities until conditions allow the implementation of a strategic review process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Information and evidence from assessments and studies of the Rome-based agencies and others will feed into the reviews as relevant”</i> (paragraph 34). The strategic review is an open and consultative process that draws inputs from national stakeholders, as well as assessments and information from international stakeholders, including vulnerability analysis and assessments. The main objective of the reviews is to identify priority actions for all stakeholders to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 2 by 2030. Therefore, strategic reviews are not intended to substitute emergency and humanitarian assessments which focus on specific situations and the identification of the population’s short-term needs, and which will continue to guide WFP’s emergency work.</li>   <li>• <i>“Because strategic outcomes reflect the specific situation and dynamics of a country, their wording needs to be appropriate to the national context, resonate with national and subnational actors and show clear alignment with national priorities and goals”</i> (paragraph 47). This paragraph highlights the importance of adopting context-specific language that is recognizable by national stakeholders,</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be beneficial to develop standardized methodology and approach for the Zero Hunger Reviews in order to ensure comparability and proper mainstreaming of cross-cutting objectives such as gender, environment, and rights of the most vulnerable groups.<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<p>partners and the local population wherever possible. This would allow WFP to clearly articulate and communicate its contribution to partner frameworks and plans. For instance, WFP could place “food poor” in its strategic outcome to describe food insecure populations if this reflects local understanding and terminology on food insecurity.</p> <p>As per current practice, WFP’s strategic outcomes will be directly aligned with one or more national objectives – whether humanitarian or development oriented – as well as United Nations frameworks. In complex humanitarian situations, WFP’s strategic outcomes will ensure full alignment with humanitarian response plans, which usually have objectives that are shared by the government. This is stated in paragraph 46 of the policy to the effect that WFP Strategic Outcomes make a “substantive contribution to meeting humanitarian needs” and reflect “United Nations strategic planning frameworks and humanitarian response plans in a country and/or articulated through national plans, including zero hunger, development and humanitarian plans.” Guided by the leaving no one behind principle of Agenda 2030 and general humanitarian principles, WFP will continue to serve the most vulnerable. However, even in internal conflict situations, WFP would still need to negotiate access, among other issues, with national and subnational actors. Therefore, formulating strategic outcomes that resonate with national and subnational actors will facilitate the implementation of CSPs, including strategic outcomes that address the needs of internally displaced, refugee, marginalized and other vulnerable populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WFP has developed guidance for Country Offices on methodology and procedures to ensure that the objectives of the strategic reviews are effectively achieved and that minimum standards are respected. Nevertheless, the guidance emphasizes the need to hold national consultations to determine the most adequate format and focus, and in so doing to be able to customize the strategic review in a way that reflects national capacities and dynamics. Guidance developed by WFP has been internally reviewed by WFP gender experts to ensure gender issues are addressed adequately. The inclusion of target 4 of SDG 2 strengthens focus on climate and the environment in general. Therefore, gender, climate and the environment, the needs of the most vulnerable groups and other cross-cutting objectives should be thoroughly addressed throughout the strategic review. For example, Indonesia’s strategic review found that the increased participation of women in the labour force had a negative impact on food consumption patterns through a significant increase in the consumption of processed foods which caused both under- and over-nutrition. This was explained by the fact that other household members, including men, were unable to fill the gap caused by the woman’s absence from the household. Recommendations thus focused on taking a whole-of-society approach that mainstreams education on nutritious food consumption across all sectors of society.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Though not made during the informal consultation, this comment was sent to the Secretariat in writing.

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail what will change with CSP regarding the dual mandate and ability to track contributions</li> <li>• “More information on how CSPs align to strategic resource plans and humanitarian appeals. How can funds through appeal be clearly directed to humanitarian processes in a CSP? Is it correct to understand that funds will have to be directed straight to the new Strategic Outcomes like in <a href="#">paragraph 66</a>?”</li> <li>• “How the new CSP and FFR structure will enable reduced earmarking. There is no [clarity] on resource mobilization and what kind of roles COs and HQ will have in this.”</li> <li>• Structures for SP and CSP docs should match and policy on CSPs should reflect the SP in a specific and operational way. Topics recommended to include in the Policy on CSPs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ overarching linkages like access to nutrition</li> <li>○ measuring and monitoring performance</li> <li>○ risk assessments</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Current planning architecture chapter would be better placed in an annex</li> <li>• Titles and texts should not speak about the new approach to CSPs but rather the approach or just the CSPs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Country Portfolio Budget and the Financial Framework Review are being designed in a way that enables the ability to track contributions. This will be reflected in the resourcing and implementation of the CSP, and was reaffirmed during the presentation of the Country Portfolio Budget at the 25 July Informal Consultation.</li> <li>• As stated in paragraph 77, “<i>emergency responses will also be aligned with the strategic response plan (SRPs) and joint resource mobilization efforts of the humanitarian programme cycle.</i>” The CSP policy (summary in figure 3) reflects how WFP will implement emergency responses in the CSP environment. In practice, WFP will add Strategic Outcomes or activities under existing Strategic Outcomes to respond to a sudden emergency in a country where a CSP is implemented. This new approach strengthens alignment with SRPs and HRP which are structured around objectives and outcomes. Humanitarian funds could then be used to finance emergency-focused Strategic Outcomes or specific emergency-focused activities as needed.</li> <li>• As discussed during the informal consultation on the Financial Framework Review, the Secretariat would encourage less earmarking, which is in line with the Grand Bargain made at the World Humanitarian Summit; however, recognizing the needs of donors, the new financial architecture would allow funding streams at the country, Strategic Outcome, and activity levels.</li> <li>• The Secretariat appreciates the Member States’ suggestions to structure the document along the same lines as the WFP Strategic Plan. The two policy documents are complementary and seek to minimize repetitions. In practice, country strategic plans operationalize the Strategic Plan at country-level and therefore are broadly structured in line with the Strategic Plan, with sections discussing the strategic orientation of WFP that cover access and nutrition, performance management, and risk management. The Secretariat is presenting examples of CSPs to the Executive Board for the next informal consultation in September 2016 to illustrate the CSP structure and content.</li> <li>• Taking into account the need to provide a strong foundation and a solid rationale for the significant changes that the draft policy would entail, the Secretariat has revised the section entitled “The Current Planning Architecture” starting at paragraph 8.</li> <li>• The Secretariat has removed the word “new” except in circumstances where a distinction may be useful.</li> </ul>
9	Norway (on behalf of the Nordic countries)	<p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to ensure WFP’s categories of outcomes, outputs, and activities relate to national SDGs and outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The advantage of aligning WFP’s Strategic Plan and framework around the SDGs is to ensure alignment with national results as WFP’s Strategic Results would then be the same as national</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
10	United Kingdom	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On broadness of document, suggest including a section on what WFP will do and how will it do it.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSP risk management approach. This is not articulated presently, nor is the place of risk analysis. The purpose of the CSP is to ensure coherence between long-term and short-term actions, it is therefore critical that the plan articulates contingency plans for 1) resilience/ recovery actions if a shock was to occur, and for 2) changes and evolutions in protracted/continuous crises (peaks, etc.). The definition of an emergency is critical and there could be a big risk that poor approaches of yearly short-term assistance to longer term issues are perpetuated if we are not careful about this. The present drought in Southern Africa for example should not be treated as a separate emergency (i.e. added afterwards as suggested by figure 3) but as an 'escalation'/degradation of the situation that requires more intense response, so in that sense, there should be some sort of 'crisis modifier' that triggers additional elements of response within the initial CSP. This is the only way for WFP approach to shift from yearly food aid in Malawi / Zimbabwe to working with governments and partners on market approaches, grain reserves etc.</li> </ul>	<p>results since countries signed up to the SDGs and are ultimately responsible for the achievement of the SDGs in their countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraphs 41-50 changed to reflect this comment. In addition, please refer to the last section of this matrix (item #20).</li> <li>The Secretariat agrees that risk management and contingency planning are critical to the design and effective implementation of CSPs and had included the following language in the third draft:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"All CSPs will include analysis of the risks associated with their implementation and mitigation measures. The analyses will take into account the country context and will assess institutional, programmatic and security risks. The mitigating measures will seek to maintain WFP's strategic direction as set out in the CSP in the event that an anticipated risk transpires." (section on risk analysis in paragraph 110)</li> <li>"They promote links between humanitarian and development assistance and enable effective resilience-building by ensuring that crisis response supports recovery and long-term development, and that development activities are informed by an understanding of risk and protect vulnerable people from crisis." (paragraph 74)</li> <li>"As a context evolves to recovery, the CSP enables a multi-sector approach to recovery programming, addressing risk and building resilience for food security and nutrition, which requires wide consultation and long-term collaboration. In each context, all aspects of the programme cycle will be examined through a resilience lens to determine how actions can best be integrated with national government strategies and partner-supported programmes.<sup>5</sup> The integration of emergency responses into the country portfolio as soon as conditions permit allows WFP to optimize its response to protracted situations by addressing both short- and long-term issues, thereby increasing the effectiveness of its interventions, while maintaining flexibility to respond quickly and efficiently to any change in the situation." (paragraph 70). In line with WFP's Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C), WFP will take a resilience-building approach to enhance capacities to absorb, adapt and transform in the face of shocks and stressors.</li> <li>Where such capacity may not suffice and humanitarian assistance can be reasonably anticipated during the design phase of the CSP, the CSP would include a Strategic Outcome that provides some flexibility to escalate and de-escalate the response, as appropriate. Such response would be of the "continued" or "predictable" nature that is incorporated in a CSP, which Figure 3 distinguishes from that of a sudden-onset and other unforeseen emergency.</li> <li>The Secretariat proposes to present to the Executive Board at the next informal consultation in September 2016 the draft Zimbabwe CSP as an example to illustrate this point. The draft</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C.

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role of regions and their added value need to be further and clearly articulated. One note of caution is just in 'over-focusing' on the country-level approach i.e. often WFP support is needed in a regional context (as with the current drought/humanitarian crisis in Southern Africa) and whilst they mention regional responses, it is only one paragraph.</li>   <li>• CSP alignment with Grand Bargain commitments</li> </ul>	<p>Zimbabwe CSP provides for assistance to enhance government capacities at all levels to provide long-term, predictable and coordinated services that are hunger-sensitive and shock-responsive. Concurrently, the draft Zimbabwe CSP recognizes the protective capacity of WFP for WFP-supported relief interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of a CSP takes into account regional trends and analyses and the formulation of WFP Strategic Outcomes "reflect the goal or the target implied or established in a country's national plan and regional framework to which WFP's assistance contributes..." (paragraph 46). The Secretariat has added the following sentence in the fourth draft of the policy to paragraph 80 to better capture regional contexts as part of the role of the regional bureaux and link it to regional responses described in paragraph 64, recognizing that the delineation of roles among Headquarters in Rome, regional bureaux and country offices are not necessarily fixed: <i>"They provide a regional perspective and coordinate the planning, design and pursuit of strategic outcomes in the countries participating in a regional response as provided in paragraph 64."</i></li>   <li>• Though it is discussed in the Strategic Plan (2017-2021), reference to WFP's support to the Grand Bargain has been added to paragraph 5, which will read in the fourth draft as follows: <b>"This policy prepares WFP to deliver on its commitments under the Strategic Plan and thus to play a crucial role in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including through its strengths and effectiveness in emergencies, and supporting the Grand Bargain resulting from the World Humanitarian Summit."</b> Furthermore, though the Grand Bargain is not specifically referenced in each instance as such underlying principles behind the CSP approach extend beyond the Grand Bargain, the new architecture of the integrated roadmap aims to support each of the commitments of the Grand Bargain, as follows:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Greater transparency:</b> "WFP's revamped financial framework and the associated country portfolio budget provide a clear link from corporate strategy to resourcing for country-level results to activity-based resourcing. This linkage enhances transparency and accountability in determining WFP's contribution to zero hunger and the 2030 Agenda." (paragraph 27). The Country Portfolio Budget and the Financial Framework Review are being designed in a way that enables the ability to track contributions. This will be reflected in the resourcing and implementation of the CSP, and was reaffirmed during the presentation of the Country Portfolio Budget at the 25 July Informal Consultation.</li> <li>○ <b>Increase the use and coordination of cash-based programming:</b> "By articulating and focusing on strategic outcomes in rapidly evolving and/or volatile emergency situations – rather than on particular activities only – WFP will be in a much better position to respond quickly, flexibly, and efficiently with a range of appropriate activities and modalities." (paragraph 69). Enhancing WFP's position to respond with a range of appropriate modalities will facilitate the use and coordination of cash-based programming, where appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Reduce duplication and management costs with periodic functional reviews:</u> “The country strategic planning process is aligned with WFP’s Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017), which defines partnership as “Collaborative relationships between actors that achieve better outcomes for the people we serve by: combining and leveraging complementary resources of all kinds; working together in a transparent, equitable and mutually beneficial way; and sharing risks, responsibilities and accountability, to achieve objectives that could not be achieved as efficiently, effectively or innovatively alone, and where the value created is greater than the transaction costs involved.” (paragraph 83). In addition to efficiency gains through a country portfolio approach’s expected reduction of internal management costs, CSPs will also facilitate more efficient partnerships.</li> <li>○ <u>Improve joint and partial needs assessments:</u> The CSP approach enhances partnerships, including fostering joint assessments. Furthermore, the national zero hunger strategic reviews promotes the use of impartial needs assessments into national level strategic planning. For example, “Information and evidence from assessments and studies of the Rome-based agencies and others will feed into the reviews as relevant.” (paragraph 34)</li> <li>○ <u>A participation revolution: include people receiving aid in making the decisions which affect their lives:</u> “A national zero hunger strategic review is an open, consultative and comprehensive analysis of the challenges the country faces in achieving zero hunger by 2030.” (paragraph 32) Depending on the availability of evidence and context, some national zero hunger strategic reviews (such as those in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Nigeria, Pakistan, and the Philippines) have held, or plan to hold, local level consultations.</li> <li>○ <u>Increase collaborative humanitarian multi-year planning and funding:</u> The CSP is designed to foster multi-year planning and funding.</li> <li>○ <u>Reduce the earmarking of donor contributions:</u> As discussed during the informal consultation on the Financial Framework Review, the Secretariat would encourage less earmarking; while at the same time, recognizing the needs of donors, the new financial architecture would allow funding streams at the country, Strategic Outcome, and activity levels.</li> <li>○ <u>Harmonise and simplify reporting requirements:</u> “Enhanced performance management, reporting and accountability: CSPs respond to a QCPR recommendation that programmes deliver demonstrable results at the country level. The plans articulate the cause and effect relationships between WFP’s assistance, the resources it employs, and the results it achieves. By clarifying the links between resources and results, CSPs improve reporting on results, and accountability to beneficiaries, host governments, donors and other partners.” (paragraph 78)</li> <li>○ <u>Enhance engagement between humanitarian and development actors:</u> “Flexibility to plan for and respond to dynamic operational contexts while balancing humanitarian and development work: CSPs are context-specific and adaptable to changes in the operating environment. They promote links between humanitarian and development assistance and enable effective resilience-building by ensuring that crisis response supports recovery and long-term development, and that</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does WFP expect any point of tension between the timeline of CSPs and the Strategic response plans timelines? (Paragraph 66)<sup>4</sup></li> <li>Role of partners / partnerships: while it is clear that WFP will interact and coordinate much more with local, national and international actors, it is not explicit how this approach will deepen partnerships for them to become truly 'equitable'. Despite consultations, CSPs will remain WFP owned. The feeling from these documents is that the strategy is very ambitious, aims to impact at a system level, but at the same time is very "WFP-centric". What mechanisms will WFP put in place to make sure that true partnerships lie on joint plans and risk taking?</li> <li>It would be useful to unpack further the role that WFP wants to play in zero hunger national reviews: para 29 and 30 talk about TA, resources, etc., what role can WFP play to promote civil society participation?</li> </ul>	<p>development activities are informed by an understanding of risk and protect vulnerable people from crisis." (paragraph 63)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat will take into consideration national planning processes, UNDAF cycles, and humanitarian response plans, as appropriate, in determining CSP timeframes. In practice, WFP will add Strategic Outcomes or activities under existing Strategic Outcomes to respond to a sudden emergency in a country where a CSP is implemented. The CSP approach strengthens alignment with strategic response plans (SRPs) and humanitarian response plans (HRPs) which are structured around objectives and outcomes. Humanitarian funds could then be used to finance emergency-focused Strategic Outcomes or specific emergency-focused activities as needed.</li> <li>The consultative analytical process of national zero hunger strategic reviews, fosters engagement with governments, and convenes partners around common priorities to eliminating hunger and malnutrition. "The reviews also foster greater coherence among operations and strategies of the Rome-based agencies and other partners, particularly at the country level, helping WFP to forge deeper partnerships through consensus on common approaches to eliminating hunger." (paragraphs 71). By focusing on Strategic Outcomes, which (according to UNDG's definition of "outcomes") usually requires the collective effort of partners, the CSP approach will require enhanced partnerships as no one agency can achieve such outcomes on its own. "WFP's partnerships with national and international NGOs have traditionally involved little substantive engagement. The country strategic planning process fosters strategic interactions and dialogue with NGOs and other civil society actors, whose roles and capacities are considered and utilized to varying degrees, depending on the context. For example, during national zero hunger strategic review processes, WFP may advocate for actions to strengthen the capacities of national civil society actors, and include these actions in its resulting CSP. While WFP's decentralized approach to engagement with NGOs has brought advantages – in allowing WFP country offices to determine which partnerships to pursue and how these partnerships should be managed – the country strategic planning process helps to ensure that partnerships with national and international NGOs are prioritized and managed in ways that build on partners' deep understanding of local contexts to enrich WFP programmes, facilitate increased access and support greater accountability to target populations." (paragraphs 88-89)</li> <li>Paragraph 88 provides: "WFP's partnerships with national and international NGOs have traditionally involved little substantive engagement. The country strategic planning process fosters strategic interactions and dialogue with NGOs and other civil society actors, whose roles and capacities are considered and utilized to varying degrees, depending on the context. For example,</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Though not made at the informal consultation, this comment was separately sent to the Secretariat in writing.

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WFP 'added value' compared to other actors towards national zero hunger reviews: para 42, if other actors are also well placed to deliver food security, resilience, etc., how will WFP decide where to focus? How will it coordinate with others?</li> <li>• Impact of the new approach: Paragraphs 54, 55, 56. It would be useful for the Board to hear learning from the new approach, including how the articulation with zero hunger processes is working. (the paras are about past review recommendations not about learning)</li> </ul>	<p>during national zero hunger strategic review processes, WFP may advocate for actions to strengthen the capacities of national civil society actors, and include these actions in its resulting CSP."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design and formulation of a CSP involves extensive consultations with the government, development partners, other UN agencies, international agencies, and local actors. For example, during the informal consultations with the Executive Board on 21 September 2015, the WFP Country Director of Indonesia, described the CSP process: "The ministries concerned are many – development planning, education, health, finance, foreign affairs, social affairs, the Coordinating Ministry for Human Welfare, and the Disaster Management Organization. Bringing them together around what they want WFP to deliver was in itself a very useful exercise that apparently had not happened all that often in the past. The country team, particularly IFAD, FAO, UNDP, UNICEF and WHO, had very concrete conversations about what each of us would focus on so that we are not duplicating but we are working together in those areas where we have the best competitive advantage. Or in the case of UNICEF where they really wanted to work on nutrition education, but because they, like us, have limited resources, asked WFP to focus on nutrition education while they focus on child protection and rights issues when it comes to public information and education work. So there was a very conscious discussion about that. Our development partners from Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Sweden, and United States of America, all reviewed our proposals very carefully before we got to that document that you have in front of you; likewise, NGOs and our private sector partners who have for the past three years been the main source of funding for our work."</li> <li>• Country Directors from Zimbabwe and Indonesia and the Regional Director in Johannesburg provided testimonies on the CSP approach during the 21 September 2015 informal consultation with the Executive Board. For example, the Country Director from Zimbabwe stated: "Specific to the zero hunger strategic review that the Regional Director alluded to in his remark, this review was a significant milestone as it brought together a unifying concept of diagnosing food and nutrition security challenges and solving hunger and malnutrition. This review was spearheaded by a highly respected individual with convening power to take Zero Hunger issues, opportunities and gaps for accelerating the Zero Hunger issues to the highest political level. The review was launched in July 2015 by the Vice President of the country and it was a strong signal of national commitment to pursue Zero Hunger. This government-owned document, and in particular the recommendations derived from it, build the baseline not only of the Country Strategic Plan but guide all stakeholders in working together to achieve the food and nutrition goals set out in the Zim Asset. WFP shifted to a less-is-more approach where emphasis is placed on deepening and sustaining the outcomes of reducing food and nutrition security, thus reducing the need for food assistance in the first place. This entailed dynamic scaling down of the pure relief portfolio and it is also an important</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On focus, paragraph 53: other services that WFP would provide upon request. We suggest having 'selection' criteria to have clear borders and avoid spreading.</li> </ul>	<p>contribution to redressing the effects of the drought and dry spells that are becoming very frequent and more intense in the country.”</p> <p>During the 25 July 2016 informal consultation with the Executive Board regarding the Financial Framework Review, the Country Director of Indonesia provided her insights: “I was lucky that I inherited the process a little way along in that we had just completed a Country Portfolio Evaluation of our work in Indonesia. Some of you may have heard that being presented at the Board. It gave us some very strategic and very constructive feedback about what we had been doing well and what we should review. That was followed by a Strategic Review which was undertaken by the Office of the President in Indonesia and which looked at the overall food security status in the country and which areas required additional focus. We were fortunate because the President of Indonesia had also been part of the High Level Panel advising on the Sustainable Development Goals; so there was a keen attention to how his country would be able to take that forward.</p> <p>Subsequently in a quiet annex, WFP asked for the institute that prepared that review to suggest to us where, based on their knowledge, they thought we had the mandate, the proven expertise, and the comparative advantage to contribute to those outcomes that the country had set itself in its National Development Plan. Once we had that and we knew from our own internal evaluation where we had done well and not so well, it was not very difficult to construct a Country Strategic Plan in very close collaboration or partnership with the national government but also with some of the provincial and district governments with whom we have met. There was a very thorough review of our work together which went to building that plan. And that, if you will agree, will come before you for approval in February.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes to WFP’s Strategic Plan (2017-2021) with respect to Strategic Results have been made to provide clarification and limitations with respect to the Strategic Results, under which CSPs will be developed.</li> </ul>
11	Netherlands (on behalf of the Nordic countries)	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligned with Nordic countries’ comments on humanitarian and development issue. On WFP capacities and operational experience. Strategic Objective 5 elaborates on the role of WFP and logistics or the platforms it provides for CBT and other services. But under the same Objective... Strategic Result on resource mobilization... is still not clear what it is that WFP specifically brings to the table in terms of capacity, strengths, experience, that really justifies this as a Strategic Result, on the same level as for example, saving lives”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8). Furthermore, commitment to partnership and collective action has long been core to WFP’s operations. Relevant text on this issue can be found in the Executive Summary and paragraphs 4, 6, 25, 26, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 48 (b.1 and 8), 49, 50, 65, 70 (v), 71 (b.1 and 4), and Annex II (5-7). In addition, please refer to the last section of this matrix (item #20).</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
12	France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Echoed comments on some of the Strategic Results being “a bit peripheral”</li> </ul> <p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistency in language across regarding humanitarian interventions vs. development</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How to ensure WFP’s categories of outcomes, outputs, and activities relate to national SDGs and outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraphs 41-50 changed to reflect this comment.</li> <li>Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8).</li> <li>The advantage of aligning WFP’s Strategic Plan and framework around the SDGs is to ensure alignment with national results as WFP’s Strategic Results would then be the same as national results since countries signed up to the SDGs and are ultimately responsible for the achievement of the SDGs in their countries.</li> </ul>
13	European Union	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will WFP make sure that food assistance will not be provided to active fighters?</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy on CSPs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSP approach is expected to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of WFP response in protracted crises. However, are we sure that this new approach will not in a certain way contribute to rain forests, the protracted nature of this, an acute crisis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WFP’s core values and principles outlined in Annex II should provide this assurance.</li> <li>By anticipating and taking a proactive approach, such as through emergency preparedness and building resilience, rather than relying on humanitarian response, the CSP approach further enhances WFP’s effectiveness and efficiency in WFP response. WFP’s Environmental Policy articulates WFP’s do no harm approach to environmental degradation.</li> </ul>
14	Hungary	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasizes the need for a stronger focus on life-saving humanitarian emergency assistance</li> <li>Regarding the development mandate:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“adequate attention should be paid to SDG1”</li> <li>Key words like synergy and complementarity should be better reflected in the SP to reflect collaboration with development partners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8). Furthermore, commitment to partnership and collective action has long been core to WFP’s operations. Relevant text on this issue can be found in the Executive Summary and paragraphs 4, 6, 25, 26, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 48 (b.1 and 8), 49, 50, 65, 70 (v), 71 (b.1 and 4), and Annex II (5-7).</li> </ul>
15	Bangladesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are aligning to [Afghanistan] statement as the List B countries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretariat appreciates the remarks from Bangladesh.</li> </ul>
16	Kuwait	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents should be more concise. Priorities should be clearly outlined.</li> <li>Explain more clearly what the resources are (available or expected resources).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8).</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
17	Panama	<p><b>Strategic Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although humanitarian work is priority, “the development mandate also needs to be taken on board and fed into activities”</li> <li>• Ensure cooperation with other agencies</li> <li>• Suggest developing a model for situations when no Strategic Plan is in place</li> <li>• Suggest more flexibility on indicators to fit different contexts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8). Furthermore, commitment to partnership and collective action has long been core to WFP’s operations. Relevant text on this issue can be found in the Executive Summary and paragraphs 4, 6, 25, 26, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47, 48 (b.1 and 8), 49, 50, 65, 70 (v), 71 (b.1 and 4), and Annex II (5-7).</li> </ul>
18	Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the document is ready for approval, but agrees with some of the refinements proposed by Afghanistan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat appreciates the remarks from Mexico.</li> </ul>
19	Guatemala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Germany’s view of WFP acting where it has a comparative advantage instead of focusing on humanitarian versus development issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional and amended text can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8).</li> </ul>
20	New Zealand <sup>6</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maximise transparency, our preference remains for the actual policy document to clearly state that the components in the country portfolio represent prioritised activities based on anticipated resources.</li> <li>• (Cross cutting issues and sustainability): we appreciate that WFP will consider our suggestions further when developing the next draft version. We also commend WFP’s intention to cover cross cutting issues in the policy “guidance” that will be developed (ideally the policy should refer to this, what it will cover, and timeline for release). With regard to sustainability, we agree the policy’s intention to position WFP’s interventions in a longer timeframe, to align these more closely with national priorities, and the work on national capacity building, will contribute to exit and handover. However other factors are also relevant such as WFP expectations around (gradually increasing) counterpart funding, and (gradual) partner assumption of management and implementation responsibilities. We would prefer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While CSPs will primarily be based on needs identified on the basis of assessments, they will also reflect resourcing priorities identified during stakeholder consultations and from the national zero hunger strategic review. The resource-based plan that are part of the FFR will further prioritize based on more precise anticipated resources.</li> <li>• Current policies and strategies relating to gender, resilience, capacity development, humanitarian protection, exiting emergencies, and partnerships will remain applicable. An updated compendium of policies relating to the Strategic Plan (2017-2021) will be presented to the Executive Board in 2017. In anticipation of the inclusion in WFP’s guidance of its commitment to gender and related matters, paragraph 109 of the draft policy states “ Mid-term reviews and country portfolio evaluations will track progress towards planned outcomes and measure progress towards gender equity and other cross-cutting corporate objectives.” The Secretariat has added: “CSPs articulate how WFP’s assistance in a country contributes to broader national plans and priorities for transitioning from and/or phasing out external assistance. The longer-term planning horizon of CSPs facilitates the setting of criteria for transition and the identification of actions to achieve conditions – such as capacity of government counterparts – the expected timeframe, contextual assumptions, and external factors that could influence progress towards these objectives.” (paragraph 71). In determining whether WFP has a meaningful role in any given country, the Strategic Plan (2017-2021) provides: “WFP does not have a meaningful role in working towards SDG 2 and SDG 17 in</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> Though not made at the informal consultations, these comments were sent to the Secretariat in writing.

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<p>therefore more explicit language around transition and exit in the policy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So if our interpretation of the response is correct, all country strategy policies will be evaluated during their final year <u>and</u> OEV has sufficient resource to do this. Can you confirm this please (in the next draft)?</li> <li>• Changes to the text are helpful. Ideally, it would be good if WFP can be a bit more specific in the document about the particular (sub-) regional situations where a regional strategic approach will be used.</li> </ul>	<p>countries that are able to effectively and efficiently undertake the necessary functions and actions themselves, or in contexts where viable, inclusive, safe and reliable commercial alternatives are available or other actors are better placed to contribute. Working closely with a range of international, regional and national partners, WFP aims to support countries in ways that make them increasingly able to assume operational, financial and technical responsibility for achieving zero hunger. In countries that are able to achieve zero hunger by 2030 without assistance, WFP's presence in the country should be phased out." (paragraph 59 of the Strategic Plan).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy aspires to ensure that evaluation, learning and accountability are fundamental parts of the planning cycle and as such, WFP will ensure that resources are budgeted for evaluations as CSPs are developed. Capacity and resources previously focused on evaluating individual projects will become available to implement country portfolio evaluations. Therefore, the Secretariat confirms its commitment to enhance the organization's capacity and resources to manage the evaluation function and increase funding for evaluations and has revised paragraph 108 as excerpted below. In order to ensure country portfolio budgets are conducted at the appropriate time to inform subsequent country-level planning, the Secretariat has removed the specification of "during the CSP's final year." In consultation with country offices and regional bureaux, the Office of Evaluation will manage and determine the appropriate timeframe for country portfolio evaluations, which may start as early as in year three of a CSP. "Under the management of the Office of Evaluation, all CSPs will undergo country portfolio evaluations towards the end of their implementation period, to assess progress and identify lessons for the design of subsequent country-level support. Lessons applicable beyond the country concerned will be disseminated across WFP. WFP will budget for and allocate the required resources to these evaluations." (paragraph 108)</li> <li>• The policy makes two provisions regarding regional responses. First, regional food security and nutrition issues should be addressed through a harmonized regional WFP response; such a response is designed at a regional level and implemented at country level through CSPs, by either the addition or augmentation of a dedicated strategic outcome in each of the concerned CSPs. The regional bureau coordinates the planning, design and pursuit of these strategic outcomes in the country offices participating in the regional response, and develops and oversees joint resource mobilization strategies. Country-specific CSPs may also include a regional strategic chapeau developed by the regional bureau. Second, WFP may also formulate regional limited emergency operations to respond to regional emergencies when needed. This would for instance ensure a quick and coordinated response to an emergency situation in small countries where WFP currently does not have an operational presence. In determining the appropriate approach regarding regional response, the regional and sub-regional context – including partner responses, the underlying factors necessitating a response,</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
21	Denmark, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK and USA on Strategic Plan, outside the Informal Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mandate:</b> the document could further describe WFP's role in emergency humanitarian response and the continued priority it will place on these activities</li> <li>• <b>Integrated Roadmap:</b> we would like to see a clearer focus and priorities, including illustrative activities by Strategic Objective</li> <li>• <b>Priorities:</b> these should be clearly set out in the documents, with a clear link to indicators</li> </ul>	<p>and the conditions under which the response will be implemented – needs to be taken into consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WFP's core role to respond to lifesaving emergency food and nutrition requirements of those most affected by disruption is unquestionable and remains a priority responsibly of WFP. WFP is committed to reaching those in greatest need first and our Strategic Vision respects and acknowledges this as critical and fundamental. The revised draft of the Strategic Plan contains significant additional language that more clearly articulates the orientation of our approach, aiming to assure all Member States that WFP fully appreciates both the commitments and the demands required to meet the SDGs. In doing so, WFP is confident that it has responded appropriately to challenges embedded in interpretative statements regarding the SDGs by the UN Secretary-General, and other leaders, who have stressed that mandates should not obscure or limit our vision and collective ability as a system to support Member States' efforts to achieve the SDGs. Additional and amended text along these lines can be found the Executive Summary, the Draft Decision, and in paragraphs 3, 9, 10, 20 (b.4), 22 (b.2), 23, 25, 27, 46 (b.5), 61, 67, 70 and Annex II (8).</li> <li>• The section of the Strategic Plan that details WFP's Strategic Objectives and Strategic Results has been significantly reworked to more clearly articulate what WFP will do, how WFP will proceed, with whom WFP will develop strategic and operational partnerships, which types of activities will be undertaken, and what WFP will not do. The Strategic Plan is intended to be read in conjunction with the CSP Policy and CRF, where the strategic outcomes and activity categories provide the evidence of how the Plan will be operationalized. These amendments to the structure of the Strategic Plan are captured in paragraphs 41-50. Similar reworking of the Country Strategic Plan Policy can be found in paragraphs 55-63 of the policy.</li> <li>• With the support of the Membership, the logic and implications of the Integrated Roadmap have solidified importantly over the last several months. That logic has direct implications for priority setting. The Strategic Plan affirms WFP's well-recognized corporate identity as the world's largest humanitarian organization and notes WFP's responsibility to fulfil commitments and expectations in emergency response and recovery in contexts of crisis and disruption, a critical dimension of WFP's work that will be maintained and strengthened. In addition, by aligning WFP with the 2030 Agenda, and recognizing core principles and commitments in the Grand Bargain, the Strategic Plan also provides a coherent and transparent framework for WFP to focus its efforts on SDG2 and SDG17, and ensuring that WFP contributes meaningfully toward the SDGs while applying it unique set of skills, capacities, and competencies developed through humanitarian action and development initiatives. The Strategic Plan guides the preparation and implementation of Country Strategic Plans that is informed by a rigorous, inclusive, and government-led strategic review process that sets out national priorities for achieving Zero Hunger at the country-level. These "bottom-up" priorities – only some of which are relevant to WFP – link directly to national SDG</li> </ul>

**SUMMARY REMARKS OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD AND ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT**

**25 JULY 2016 Informal Consultation on the draft Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the draft Policy on Country Strategic Plans**

#	MEMBER STATE	EXECUTIVE BOARD'S REMARKS	DOCUMENT CHANGES AND RESPONSES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Coordination and cooperation with RBAs and other UN Agencies:</b> the importance of synergy and seeking collaboration and complementarities should also be reflected in the Strategic Plan</li>   <li>• <b>Role of the Executive Board:</b> Board oversight should be more frequent than the currently envisaged 5 year-planning cycle allows. From this perspective we would welcome a mid-term review of the Strategic Plan</li> </ul>	<p>targets that are mapped against WFP's strategic priorities, as represented by our SDG-motivated Strategic Objectives, Strategic Results, Strategic Outcomes, Outputs, and Activities and backed by the Financial and Corporate Results Frameworks. The Integrated Road Map therefore envisions a priority setting effort that is country-specific and guided by national priorities that transcend the humanitarian-development divide, ultimately yielding a portfolio that is aligned with the SDGs at multiple levels and congruent with WFP's skills, capacities, and competencies. The Zimbabwe CSP provides a compelling example of the result of the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Strategic Plan makes clear that WFP fully embraces the partnership imperative implied by the 2030 Agenda and the World Humanitarian Summit's Grand Bargain. This commitment to partnership and collective action has long been core to WFP's operations. Enhanced partnership with FAO, IFAD and other UN agencies is a major theme and the objective will be transparent, equitable and mutually beneficial arrangements with established mechanisms for sharing risks, responsibilities and accountability. In that spirit, senior colleagues from FAO and IFAD were recently invited to WFP for a presentation and discussion of the Integrated Roadmap. The revised versions of the SP and CSP Policy to be discussed at the Informal Consultation on September 05 integrate several of their constructive comments and suggestions. However, the true value of the exchanges lay in the expanded common ground that they generated. From the discussion with IFAD came enhanced mutual understanding of our respective roles in enabling (WFP) and investing in (IFAD) the transformations that will allow vulnerable people to pull themselves out of hunger and poverty. The discussion with FAO yielded greater insight on major opportunities for strategic partnership at the country level, especially with respect to policy engagement and capacity development. Both sets of RBA leadership acknowledged that the invitations and discussions represented best practice that they intended to emulate in the future. WFP has invited FAO and IFAD to nominate representatives to attend the 5 September Informal Consultation.</li>   <li>• Noting that General Rule VI.1 requires a mid-term review of the Strategic Plan, we acknowledge this concern regarding oversight and confirm that we will ensure that the Membership feels fully satisfied regarding exercising its oversight role.</li> </ul>