

**NFR**  
**3<sup>rd</sup> TAG meeting**

**Chair:** Jane Pearce

**EB members:**

- Mr. Siragi Wakaabu, Agricultural Attaché and Alternate Permanent Representative of List A, Uganda
- Mr. Abdul Razak Ayazi, Agriculture Attaché and Alternate Permanent Representative of List B, Afghanistan
- Mr. Luís Fernando de Carvalho, Minister Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative of List C, Brazil
- Ms. Angelica Jácome, Permanent Representative of List C, Panama
- Her Excellency Marie-Therese Sarch, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of List D, United Kingdom
- Ms. Chiara Segrado, First Secretary and Deputy Permanent Representative of List D, United Kingdom
- Mr. Evgeny Vakulenko, First Secretary and Alternate Permanent Representative of List E, Russian Federation

**Observers:**

- Ms. Sara Ouafi, First Secretary and Alternate Permanent Representative of List B, Morocco
- Ms. Paula Peraza, Second Secretary and Alternate Permanent Representative of List C, Costa Rica
- Ms. Nadine Barbara van Dijk, Second Secretary and Alternate Permanent Representative of List D, Netherlands
- Mr. William Berger, Senior Humanitarian Adviser and Alternate Permanent Representative of List D, USA
- Mr. Damien Kelly, Alternate Permanent Representative of List D, European Union
- Ms. Elizabeth Petrovski, Finance and Oversight Specialist and Alternate Permanent Representative of List D, USA
- Ms. Naomi Sterk, Intern of List D, Netherlands

**WFP participants:**

- Harriet Spanos, Secretary to the Executive Board
- Natasha, Chief RMPM
- Jean-Pierre Demargerie, Deputy Director OSZ
- Chad Martino, Executive Manager OS
- Elise Benoit, Chief RMPS
- Jennifer Rosenzweig, Knowledge Management OSN
- Irene del Rio, Performance Management Officer RMPS
- Cecilie Gundersen, Officer OSZ
- Stephanie Shih, RMPM

**Introduction:** RMP Director presented the draft corporate targets in two parts for TAG consideration 1) programme output and 2) Management KPI. TAG endorsed the NFR from the previous meeting.

### **Programme targets**

- **The representative of Afghanistan** questioned the significance of the indicator on number of services provided. WFP responded that this is a change from the indicator number of partners supported and there is on-going deliberation on the relevance of this indicator. **The representative of UK** expressed desire to see sub-indicators under services provided and suggested to pick out high-profile services such as UNHAS that may be important to highlight. WFP said it would be brought to the table with Supply Chain colleagues. **The representative of Brazil** questioned whether this indicator is trying to measure different things at the same time. WFP noted it will continue to streamline the extractions from data systems to effectively aggregate these metrics.
- **The representative of the Russian Federation** sought clarification on the process and role of the Executive Board for the revision of targets. WFP explained that the revised targets would be approved in the November session in the context of the Management Plan, to be implemented over the following year and reported on in the Annual Performance Report in the annual session the year after.
- **The representative of USA** asked whether reporting would be done against the Implementation Plan or the Needs-based Plan. If needs-based, it's a funding issue. WFP responded that needs-based plans were looked at for the setting of corporate targets because the goal is Zero Hunger and these are set out in CSPs based on assessments, evaluations and discussions with governments. In the reporting, there will be both implementation plan and needs-based plans. **The representative of USA** asked how targets would change given implementation plans. WFP responded that targets are set at this point in time for 3 years and each year in the Management Plan, the targets will be adjusted based on resources and also changes on the ground.
- **The representative of the UK** agreed with the point that targets should be adjusted annually and **the representative of Afghanistan** asked whether in the annual revision the indicators would remain the same and only the targets will same. WFP confirmed only the targets would change.
- On the changes mentioned in the presentation, **the representative of the UK** requested clarification on whether the changes described were from the document version sent to them. WFP explained they were mainly refinements from the initial proposal presented during the second TAG meeting.
- On methodologies, **the representative of the UK** requested more detail– for instance adding links or notes to somewhere in the public domain for more information referencing the indicators on number of partners supported and quantity of fortified food. WFP explained that it was written with brevity in mind, but links can be provided where there is other information needed. **The representative of Panama** suggested annexing the relevant parts of reference documents.
- **The representative of the UK** noted it was interesting that targets are set based on an average trend, when ideally, they would be based on planned targets. Need to be clear about how targets have been set, which will provide background on whether targets have been met. WFP agreed that more information would be added and stated that annual adjustment of targets will help with accuracy.

- **The representative of the UK** said it would be useful to have 2018 statistics in the final document so that the Board can have a reference point on whether targets are more or less ambitious. WFP responded that 2018 numbers will be included pending the reporting exercise that closes on 31 March.
- **The representative of the UK** reiterated the request to put an indicator on the USD value of total quantity of food provided in order to get a meaningful sense of percentage of cash related to food transfers. WFP responded that analysis was done on historical information since 2016 and planning figures up to 2021 to calculate a reasonable trend for the next 3 years. This rationale applies to most of the targets where there was no planning by a specific technical unit. WFP highlighted the difficulties in using planning figures for 2019 to 2021 since some country offices will be finishing the project cycle during this time and do not yet have a clear picture.
- **The representative of the UK** reiterated the importance of monitoring WFP's work on disabilities, for instance including an indicator on number of offices that were monitoring disability. WFP said that this is an area where the organization is trying to learn and will continue to look at how to include this methodology. The first step was to include an output level indicator in the revised CRF.
- **The representative of the UK** requested to be transparent in the methodology about whether it includes ISC when reporting on Total USD value (whether related to CBT, capacity strengthening transfers or providing services). WFP agreed to consult with colleagues who collaborated on these values to determine whether the values represent transfer value only or full cost recovery values (including ISC).
- **The representative of the UK** stated it was fundamental that the next frame of work includes the theory of change. This will be raised in the next board meeting.
- **The representative of Panama** noted Tier 3 beneficiaries are key for Latin America and are not reflected in the document. WFP responded it is a new area of work and discussions are on-going including with other agencies who have expertise in capacity strengthening. **The representative of the UK** further requested definitions for Tier 1, 2 and 3 beneficiaries and to include this information in the methodologies for clarity. WFP stated that the guidance is being finalized and explained that for this exercise the focus is on USD value as work is ongoing to define tier 3 for the organization.
- **The representative of Afghanistan** asked whether all indicator targets would be gender disaggregated. WFP responded that gender-disaggregated reporting is done in the APR.
- **The representative of Uganda** asked how gender is reflected in the targets on number of beneficiaries. WFP responded that a conversation would be had with Gender office and will revert in bilaterally or in the Informal Consultation.
- **The representative of the USA** noted that delivery-type indicators do not really work for measuring results of capacity strengthening. Need better measures of success for capacity strengthening initiatives to show that investments are sustainable. For instance, if capacity strengthening trainings are done, the government needs to demonstrate that they are dedicating resources to sustain it. WFP noted that these are more outcome level whereas the scope of this exercise was agreed to be limited to output indicators and that this is still a new area of work and opportunity for WFP. **The representative of Panama** agreed with the USA, expressing the need to think outside the box for more objective indicators and to build something together. WFP noted the process for Country Portfolio Evaluations planned for the

penultimate year of each CSP which would help build lessons learned and improve each generation of CSPs and the accountability framework. **The representative of Uganda** emphasized that output level is important in measuring capacity strengthening as well to see how it fits into the outcome level where institutions can make an impact.

- **The representative of Brazil** noted that the target for number of schoolchildren does not increase significantly from 2019 to 2021. WFP emphasized that technical units would have more information but that while there is the ambition to do more, school feeding is one of the areas that lends itself best to handover to national governments.

### Management KPI targets

- **The representative of Panama** stated that one indicator that may be missing on KPI 3 is something related to occupational health and safety which is an important area. WFP responded that a wellness-specific indicator is pending as there is data for most country offices but not all. One of the criteria used for selecting indicators is that it applies to all operations. There is a component on the working and living conditions for staff which partly address this, under the administration functional area. This KPI measures compliance with standards and policies in the administration areas, including those. It is not visualized in the aggregation but is included.
- On the sexual harassment and abuse of power indicator, **the representative of Panama** said the completion of the mandatory course should not be measured since if its mandatory it should be done. We can work to find another relevant indicator. This point was echoed by **the representative of the UK**, who suggested that it would be good to see perhaps the number of cases that have been reported and for which disciplinary action has been taken. WFP said that these figures are not being disclosed at the moment and would have a conversation with executive management on this issue.
- **The representative of Afghanistan** asked whether the composite indicators are at country level or at corporate level and asked for further clarification on the methodology for these composite indicators. WFP explained that the starting point is with countries and all the KPIs at country level are aggregated based on the methodology and the nature of the measure. There is no single figure for the indicator. For instance, in terms of KPI 1 where there are 4 components, we look at how many countries actually reached all of the targets/standards.
- **The representative of the UK** emphasized that the targets could be more ambitious, specifically referencing the methodology for percentage of outcomes which have implementation and percentage of outputs which have implementation. In reference to the difficulty in telling if a country is excelling in terms of effectiveness – the representative questioned how this would be possible to ascertain if the targets are not ambitious enough. WFP responded that during APR discussions, this concern may be addressed. Targets are being set for these indicators since it's the first time a full set of data is available. Around 40 percent of outcome indicators are new and since roll out has just started, we are checking quality of the data.
- On measuring effective emergency preparedness and response, **the representative of the UK** requested clarity on the methodology since a lot of effectiveness of emergency response depends on time of declaration of an L2/L3 emergency.
- For KPI 3: resource mobilization, communication and reporting, **the representative of Uganda** asked for further explanation because communication and reporting could get lost under

resource mobilization. WFP agreed, saying the only indicator is on resource mobilization but that they are looking to add another on communication. The methodologies are being developed. For reporting, it is more difficult because all the measures look more at the volume of work rather than quality. She mentioned that a future measure could include completeness of data shared in the CSP data portal, or similar measure, but nothing has been yet developed.

- **The representative of the USA** asked who is responsible for reporting on KPI 2 and whether there is an accountability mechanism. WFP said that each component has an owner/division that is responsible for the data. Most come from centralized systems that are extractable in HQ. In September/October 2018, there was extensive work to develop and have directors signing off indicators under their responsibility including rationale for selection and actions to be taken when values are off target.
- **The representative of the UK** asked whether there would be a mock-up provided of the APR report. WFP apologized for the delay and promised to send soon. With the changes in the APR, wanted to be rigorous in checking that the proposals fit in the new system.

### **Conclusion and way forward**

- **Action:** APR mock-up to be shared
- **Action:** draft CRF part 2 document to be amended reflecting points mentioned in meeting