



World Food Programme

SAVING LIVES
CHANGING LIVES

Round Table on Evaluation Reports

Strategic evaluation of the pilot country strategic plans

9 November 2018



Strategic evaluation of the CSP pilots (2017 – mid-2018)

Recommendations from the evaluation cover five topics:

- 1. Management of the CSP Framework**
- 2. CSP Processes and Guidance**
- 3. UN Reform**
- 4. Monitoring and Reporting performance**
- 5. Funding**

Management accepts the conclusion that “adopting CSPs as the framework for planning, managing and delivering WFP’s functions was a significant step forward” and the recommendation that there be an “ongoing focused commitment to making the CSP approach fully fit for purpose across WFP, with continuous, more systematic learning and a comprehensive review in 2020.”

Recommendation 1: Management of the CSP Framework

1(a): From now until 2021, mainstream IRM-specific structures while strengthening all existing structures to ensure effective coordination of the IRM and effective operationalization of the CSP approach in a transparent and inclusive manner.

- Maintain implementation of the CSP framework as a top management priority for WFP until the end of 2021;
- Continue to dedicate senior staff time to CSPs at headquarters and the Regional Bureau;
- Ensure the continuation of an active, carefully coordinated effort to optimise the efficiency and complementarity of all relevant systems and procedures, as well as ongoing strategic monitoring of the fitness of the current CSP model for its many diverse purposes.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Implementation will remain a top management priority recognizing the potential trade-off between maintaining centralized capacity and mainstreaming responsibility and accountability in regular structure;
- Continuation of IRM Steering Committee arrangements until 2021;
- Re-evaluate success in mainstreaming IRM-specific structures;
- Provision of sufficient resources to enable IRM implementation office to complete transition, coordinate continued simplification and improvements, and finalize delegations of authority to be presented at EB.1/2020.

Recommendation 1: Management of the CSP Framework

1(b): By the end of June 2019, strengthen the process of systematic learning from the implementation of the CSP framework and strengthen implementation process monitoring to support learning across all areas.

- Incorporate high-level elements of the CSP monitoring system and the existing performance management system;
- Systematically monitor the development of partnerships;
- Strengthen the capacity of country offices to learn from their experiences and adapt as necessary;
- Encourage the exchange of information and experience from country office to country office and from Regional Bureau to Regional Bureau.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Revised CRF will better articulate the links between results and resources;
- Updated minimum monitoring requirements will guide country office planning and implementation of monitoring activities;
- Monitoring, evaluation and review plan will be added to the corporate performance management and monitoring system;
- Development of indicators for thematic areas where there are gaps;
- Conduct trainings and on-line courses on the revised CRF and monitoring;
- Review emergency response and preparedness activities;
- Revised CRF to include partnership outcome indicator;
- Roll-out of updated guidance to facilitate and inform system learning.

Recommendation 1: Management of the CSP Framework

1(c): In Q1 2020, carry out a comprehensive review of experience to date with the CSP format and systems to generate recommendations for improving the CSP framework and other relevant elements of the IRM.

- The review should cover a full implementation cycle of the pilot CSPs (which will include the formulation of the second-generation CSPs in the pilot countries);
- The review should build on all existing efforts, including those of the Regional Bureaux;
- The process should be linked to the mid-term review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021);
- The review should focus on areas that are relatively difficult to assess, such as the alignment with national priorities.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Initiate a comprehensive management review linked to the mid-term review of the strategic plan;
- Review will examine alignment with national priorities and the development of strategic partnerships, progress towards more flexible and predictable funding and the alignment of CSPs with UNDAFs.

Recommendation 2: CSP process and guidance

2(a): Building upon existing efforts, ensure that simplification process is complete by 1 January 2019.

- Ensure that country offices have systems that are fit for purpose;
- Reduced transaction costs as far as possible;
- Keep staff workloads within acceptable limits;

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Close monitoring of country offices will ensure that tools, trainings, and support activities for CSP implementation are mainstreamed and that they have capacity and office structure necessary;
- Simplification of the country portfolio budget structure and related processes will reduce transactional workload and minimize additional workload for country offices;
- Simplification efforts will continue including with regard to emergency response and preparedness activities.

Recommendation 2: CSP process and guidance

2(b): By the end of the first quarter of 2019, update existing guidance related to the development and implementation of CSPs and prepare a single and comprehensive set of new guidance that reflects the need to undertake differentiated processes according to national context.

- All existing guidance related to implementation of the CSP framework and the WFP Programme Guidance Manual should be replaced by a new comprehensive CSP Manual that will guide all aspects of formulation and implementation of CSPs;
- WFP should now confirm that the CSP is a dynamic model, and that the next generation of CSPs (and their supporting procedures, notably NZHSRs) may vary more according to local conditions – while all adhering to core systems that facilitate standardized management, monitoring and reporting procedures. All guidance should specify what is mandatory, where there should be flexibility and where waivers can be obtained;
- NZHSR processes should better reflect national needs and provide opportunities to use the approach in areas beyond SDG 2;
- There should be a light option for the mandatory mid-term review (MTR) for countries with CSP cycles of less than 5 years;
- MTR and country portfolio evaluation processes should be aligned in sequence and method;
- Guidance should take the UN reform process into account, and the revision of guidance should be designed accordingly.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Created new CSP manual as “one-stop-shop” for users;
- Revised guidance, including on emergency response and preparedness activities, will clarify mandatory requirements, address issues of flexibility and lay out options for waivers;
- Issue guidelines for mid-term review;
- Finalize guidance for mid-term reviews and country portfolio evaluations to ensure that the purpose and scope of both processes are complementary;
- Revise guidance in line with United Nations reform decisions.

Recommendation 2: CSP process and guidance

2(c): By the end Q1 2019, define cross-cutting issues and provide guidance on how to address them in the context of a CSPs.

- Review the WFP policy compendium and streamline it to reflect the findings and recommendations of recent OEV policy evaluations;
- Incorporate gender equality and other cross-cutting issues in all other CSP guidance.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Review and update WFP policy compendium in line with the findings and recommendations of this evaluation;
- Review by OEV of the WFP policy compendium and provide updates on planned policy and strategic evaluations to inform decision making;
- Incorporated gender equality into CSP templates and guidance which will be updated as the framework matures;
- Revise gender equality, accountability to affected populations and protection cross-cutting indicators as part of the ongoing CRF review;
- Developed methodology for the use of an environment cross-cutting indicator.

Recommendation 3: United Nations Reform

3(a): Continue strong engagement with the United Nations reform process and participate in the practical work of developing a new generation of UNDAFs, including by introducing WFP innovations and experiences into the process.

- Tailor lesson-learning documents to UN Reform workstreams, especially those related to developing the new generation of UNDAFs;
- Options may include joint country strategic reviews and planning with the RBAs and possibly other United Nations entities, or the whole United Nations Country Team.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Continued engagement in the UN reform process, including interagency discussions and leading some of the strategic thinking and work streams of the newly established UNDAF design team;
- Provide inputs based on experience as the first UN agency to align its corporate strategic plan with the SDGs;
- Explore ways to increase collaboration among the RBAs on joint zero hunger strategic reviews as inputs to UNDAFs;
- Provide inputs in areas such as the new UNDAFs, Resident Coordinator system and implications for UN country teams;
- Co-lead work in the area of shared back office functions and premises.

Recommendation 3: United Nations Reform

3(b): By mid-2019, develop strategies to ensure that all CSP cycles match UNDAF cycles as quickly as possible.

- For each ongoing CSP that does not match the corresponding UNDAF cycle, examine opportunities to shorten or extend the CSP cycle to align with that of the UNDAF;
- Include a short section on the strategy for UNDAF alignment (or an explanation for the absence of such a strategy) in all concept notes for CSPs.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Review how interagency instruments and WFP's instruments align and how best to engage the Executive Board in this process;
- Match CSPs to the revised UNDAF cycles as quickly possible to be consistent with UN reform;
- Current guidance recommends that each zero hunger strategic review and CSP be aligned with the current UNDAF cycle to the extent possible and when not possible to revise the CSP to align it with the next UNDAF;
- Concept notes will refer to alignment with UNDAF outcomes and how the CSP reinforces the UNDAF;
- Consider strengthening alignment in concept notes and CSPs.

Recommendation 4: Monitoring and reporting performance

4(a): By Q2 2019, ensure that the comprehensive system for monitoring and reporting performance is aligned with the revised CRF.

- Gender-responsive monitoring and reporting systems based on a revised CRF should be tested, Once confirmed workable, they should be adopted by country offices after adequate training and should be in place to support comprehensive monitoring and reporting of all CSP results;
- In the meantime, WFP will need to confirm to donors and other stakeholders that it will not be able to report in full on all activities under certain CSPs for the first one or two years of implementation because indicators and a supporting methodology were not in place when the CSPs were launched.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Revised CRF has cross-cutting indicators, including gender. New indicators have been tested before inclusion in the CRF;
- Provide training to support monitoring and reporting through the revised CRF;
- Analyse information gaps caused by lack of data collection, a lack of methodologies for some indicators, or a slow or late start from some activities under the pilot CSPs in 2017.

Recommendation 4: Monitoring and reporting performance

4(b): By mid-2019, ensure country portfolio evaluations are at the centre of the performance management system to enable better assessment of WFP's contribution to development results.

- OEV to review and revise current CPE model and adapt it to CSPs (by end 2018). *Agree;*
- Ensure the sustainable financing of CPEs. *Agree;*
- Introduce a rating system in CPEs that gauges CSP performance in terms of contribution of CSP activities to strategic outcomes. *Partially Agree;*
- Incorporate the results of CPEs into annual performance reporting using the rating system. *Partially Agree;*

Management Response: *Agree/Partially Agree.*

- Review by OEV of the CPE model and process to streamline process and adjust timelines in order to deliver evaluation evidence in time to inform the design of CSPs. New model to be tested on first three CSP evaluations conducted in 2019;
- Establish a sustainable financing task force to identify mechanism for securing adequate and timely funding for CPEs;
- Explore feasibility of developing a rating system for all CSP evaluations, noting implications for OEV systems and processes *[partially agree];*
- If an operational rating system is in place, results will be public at the evaluation level and consideration given to which annual performance reporting should also include CSP operational ratings. *[partially agree];*

Recommendation 5: Funding

5. By mid-2019, address constraints on more flexible and predictable financing.

To ensure more flexible and predictable financing WFP should:

- Undertake a strategic dialogue with the Executive Board on multilateral funding and earmarked funding;
- Strengthen engagement with donors on adapting to the new model;
- Make greater effort to demonstrate the gains in efficiency and effectiveness that predictable and flexible funding delivers in the context of the longer-term CSP framework;
- Make special efforts to reduce earmarking by strengthening staff negotiating skills;
- Set clear and time-bound targets for more flexible and predictable funding.

Management Response: *Agree.*

- Committed to advocating for more fully flexible funding and predictable multi-year funding while building evidence to demonstrate gains in efficiency and effectiveness that such funding delivers;
- Implement a strategy for maximizing funding impact which entails bilateral strategic financing dialogues;
- Provide improved guidance to staff to ensure deliberate efforts to improve the nature of the funding and ensure negotiations are tailored to individual donors with the aim of easing or eliminating conditions and maximizing flexibility within the constraints of current donor policies.

Discussion

