

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

13 September 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
Strategic Plan			
1	Several Members re-affirmed WFP's humanitarian and development mandate	Executive Board's role interpreting WFP's humanitarian and development mandate in adapting to changing environment (i.e. SDGs, WHS, humanitarian-development nexus)	Added reference to Article II of the General Regulations into the Executive Summary. WFP's basic governance documents, which include its General Regulations, provide for mandate that includes humanitarian and development objectives and functions with a focus on world food security. This is in line with previously approved Strategic Plans (2008-2013, 2014-2017) and policies.
2	All Members	Partnership among the Rome-Based Agencies (RBAs)	Added new paragraph 31 to highlight RBA partnerships. Several EB members requested the RBA Paper to be produced as early as possible, while noting that finalizing the RBA Paper is not a pre-requisite for the approval of the Strategic Plan 2017-2021. Outlining RBA partnerships should not be about a discussion on mandates, but a way to maximize the use of each agency's capacities and strengths, effectively.
3	Finland, EU	Request to make specific reference to the Mid-Term Review of the Strategic Plan	Reference added in paragraph 3.
4	France, USA, UK	WFP's role in emergencies ("humanitarian DNA") should remain a key priority for the organization	Executive Summary: "Responding to emergencies and saving lives and livelihoods – directly and by strengthening country response capacities – are paramount and will remain the major part of WFP's operations."
5	Switzerland	Alignment with the QCPR cycle	Reference improved on paragraph 3.
6	Norway, Denmark	Ready to approve the Strategic Plan 2017-2021	N/A
7	Italy	Food security and nutrition vulnerability as a condition for WFP's intervention	Reference added in paragraph 30.
8	China	WFP to work within the laws and regulations of the countries. WFP to intervene when required by governments, based on humanitarian needs and human rights. South-South cooperation should be highlighted in the document.	The language of the Strategic Plan already cover comments made by China. No revisions made. WFP's interventions in a given country are based on food security and nutrition needs. WFP works in close collaboration and partnership with governments. WFP is committed to the highest standards of integrity and WFP's actions will at all times be guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. WFP's work under Strategic Result 8 covers South-South cooperation.

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

13 September 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
Policy on Country Strategic Plans			
9	Sweden (from SP session)	Flexibility to articulate Strategic Outcome?	Formulation of free text strategic outcome at country level aligned to corporate outcome categories is explained in the policy paper (para 45-47)
		Will one SO always be humanitarian in nature?	No action needed/taken. See above.
10	Afghanistan	Fully support the approach	The Secretariat appreciates Afghanistan's support.
		Priorities other than SDG2 should not be belittled	Importance of other national priorities from other sectors and other SDGs are addressed in various parts of the policy paper – particularly, para 21, 23, 24, 26, 28 among others.
		Para 35 / 36: we agree that CSPs should be aligned with national SDG targets and should be result oriented	No action needed
		We support the section on transitional arrangements and understand that CSPs will absorb resources of all WFP ongoing projects.	No action needed
		Area of concern: how will the approach be implemented well in absence of a country budget? Strategic planning requires staff for a longer period – is it possible to have more staff at the country level funded from PSA?	Response given in verbally during consultation, including the role of the Financial Framework Review in this regard.
		Joint CP by RBAs is not realistic: what can be realistic are joint activities in specific areas of work: such as during the SR?	The Strategic Review plays a role in setting the stage for partnering, including with RBAs, and is addressed in para 33, and also 84.
		Indicators: the SP of WFP results are SDG targets – 14 indicators, 9 related to SDG 2 and 5 to SDG 17: will the CSP follow the same indicators as the global strategic framework or not? Where will the current indicators on emergency fitted?	CRF includes how relevant SDG indicators will be addressed globally and at national level. Other WFP CSP-specific indicators will be included in CSPs as necessary (as at present with projects).
11	Italy	There is a need to have clear exit strategies especially when local short term crises don't require WFP presence for up to 5 years: need to highlight this better	<p>Para 71 already includes: "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."</p> <p>For exit and handover in crisis, para 56 added: "In all circumstances, WFP emergency response will include transition or/and exit plans based on an evaluation of needs in the aftermath of the crisis."</p>

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

13 September 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>We believe accordingly to RBA collaboration that CSP planning moment is one of the best moment to consult and create synergies and collaboration with RBAs and I really appreciate the Afghanistan idea that especially in the assessment of the country situation this should be done together to cohere different point of views and analysis → better synergy and possibility to improve local conditions</p>	<p>The Strategic Review plays a role in setting the stage for partnering, including with RBAs, and is addressed in para 33, and also 84.</p>
		<p>Drafting of CSP should ensure a clear division of labor with RBA and other partners, incl. advocacy strategies and joint resource mobilization activities especially in resilience.</p>	<p>As discussed during the consultation, the CSP development process will engage its RBA and other partners at various stages, recognizing that no single entity can achieve Strategic Outcomes on its own.</p>
12	UK	<p>Consistency: the latest draft of the SP includes reference and language around humanitarian work but what we see in the CSPs especially in ICF we only see reference to exceptional circumstances – I. e. protracted crises and humanitarian work – we are asking for more consistency across the integrated roadmap / we want same effort to put humanitarian language through the roadmap, especially in CSP</p>	<p>Explicit reference to Grand Bargain removed as per the Strategic Plan (exec summary 1st para, para 3 and 5, footnote 4)</p> <p>Para 57 defines clearly what is meant by exceptional circumstances: “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.”</p>
		<p>Process: you mentioned WFP alone won't be achieving results; partnerships are important and WFP is pioneering an approach: did you identify a risk that other agencies and stakeholders won't follow your step? How do you ensure that partnerships are there? That all partners will find their way to contribute to national strategies? What if there is no national strategy or no national country owned review?</p>	<p>The Strategic Review is a consultative and inclusive process plays that will facilitate and set the stage for partnerships, including with RBAs, and is addressed in para 33, and also 84.</p>
		<p>Literally on one page it mentioned country-owned processes and then you turn the page and it says that local governments should be involved and other partners should be involved. That is, I think, our main point of concern. We would like to know if the risks are identified. And if so, if there is a mitigation strategy in place for these processes to be successful.</p>	<p>Possibly confusion on 'country' vs. 'government'? The aspect of 'country' ownership vs. 'government' ownership was addressed in verbal responses given on the Strategic Review during consultation.</p>
		<p>Role of RBs: we appreciate that the focus is on evidence and learning. It would be interesting to know if you could articulate better how this will happen, cause it is an institutional weakness, for evaluations to be really strong, especially decentralized evaluations how they play a role in institutional learning?</p>	<p>Action taken through the incorporation of OEV comments into paras 17, 78, 108 and 109.</p>
13	USA	<p>We appreciate the presentation of the examples</p>	<p>No action needed</p>

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

13 September 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
		CSPs will have different approaches according to context the policy document is a bit too general, we need developments: suggest to include a template with standard components to be presented in all CSPs; it might help us all with a common language	The structure of the CSP will be discussed further with the Membership as needed going forward.
		To give further specificity to the policy, we feel that the corporate activity category should be included in the CSP policy	Activity categories will be clearly stated in the logframe of each CSP.
		We'd like to understand whether WFP will distinguish refugees and IDPs in the activity categories	Response given in verbally during consultation.
		We feel insufficient to limit board oversight of CSPs for once in a 5 years, we wait for a proposal from WFP on this governance aspect of the strategy	Para 103, aligned with the FFR paper, provides further details of additional, regularly updated information that will be made available to Member States, which can be accessed via an online portal any time and for any period.
		We would like to see the budget broken down by the 4 programme cost categories (transfer, implementation, , adjusted direct and indirect)	Para 98 revised and aligned with FFR paper. Budget planning for CSPs follows the structure of the country portfolio budgets developed under the Financial Framework Review to be submitted to the Board in November 2016. A year-by-year budget divided by WFP Strategic Outcome and high-level cost category ¹ will be provided for the duration of the CSP. ²
		How will the Board be informed about the efficiency gains through a streamlined CSP process	Continuous consultation during pilot phase a well as a mid-term review of the Strategic Plan.
		Update on progress and success as pilots begin next year	Continuous consultations were committed to by WFP management as part of the consultation.
14	Japan	Samples were very helpful to understand concretely the new structure	The Secretariat appreciates Japan's input.
		Comment is on samples: one point is similar to Italy's: RBA collaboration: we have the impression that RBA collaboration does not come out in the sample	The CSP template includes a section on partnerships where COs are requested to highlight RBA collaboration.
		Structure of activities: we have the impression that the activities are described in a brief manner, modalities are not illustrated well; modality is very important for us.	Enhanced operational detail in most recent CSP template being developed will address concerns raised here based on current Zimbabwe and Indonesia CSP examples.
15	Germany	Strategic Reviews: the source of funding remains rather vague: to what extent can the conducting of strategic reviews be financially covered? It has been added that SR reports are usually produced by independent institutions but we'd like to ask: what is the underlying rationale for commissioning independent institutions?	Funding issue raised adequately addressed in para 34. Independent nature of the Strategic review issue raised is addressed in para 33 and 34.

¹ The four high-level categories include: transfer, implementation, adjusted direct support costs and indirect support costs

² The budget will consist of Strategic Outcomes developed on the basis of needs assessments and/or identified Outcomes based on Strategic Reviews or similar analysis in collaboration with government counterparts and partners. The budget for development related Strategic Outcomes will be guided by estimated available resources as per General Rule X.8.

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

13 September 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
		Board revision of drafts: can EB comment on drafts before the official approval process? Could informal consultations be conducted on draft CSPs? In what way?	As part of ongoing consultations with the EB, their continuous feedback would be sought during 2017 based on experience gained.
		Transitional arrangements: what feedback mechanisms to review the transitional arrangements?	As part of ongoing consultations with the EB, their continuous feedback would be sought during 2017 based on experience gained.
		Exit strategies: more thinking on this in the current CSP drafts.	The Secretariat notes this comment on the Indonesia and Zimbabwe CSP examples. No action taken in the CSP policy. Ref edits to para 56 in response to Italy's comments.
16	Spain	Drafts CSPs: very important to check out	No action needed.
		Para 82: interim country frameworks: it is important that the EB has something to say on these before two years have passed, because the countries in which this type of interim framework will be applied have their specific context and issues and it's important for the Board to be informed and have its say on these ICFs.	No action taken. Issue addressed in verbal response during consultation.
17	Netherlands	Many issues were brought up already (USA, Italy, UK, Germany)	No action needed.
		Exit strategies and handover: we fully support Italy's question and look forward to seeing how it will be integrated. Should be in template.	See edits to para 56 as per Italy's comment. More recent template should better/more explicitly address this issue.
		Template: we are looking forward to the CSP template.	The structure of the CSP will be discussed further with the Membership as needed going forward.
		We think it makes sense to make RBA collaboration as part of the template.	The CSP template includes a section on partnerships where COs are requested to highlight RBA collaboration.
		EB governance: after the transition, would you then expect that in 2018 the bulk of new CSPs will go through the Board and since they all have a 5 year period can we expect that in 2023 it will be another tough year for the EB to go through all of the CSPs? Will they be at all EB sessions or at a fixed moment? Etc.	No action taken. Comment acknowledged during the consultations.
		Commissioning of national review (in response to Germany): earlier we thought these SRs are done by national government or follow the processes of government and that is different from saying that there will be an independent entity to do the review.	No action taken in document. Comment addressed during verbal response.

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

13 September 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
18	Finland	<p>Transitional period: what kind of resource allocation and budget resources do you foresee during the transitional period? Exit strategies: are you going to carry out a review of possible operations to be closed during that transitional period?</p> <p>Could you elaborate this issue of moving from needs based to resource based budgeting? Elaborate the criteria for starting country operations in countries without a WFP presence – especially in the development area.</p> <p>We also still need to fix some things in the country level policy document in that sense, especially in Paragraph 61 and 76 as we have been saying last week when we had the informal discussion among the Board members. We should have a stronger reference to the joint humanitarian coordination system, the humanitarian coordinator's role and then how WFP works in that context because you are very well illustrating in the documents how you would be working with an UNDAP (Ph) context. Also I mean reference made to QCPR processes etc. but that is still missing in terms of your partners.</p> <p>Earmarking: how do you intend to manage earmarking?</p>	<p>No action taken in document.</p> <p>No action taken/needed. Discussed further as part of the Financial Framework Review.</p> <p>Para 76 underline added to the title: <u>Harmonization with the humanitarian programme cycle</u> and other United Nations agencies and processes.</p> <p>Para 76: changed order of paragraphs with humanitarian ones first: 76. Harmonization with the humanitarian programme cycle and other United Nations agencies and processes: CSPs will be aligned with strategic response plans and joint resource mobilization efforts of the United Nations humanitarian programme cycle by adequately reflecting emergency-related outcomes and activities that are part of the wider humanitarian response.</p> <p>No action taken/needed – FFR issue.</p>
19	Guatemala	<p>Comment to clarify the vision: in Guatemala we are doing the SR which is different from the CSP which will follow. The CSR for us is an idea that comes from WFP and it is an excellent idea: it is an idea that will help countries and give a certain order to their ideas to sequence and establish national priorities that will help meet the SDGs. It is certainly an effort that requires a good measure of institutional coordination at national level. In Guatemala the principle that is guiding the review was recommended by Eduardo Stein, the ex-vice president, he has a huge reputation and knowledge include. Appreciated by private sectors and he conducted consultations with everyone incl. the government – this is the necessary first step and it is important for us to then take ownership of the whole review process. There is a certain point in time where the government takes over this process esp. to lead the institutional coordination. The government will be the one to coordinate, especially in the framework of international cooperation, not only RBA but with all other possible actors; RBA alone is cutting short. Review will offer the process that the country needs to sit with everyone and WFP for its CSP will in agreement with the Government implement its mandate and only the areas of its mandate</p>	<p>The Secretariat appreciates Guatemala's sharing of its experience on the Strategic Review.</p>

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

13 September 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>but it would have contributed to a framework that the Government will use with all actors. It is a start for the implementation of all the SDGs.</p>	
20	<p>New Zealand (comments transmitted by e-mail on 30 August)</p>	<p>We welcome the further changes made to the country strategy draft, notably the inclusion of text on the need to address gender and other cross cutting issues, as well as more strongly articulating the primacy of humanitarian principles, and (coupled with the country portfolio budget draft) the intention to translate the strategic plan into a resource-based operational plan.</p> <p>We note the current draft confirms evaluation resourcing (which is good), although the relevant language (para 13) in the Office of Evaluation's Work Plan 2017-2019 attached to the draft Management Plan to be discussed at the 2 September informal is somewhat less empathic on this.</p> <p>The major area of unease we still hold relates to sustainability. As previously noted, we agree that 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 usefully contribute to exit and handover. However it is unfortunate that the draft policy does not highlight other relevant factors such as WFP expectations around (gradually increasing) counterpart funding, and (gradual) partner assumption of management and implementation responsibilities. This should be covered so that all country offices and partner countries are clear as to expectations.</p>	<p>The Secretariat appreciates New Zealand's support</p> <p>The difference between the wording in the draft policy (para 108-109) and the OEV Work Plan 2017-19 (para 13) is explained by timing. If the CSP Policy is approved in November 2016, the first CSP's will be produced in 2017. The CSP Policy provisions for evaluation resourcing will apply to those CSPs. The first <u>Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs)</u> of those CSPs will therefore be done 3 to 5 years later – in 2020 to 2022.</p> <p>Until that time, Country Portfolio Evaluations will continue to be funded from OEV's budget, which is sourced from PSA. The Evaluation Policy 2016-2021 sets a minimum coverage norm for CPE's of 9 per year by 2021, increasing from 4 per year in 2015. Para 13 of the OEV Work Plan 2017-19 refers to the fact that there is in fact insufficient increase in OEV's budget to finance any increase in the number of CPE's in 2017 (as was also the case for 2016, which was the first year of implementation of the Evaluation Policy).</p> <p>Counterpart funding and gradual partner assumption of management and implementation responsibilities are part of exit and transition plans</p> <p>Para 71 already includes: "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."</p> <p>For exit and handover in crisis, para 56 added: "In all circumstances, WFP emergency response will include transition or/and exit plans based on an evaluation of needs in the aftermath of the crisis."</p>

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

13 September 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>Comments related to the Indonesia CSP:</p> <p>We welcome the emphasis on capacity strengthening, but what we would also like to see is much more clarity around WFP expectations on the level of progress and expected country situation by 2021 e.g. do you expect the Food Security Agency to be able to monitor trends and prices without the need for external input by 2021 (para 44); do you envisage any WFP inputs into the SUN Secretariat's reports after 2020 (para 46)?; do you realistically expect National Disaster Management Agency to manage logistics requirements if the disaster is not a Level 3 event from 2021 (para 62)? The plan should endeavour to identify those areas where WFP does not envisage a role post 2021. For those areas where WFP anticipates that support post 2021 may be required, it would be helpful to get a much better sense of what you expect GOI partners to deliver by 2021.</p>	<p>The Secretariat appreciates New Zealand's points and will endeavour to address them in the Indonesia CSP before it is presented to the Executive Board for approval at EB.1/2017.</p> <p>These are excellent points, and while it is somewhat difficult to predict the pace of progress at this early stage, the Secretariat will endeavour to be more specific in the document. Most specifically, we already expect the government to deal with logistics requirements for emergencies other than Level 3 – the issue is one of increased effectiveness and reduced timing.</p>
		<p>The expected WFP contribution in a number of activities is not as clearly defined as it could be: e.g. campaign on nutritious diets (paras 52, 53), school feeding (para 57), Family Hope (para 58), working with NGOs and faith groups (para 64). Where relevant (e.g. school feeding), it would be helpful to indicate geographic focus.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will try to be more specific in terms of the WFP contribution, as we now have more details on the specifics of each activity. The geographic focus will depend largely on government priorities, many of which are only now emerging.</p>
		<p>Gender is covered, but we cannot see any reference to integration of protection issues.</p>	<p>Well noted.</p>
		<p>Greater clarity on expected role of private sector partners would be useful, given the prominence given to these in the office's staff profile and recent funding trends.</p>	<p>Well noted.</p>
		<p>A timeline for the completion of the necessary baseline work and M&E plan would be helpful. Ideally, the M&E plan should form part of the country strategy. The usefulness of the budget data would be enhanced if 2016 income projections could be included.</p>	<p>This is a good point, and one for which there is currently no mechanism for funding ahead of the CSP's approval. The M&E guidance for capacity strengthening is still a work-in-progress, which we are contributing to as we understand the intricacies of measuring impact, not just the number of officials trained.</p>
		<p>The risk management section could be more detailed, especially with regard to proposed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Well noted.</p>
		<p>It is rather unclear from the document what WFP's <u>current</u> portfolio of work in Indonesia is. This would help set the scene for the planned programme of work.</p>	<p>The current portfolio is the one approved by the Executive Board in EB.1/2016 – essentially identical to that in the CSP as it was designed before the EB was ready to consider the CSP for approval.</p>
		<p>The proposed programme contains 3 Strategic Outcomes and 4 activities (with various components under these), with a modest WFP budget foreseen (US\$11.95m over 4 years). Given that each are aligned with UNPDF and GOI priorities, but also the risk that you will not secure the funding sought, it could</p>	<p>As each Ministry or body concerned will be expected to allocate its own budget to the activities, it is not easy to suggest that the Government (or Ministry of Development Planning) will prioritize one activity over others.</p>

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

13 September 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
		be useful for the strategy to indicate which of these represent the highest priorities in dialogue with GOI and in resource mobilisation / allocation strategies.	