

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT REPORT:  
MOPAN (2017–2018)**

**BACKGROUND**

1. This document presents an update to the Management Response from the WFP Institutional Assessment Report: MOPAN.
2. The assessment covered 2017-2018.
3. In addition to the previous management response presented this update addresses all 'Unsatisfactory' Key Performance Indicators (KPI's), highlighted with an asterisk for reference.
4. To provide a more consolidated action plan some Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) and findings have been grouped where they relate to the same area/issue, with implementation timelines included as applicable.
5. The revised matrix includes specific actions which will be tracked, monitored and reported in the new Risk and Recommendation Tracking Tool (R2).
6. Action updates and Leadership Group Review will occur twice yearly.
7. As noted in the July briefing, a number of findings have been addressed and completed through the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) process and the revised Corporate Results Framework (CRF).

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p><b><u>Finding 1</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Strategic Management</i></b>  <b>KPI 2.1a: Gender equality and the empowerment of women</b>  Despite the application of the gender marker, there are identified challenges in integrating gender in WFP programmes, such as the inconsistent use of guidance in programmes. WFP still has progress to make towards sufficient human and financial resources to effectively address gender issues.</p> <p>Also addressing;</p> <p><b><i>Results</i></b>  <b>*KPI: 9.4 Interventions assessed as having helped improve gender equality and the empowerment of women</b>  Evaluations point to the limited inclusion of gender in the design of WFP interventions and consequently inconsistent results for improving gender equality and the empowerment of women.</p>	<p>GENDER</p>	<p>The integration of gender in WFP’s work is guided by the Gender Policy (2015-2020) and corporate Gender Action Plan (GAP), which align with UN system frameworks (notably UN SWAP). Further integration will be supported by the integration of the Gender Office within the Programme and Policy Development Department which will enable a more direct engagement by the office throughout the project cycle. The Gender Office will continue to lead implementation of the Gender Policy and GAP, directly through provision of technical assistance, substantive contributions to all governance documents, capacity-strengthening, implementation of gender mainstreaming mechanisms (such as the Gender Transformation Programme), research and knowledge management, and campaigns and communications. This work is guided by annual performance plans. Collaboration across WFP includes strengthening means of achieving and measuring gender equality impacts, including through the Corporate Results Framework and application of the Gender and Age Marker.</p> <p>The Gender Office will also continue to support the WFP leads for the nine objectives of the GAP and the UN SWAP Business Owners in fulfilment of their responsibilities.</p> <p>As the external evaluation of the Gender Policy (2015-2020) is underway, decisions as to strategic orientation, processes and resourcing will be made on an informed basis in the coming year; with continued annual reporting to the Organisation and Executive Board. Deadlines will be reviewed following completion of the Gender Policy</p>	<p>On-going</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>Mid 2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		(2015-2020) evaluation, with the report to be submitted to the Executive Board at the first regular session in 2020.	
<p><b><u>Finding 2</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Strategic Management</i></b></p> <p><b>*KPI 2.1b: Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change</b> WFP is explicit in its commitment to climate change and environment issues, however, there may be limited understanding within the organisation of the implications of the policies for interventions. Results on environment and climate provide limited evidence and environmental screening systems are not yet in place. While initial funding has been allocated for the implementation of the Environmental Policy, there are no references to resource commitments for ensuring technical capabilities in climate.</p> <p>Also addresses:</p> <p><b><i>Results</i></b></p> <p><b>*KPI: 9.5: Interventions assessed as having helped improve environmental sustainability/helped tackle the effects of climate change</b> Environmental sustainability has only recently become a focus of WFP programming, particularly in its work around natural and disaster risk management. Results for climate change and sustainability remain peripheral to core programming.</p>	Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Unit (OSZIR) in collaboration with the Environmental Unit (RMMI)	<p>The implementation of WFP's Climate Change Policy (2017) is ongoing and will be evaluated in 2022.</p> <p>WFP is responding to the need for capacity strengthening at all levels on issues related to climate risk analysis, climate risk financing, and climate change adaptation. WFP's climate and disaster risk reduction units (OSZIR) are implementing a capacity development strategy which tracks the number of staff at all levels of the organisation that receive training on climate issues.</p> <p>Since 2017, 1,217 programme staff at varying seniority levels have been trained on climate issues through learning and awareness raising exercises.</p> <p>There is an increased focus in the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) on climate related issues. Out of the 82 first-generation CSPs, 58 have included climate-related interventions, corresponding to 106 distinct activities. Programme activities comprise a wide range of actions, from emergency preparedness and response through food security analysis/early warning and climate services to community resilience/ risk reduction/ social protection/ climate adaptation and policy support. WFP will continue to provide support to the integration of climate actions into second generation CSPs through its headquarter staff and regional Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction advisors.</p>	<p>End 2020</p> <p>Completed</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>WFP supports the implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), National Adaptation Plans and climate risk informed food security strategies. In certain countries, WFP contributes to climate analyses identifying the impact of climate variability on food security and livelihoods (Atlas of Climate Risk and Food Security in the Greater Horn of Africa, C-ADAPT, CLEAR). These analyses inform the Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews and the formulation of CSPs. Policy and programmatic support to governments is ongoing and conducted with a special focus on countries with Green Climate Fund and AF projects, ARC replica, and forecast-based financing.</p> <p>The WFP evaluation office has developed a dedicated impact evaluation window for climate and resilience programmes which will be operationalised in 2019 and provide additional evidence.</p> <p>Over the past four years evaluations and several research initiatives with specialized institutions have enriched the evidence base for WFP activities enhancing resilience to climate change.</p> <p>The implementation of the WFP’s Environmental Policy (2017-2022 inclusive) with development and roll-out of tools is ongoing.</p> <p>The procedure for environmental and social risk screening of Livelihood and Asset Creation activities is being refined.</p> <p>Reporting on environment as a cross-cutting issue is now mandatory for country offices. WFP has allocated a total of USD 1.3m (spanning 2017-2019 inclusive) in extra budgetary funds to support policy</p>	<p>Dec 2019</p> <p>Dec 2022</p> <p>Dec 2019</p> <p>Completed</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>implementation, covering tool development and piloting, some training and initial rollout to country offices. In 2019, the number of countries implementing an environmental management system (EMS) has increased from 1 to 5 (with further sites planned in the remainder of 2019).</p> <p>The procedure for screening of Smallholder Market Access activities and School Feeding activities is being tested.</p> <p>Alignment of the environmental and social safeguards framework with the Risk Management Framework and Oversight functions, and to mainstream the safeguards in processes such as the Country Strategic Plans and agreements with cooperating partners is on-going.</p>	June 2020
<p><b><u>Finding 3</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Strategic Management</i></b></p> <p><b>*KPI 2.1c: Good Governance</b></p> <p>The Strategic Plan 2017-21 has made reference to capacity strengthening more explicit. There is an aim to mainstream capacity strengthening under all Strategic Objectives and results, with associated indicators and targets, although this is still a work in progress. While there is no dedicated policy on good governance, there are specific policies on Capacity Strengthening and Emergency Preparedness. However, the evidence from evaluations has shown an inconsistent focus</p>	Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	<p>WFP will prepare a new capacity strengthening strategy (CCS) in 2020. The strategy will support operationalisation of the 2009 Capacity Development Policy Update. The strategy will clearly articulate relevant roles and responsibilities, ensure commitment to quality assurance procedures and accountability mechanisms at all levels. It will build on evaluation and internal audit findings to ensure weaknesses identified are systematically addressed, and corporate performance enhanced over time.</p> <p>To complement the CCS strategy, a dedicated CCS Internal Capability Development (ICD) Strategy for 2020-2025 has been drafted and is under approval. The strategy will also outline clear plans for</p>	<p>November 2020</p> <p>January 2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p>on capacity building of partners, mixed effectiveness of assessment mechanisms, and limited staff capacity in both quantity and skills.</p> <p>Also addresses: <b>Results</b> <b>*KPI 9.6 Interventions assessed as having helped improve good governance</b></p> <p>Evaluations refer to challenges in the approach taken for capacity development, and particularly a lack of a strategic underpinning for WFP's capacity development work, including clear intended results and systemic rather than piecemeal approaches. Capacity strengthening remains largely focused on individual units or personnel.</p>		<p>enhancing internal capabilities in capacity strengthening across all areas of WFP work.</p> <p>The November 2018 revision of the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) enhanced the depth and breadth of corporate indicators for capacity strengthening. In 2019 Guidance on Tier 1 beneficiary counting – including capacity strengthening transfer modalities – was finalised and released.</p> <p>Specific efforts are planned to develop guidance defining WFP institutional capacity strengthening interventions (where there are no direct Tier 1 beneficiaries) through contribution analysis and/or similar impact assessment methods.</p> <p>WFP has refined its approach to designing sustainable capacity strengthening interventions. It has developed a toolkit that includes technical mechanisms and guidance for adopting and implementing a systems-strengthening approach. The toolkit addresses capacity enhancement at individual, organisational and environment levels. Through the toolkit WFP country offices can formulate and document clear capacity outcome statements, conduct comprehensive capacity needs mapping exercises, identify stakeholder needs and gaps, partners roles and responsibilities, and clear entry points for WFP. The CCS-ICD Strategy will support the roll-out and institutionalisation of the processes outlined in the toolkit over the next five years.</p>	<p>Completed Oct 2019</p> <p>Basic guidance completed mid-2019.</p> <p>Roll-out is ongoing.</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		Awareness-raising and internal capability development in capacity strengthening as a robust and results-oriented discipline will continue to be a priority for 2020. A dedicated CCS Communications Strategy has been drafted and pending approval, will be implemented in 2020.	Dec 2020.
<p><b><u>Finding 4</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Strategic Management</i></b></p> <p><b>*KPI 2.1d: Human Rights</b></p> <p>The Evaluation of WFP Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts concludes overall that the principles and the policy have not been effectively disseminated, do not include implementation measures and are not fully operationalised. While human rights are not explicitly referenced within discussion of the Strategic Objectives or results, or WFP’s intended means of addressing these, there is some limited evidence of the use of rights language in some indicators.</p> <p>Also addresses:</p> <p><b><i>Results</i></b></p> <p><b>*KPI: 9.7: Interventions assessed as having helped improve human rights</b></p> <p>WFP’s effects on improving human rights through its interventions are not systematically considered in evaluations.</p>	Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	<p>WFP’s efforts to promote human rights—or rights up front—is captured under its approach to Protection, Inclusion and Accountability to Affected Populations. WFP’s Protection Policy (2012) provides a framework for WFP’s contribution to human rights in humanitarian and development settings.</p> <p>The 2012 Protection Policy was formally evaluated and presented to the WFP Executive Board (EB) in June 2018. A direct outcome from the evaluation was the commitment for WFP to: (a) design and implement an operational strategy to address issues raised in the evaluation; and (b) using country level experiences, update its Protection Policy.</p> <p>The operational strategy plays an important role in addressing core protection concerns such as: (a) having improved and coordinated context analyses that look at protection concerns in humanitarian and development settings (including humanitarian access issues, human-rights, and rights-up front approaches); (b) strengthening corporate monitoring and evaluation functions (including beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanisms) to ensure that beneficiary protection issues are embedded into organisation-wide risk management systems; and (c) improving the quality of food assistance programmes through partnerships with UN system agency and civil society partners.</p>	<p><b>Strategy Implementation:</b> Ongoing since September 2018</p> <p><b>Updated Protection Policy:</b> November 2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		The lessons learned from the strategy implementation will be incorporated into the update of the Protection Policy. To date, WFP has had series of country, regional and global consultations with beneficiaries, WFP country offices, partners, Governments and donors to ensure bottom-up input into the updated to the Protection Policy. This will include a new theory of change and an accountability framework to monitor progress/setbacks.	
<p><b><u>Finding 5</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Strategic Management</i></b>  <b>KPI 2.1e: Protection</b>            The Evaluation of WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (May 2018) found mixed results with regard to implementation. There is still a recognised need for further resources to ensure that protection issues are included consistently.</p> <p>Also addresses:</p> <p><b><i>Results</i></b>  <b>*KPI: 9.8: Interventions assessed as having helped improve protection</b>            Although protection is a cross-cutting concern for WFP’s interventions, intended to inform all aspects of WFP’s response, evaluations do not systematically assess the extent that WFP has addressed protection in its interventions.</p>	Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	<p>The update to the WFP Protection Policy and the implementation of key findings from the 2018 Protection Policy Evaluation are well underway. These two complementary and interdependent efforts will help address consistency and coherence in WFP’s approach to achieving protection outcomes in development and humanitarian settings.</p> <p>In additional to currently allocated resources, several interested donors have indicated that they are happy with the approach WFP is taking at global, regional and country levels to meet its obligations and are likely to increase funding for WFP in 2020 and beyond.</p>	<p><b>Strategy Implementation:</b>            Ongoing since September 2018</p> <p><b>Updated Protection Policy:</b> November 2020</p>



**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p><b><u>Finding 6</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Operational Management</i></b>  <b>(The MOPAN methodology does not include a specific KPI for this area; however, this observation was made by the MOPAN Secretariat during the de-brief and launch sessions)</b>            Challenges remain in securing the required numbers and skillsets in the right places. Meeting humanitarian staff requirements is a constant challenge, despite investment in building surge capacity. The number of consultants hired has increased, and the workforce includes a high proportion of short-term staff. Exploring new approaches is therefore essential – one area currently being looked at is the localisation of long-term expertise. Strategic workforce planning tools and guidance were being finalised at the time of this assessment, but these have not yet been applied systematically.</p>	<p>Human Resources Division (HRM)</p>	<p>The Human Resources division (HR) continues to focus on shaping workforce planning prototypes for pilot functions and offer advice to other main functions. The workforce 2020 Corporate Critical Investment (CCI) was approved in 2019, with strong organizational support. The funding supports the transition to a systematic approach to workforce planning across all functions. Data and analytics play a pivotal role in workforce planning. Therefore, the CCI Workforce 2020 will procure an HCM Platform that will ensure access to quality data and analytics needed for workforce planning. The initiative is a joint effort led by functional divisions in partnership with HR. It is anticipated that the project will take several years to implement and fully realize benefits.</p> <p>Fit Pools (Future International Talent Pools) have been built for a number of functions (vulnerability assessment and mapping, security, programme, finance, monitoring and evaluation). These pools provide WFP with a select number of competent candidates for each of these functional areas, who can be recruited and quickly deployed to vacant positions.</p> <p>In addition to maintaining WFP's Emergency Roster which is regularly used to identify pre-selected staff for deployment, HR and staffing coordinators participate in the operational task forces for L-3 and L-2 emergencies to help identify short and long-term staff to fill staffing gaps.</p>	<p>End 2021</p> <p>Completed</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>Progress is being made in the organizational alignment project, which focuses on the development of optimum organizational structures addressing long-term organizational needs for staffing stability. HR reviews grade levels to ensure country offices can attract and retain the people with appropriate skillsets. Forty-two country offices have carried out the organizational alignment review since January 2018. To monitor the impact of the organizational alignment project, the HR Analytics Dashboard monitors the workforce composition in all country offices. Based on the CCI Workforce 2020 investment in HR Technology further improvements in data availability and quality, as well in HR Analytics are anticipated.</p> <p>Corporate guidance, resources and training have been developed and made available to ensure COs are implementing the corporate methodology in a consistent manner.</p>	<p>June 2020</p> <p>Completed</p>
<p><b><u>Finding 7</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Operational Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 3.4HR systems and policies performance based and geared to the achievement of results</b>                      The People Strategy and WFP’s performance management system do not explicitly outline the process for managing</p>	<p>Human Resources Division (HRM)</p>	<p>WFP has agreed on the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) As part of the upcoming enhancements of the PACE process for 2020, the communications and skills development campaign will include a dedicated module on the topic of “what to do in case of disagreement”</li> </ol>	<p>April 2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p>disagreement and complaints relating to staff performance assessments. While management information indicates that the PACE system involves a clear and systematised process for managing disagreements between staff and their management, as well as the existence of a recourse procedure, there is evidence that not all staff experience the process in this way.</p>		<p>2) The new PACE will include a functionality which highlights to the 2<sup>nd</sup> level supervisor when there is a disagreement between the employee and the 1st level supervisor</p> <p>3) As part of the PACE enhancements, the PACE process and online tool will be extended to all contract categories, making WFP the first large UN agency to use the same approach to performance management across all contract categories.</p> <p>The RESPECT Campaign and Staff Relations Outreach missions also indirectly contribute to the quality of the conversations between staff and keep the focus on having respectful interactions and conversations, including as part of the performance management process, and when there are disagreements at work.</p>	
<p><b><u>Finding 8</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Relationship Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 5.3: Capacity analysis informs intervention design and implementation, and strategies to address any weakness found are employed.</b>            Successive Operations Evaluations Syntheses find that WFP’s intervention designs increasingly prioritise capacity development of national partners. This, however, is not yet supported by a clear statement of the capacities of national implementing partners and country capacity assessments are not systematically conducted through joint analysis.</p>	<p>Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)</p>	<p>The National Capacity Index is no longer in use and has been replaced by a more robust and more operationally relevant tool and methodology.</p> <p>Significant progress has been made in this area since the Evaluation of the Capacity Development Policy. A new strategy is being developed and roll-out and adoption of the new approach and tools will follow.</p> <p>Speed and uptake are determined by country office priorities and resources, as new approaches take time to internalise and valorise.</p> <p>The tool and guidance to support national stakeholder capacity assessment ("Capacity Needs Mapping") are grounded in a</p>	<p>November 2020</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>comprehensive Theory of Change for Capacity Strengthening and a robust conceptual model and framework for operationalising capacity strengthening support.</p> <p>The guidance underpinning the capacity assessment process focusses extensively on a participatory, stakeholder-driven process and provides very clear guidance on articulating realistic and measurable capacity outcome statements in which to anchor effective operationalisation.</p> <p>These very clearly address the "what" whilst the capacity strengthening framework clearly articulates the "how" of WFP's support to national stakeholder capacities.</p> <p>After extensive field testing of the latest tools and approach to capacity assessment over the past few years, the core HQ Capacity Strengthening team is articulating an internal Learning and Development plan and an internal Communications Strategy for Capacity Strengthening that will support internal awareness raising of the above and contribute to internal capability development to support effective utilisation of this approach across the organisation. This is an ongoing process of change in organisational behaviour and practice.</p>	Ongoing
<p><b><u>Finding 9</u></b></p> <p><i>Relationship Management</i></p> <p><b>KPI: 5.5: Intervention designs include the analysis of cross-cutting issues (as defined in KPI 2)</b></p>	<p>Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)</p>	<p>The second generation (2G) Country Strategy Plan (CSP) template includes a new section on environmental and social safeguards. CSPs should identify potential negative environmental impacts and mitigations. Reference is made to nine social and environmental standards.</p>	Dec 2019

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation is clear that outcomes and outputs must integrate cross-cutting issues, however, environmental sustainability is lightly integrated.			
<p><b><u>Finding 10</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Relationship Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 5.6: Intervention designs include detailed and realistic measures to ensure sustainability (as defined in KPI 12)</b>  Evaluations find continued weakness in the extent that WFP interventions prepare for transition and sustainability. There are significant gaps in developing and implementing adequate transition strategies</p> <p>Also addresses:  <b><i>Results</i></b>  <b>*KPI: 12.1: Benefits assessed as continuing or likely to continue after project or programme completion or there are effective measures to link the humanitarian relief operations to recovery, resilience and, eventually, to longer-term developmental results</b>  The transition from humanitarian relief operations to longer-term development results are mixed, but overall there is limited likelihood of benefits continuing after the project/programme completion or WFP leaving the context. The plans for transition or handover to national stakeholders</p>	Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	<p>This weakness was noted during several Informal Consultations at the beginning of the Integrated Road Map/Country Strategy Plan (IRM/CSP) process. Countries were advised to strengthen their transition strategies as an aspect of the CSP starting at CSP design -by using the Theory of Change and other forward-looking techniques. The new corporate approach to capacity strengthening (CCS) through new tools, guidance and methodologies is helping to strengthen the sustainability of longer-term results, providing for better and more realistic institutionalisation strategies of activities.</p> <p>WFPs new ten year school feeding strategy builds on past successes at transitioning programs to government systems, and also incorporates the lessons from evaluations and audits that highlight the weaknesses in WFPs approach to transition. Using a more systematic and corporate approach and moving away from ad-hoc transition planning, the strategy has selected 30 WFP county offices in stable countries to design, agree and implement formal handover strategies with the government. WFP will strengthen its ability to engage and influence government decision making and prioritization through better upstream engagement at the country level. It will also strengthen its ability to provide technical assistance to governments and will put in place a new funding strategy to finance these activities throughout the transition. Finally, a review of WFPs existing results</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p>are not always clearly planned and implemented from the outset.</p> <p><b>Results</b>  <b>*12.2: Interventions assessed as having built sufficient institutional and/or community capacity for sustainability, or have been absorbed by government</b>            Although strengthening community institutional capacity is a focus for WFP, results have been limited thus far.</p> <p><b>Results</b>  <b>*KPI: 9.3: Interventions assessed as having contributed to significant changes in national development policies and programmes (policy and capacity impacts), or needed system reforms</b> WFP            has made gradual improvements in its efforts to improve the policy environment over time, but this continues to be an area of weakness, noting missed opportunities for engaging in and influencing national policies and integrating WFP's portfolio into these. Approaches to strengthening national policy frameworks were inconsistent due to the lack of a corporate strategic underpinning, or specific funding for a more coherent approach to support national policy objectives.</p>		<p>framework will lead to a stronger ability to measure and document the results of its transition work.</p> <p>Work on strengthening stakeholder response capacity during emergencies is ongoing. WFP is currently undertaking analyses to better understand the key shifts CSPs lead to in different contexts, including in relation to facilitating sustainable institutionalisation of capacity. These analyses will inform the second generation of CSPs and Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews.</p> <p>WFP will continue its efforts on capacity strengthening to capitalize on best practices to expand its knowledge and replicate where possible. WFP is looking at further strengthening how Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews identify policy gaps and other critical functional and technical capacities and to make recommendations to address these.</p> <p>The CSP process combined with a Zero Hunger Strategic Review and the SDG17 rationale which underpins Strategic Goal 2, provides WFP with a 15-year window and a 5-year programme cycle to engage more substantially with national, development and IFI actors. This will assist WFP in embedding its interventions in a longer-term programme which includes carefully planned institutional capacity strengthening. The vision of the Secretary General and subsequent UN reforms being rolled out require stronger internal and external integration across the humanitarian-development-peace community.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>WFP has increased engagement in more comprehensive analyses of context and structured dialogues with stakeholders to identify gaps in individual, organizational and enabling environment capacities. This involves, inter alia, a systematic review of prevailing regulatory instruments and conditions, thus identifying potential entry points for WFP policy advisory support.</p> <p>A rigorous and systematic approach to capacity strengthening has been adopted through the programme definition, design and delivery phases. WFP is demonstrating a serious corporate commitment to contributing to sustained changes in stakeholder system and service performance through its capacity strengthening support.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Completed</p>
<p><b><u>Finding 11</u></b></p> <p><i>Relationship Management</i>  <b>KPI: 6.4: Strategies or designs identify synergies, to encourage leverage/catalytic use of resources and avoid fragmentation</b>  WFP needs a comprehensive forward-looking strategy to partner with the private sector.</p>	<p>Partnerships and Advocacy Department (PA)</p>	<p>Throughout 2019, WFP laid the groundwork for a new Private Sector Partnership and Fundraising Strategy which aligns with WFP’s goal of diversifying funding resources and leveraging the impact of our government donors through partnerships with companies at the global and local level. WFP’s Executive Board approved the strategy in November 2019.</p>	<p>Completed Nov 2019</p>
<p><b><u>Finding 12</u></b></p> <p><i>Relationship Management</i>  <b>KPI: 6.5: Key business practices (planning, design, implementation, monitoring and</b></p>	<p>Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO) in</p>	<p>The ongoing UN Reform process will align WFP’s Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) with the new United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF, or ex-UNDAF). In this context, WFP will align its programme cycle with other UN system agencies and, in the context of the Reform, undertake common analysis with sister UN agencies of the drivers of food insecurity and malnutrition, develop</p>	<p>2019-2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p><b>reporting) co-ordinated with other relevant partners (donors, UN agencies, etc.)</b> Full alignment of WFP planning cycles to those of the government, sister agencies and other key strategic frameworks in countries is still a work in progress. While WFP participates in joint evaluations, these are not widely commissioned</p>	<p>collaboration with Office of Evaluation (OEV)</p>	<p>collective outcomes, and develop UN-wide benchmarks against which to measure performance against the SDG goals and national priorities. WFP has already begun the process of developing guidance for country offices on how to position the organisation at country level vis-à-vis national priorities as well as forging stronger partnerships with dual mandated agencies such as UNICEF and WHO.</p> <p>Reflecting the wider contextual changes and increasing demand for system-wide and inter-agency collaboration on evaluation, WFP will continue to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explore further opportunities for joint evaluations joint decentralized evaluations with other United Nations agencies, NGOs and government partners. In addition, the office of evaluations (OEV) will develop guidance to joint evaluation and contribute to improved practice in joint evaluations.</li> <li>• take a leading role in raising the profile, coverage and quality of humanitarian evaluation in partnership with the IASC inter-agency humanitarian evaluation mechanism, UNEG and others. This will need to be balanced with the need to assure appropriate coverage of WFP specific evaluations to meet accountability and learning needs of WFP management and funders.</li> </ul> <p>Progress will be monitored and reported in the Annual Evaluation Report presented to the Executive Board each year.</p>	



**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p><b><u>Finding 13</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Relationship Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 6.7: Clear standards and procedures for accountability to beneficiaries implemented</b>            Clear standards and procedures for accountability to beneficiaries through beneficiary management guidance and more systematic reporting on cross-cutting results need to be implemented</p>	<p>Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)</p>	<p>The update of WFP’s Protection Policy and associated operational strategy has explicitly internalized Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) as a core pillar of focus. While there are specific tools and policy guidance on how to systematically incorporate beneficiary voices into the design and implementation of food assistance programmes, WFP is also recognized as a global leader in the design and establishment of beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFMs).</p> <p>CFMs—both WFP owned and those that are inter-agency platforms—are an effective and safe way to garner feedback from beneficiaries on the quality of WFP and partner programmes, constraints faced by beneficiaries in accessing key services, and a tool through which WFP programmes can be adapted and changed to better meet the needs of those they serve.</p> <p>WFP has embarked on a global CFM Standardization Project for all country offices (COs) that will: (a) establish new or adapt existing CFMs with minimum programmatic and technological standards to ensure <i>functionality</i>; (b) develop CO level SoPs on data capture, storage, protection and sharing; and (c) support management oversight, decision-making and reporting on how our operations are meeting/not meeting the needs of beneficiaries. To date over 45 COs have participated in regional standard setting workshops.</p> <p>Efforts to strengthen WFP’s corporate reporting system to better capture qualitative aspects of AAP have resulted in an update of its</p>	<p><b>CFM Standardization Project: end 2020</b></p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		corporate Indicators. performance on receipt and utilization of feedback from affected people, as well as reinforcing the key performance indicator on complaints and feedback mechanisms.	Completed Nov 2018
<p><b><u>Finding 14</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Relationship Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 6.9: Deployment of knowledge base to support programming adjustments, policy dialogue and/or advocacy</b>            There is an acknowledged gap in WFP’s corporate knowledge production and management.</p>	Innovation and Knowledge Management Division (INK) in collaboration with South-South Cooperation (SSC)	<p>Leveraging its Innovation and Knowledge Management division, WFP is currently conducting a corporate survey of knowledge management resources and assessing the most appropriate application of future corporate efforts.</p> <p>There is specific exploration of a pilot within one Regional Bureau to further refine and improve knowledge production and management practices, and then apply learnings to other regions and divisions.</p> <p>In order to support WFP country offices to facilitate knowledge exchanges between host governments, the South-South Cooperation (SSC) team developed the first prototype of a Tableau-based platform that provides a global overview of solutions (good practices, innovation, lessons learned, and experiences) that can be transferred amongst countries in the Global South. The South-South platform also identifies opportunities for knowledge exchanges building on needs and requests coming from host governments for WFP support in SSC.</p> <p>The South-South cooperation team is working together with the existing network of WFP Centres of Excellence in Brazil, China and CERFAM, and taking a step to coordinate country-level initiatives to establish technology-based knowledge hubs and platforms</p>	<p>Jan 2020</p> <p>Feb 2020</p> <p>Completed Oct 2019</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p><b><u>Finding 15</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Performance Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 7.1: Leadership ensures application of an organisation-wide RBM approach</b>                      The CRF is a work in progress. It remains to be seen how the Indicator Compendium guidance will be used in planning and programming. Further work is required to align the existing tools once the CRF is revised, and it remains to be seen how effectively these tools will be used.</p>	Performance Management and Reporting Division (RMP)	The Corporate Results framework (CRF) revision was approved in November 2018 and accompanied by updates to guidance, tools and the indicator compendium. Webinars conducted by programme technical units for regional bureaux (RBs) and country offices (COs) Monitoring and Evaluation Officers. These are available on the WeLearn platform.  All logframes are realigned to the revised CRF for 2019 reporting.	Completed Dec 2018   Completed April 2019
<p><b><u>Finding 16</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Performance Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 7.3: Results targets set based on a sound evidence base and logic</b>                      There is still work to be done to ensure that the outcome and output categories are broad enough to capture the linkages between interventions and outcomes at the level of country strategic plans. The indicators are not sufficiently broad ranging to capture the intended results. The CRF is currently under significant revision.</p>	Performance Management and Reporting Division (RMP)	The revised Corporate Results Framework (CRF): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Includes additional outcome and output indicators to better reflect the different results to which WFP contributes within each broad Strategic Outcome category. This includes new cross-cutting indicators on accountability to affected populations, protection, climate change, an output indicator on disabilities, and new capacity strengthening indicators;</li> <li>b) Provides a list of SDG related indicators and addition of new indicators in areas where gaps have been identified.</li> <li>c) Links between interventions and outcomes in Country Strategy Plans (CSP) are further reflected CSP narratives and Annual Country Reports; Mid-Term Reviews of the first generation of Country Strategic Plans include the qualitative and quantitative analysis of achievements on the indicators included in the CSP logical framework.</li> </ul>	Completed Dec 2018

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p><b><u>Finding 17</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Performance Management</i></b>  <b>KPI: 7.4: Monitoring systems generate high quality and useful performance data</b>            Work is underway in WFP to further develop and test outcome level indicators that can be used at the national level for the CRF and further work will be needed to develop systems in line with this revised framework. The capacity to be able to carry out monitoring effectively at the country level still needs to be strengthened. Considerable work will be needed once the CRF is revised to ensure that data collected is adequate to provide a clear picture of corporate results.</p>	<p>Performance Management and Reporting Division (RMP) in collaboration with Research Assessment and Monitoring Division (RAM)</p>	<p>A Corporate Monitoring Strategy (2018-2021) was developed highlighting three priority areas of work related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) adequate monitoring expertise;</li> <li>b) financial commitment;</li> <li>c) functional capacity.</li> </ul> <p>It addresses observed weaknesses in WFP's monitoring while moving towards an optimised monitoring function defined by credibility, relevance and use and through robust and evidence-based operational planning, design and implementation.</p> <p>The Corporate Results Framework (CRF) was revised to include new improved indicators on capacity strengthening, support to small holder farmers, food systems, cross-cutting indicators (protection, accountability to affected populations).</p> <p>Additional guidance on qualitative monitoring data analysis has been developed. Face-to-face workshops were conducted in two regions to enhance qualitative monitoring and analysis. A related standard training package is being developed with planned e-training modules.</p> <p>A Monitoring Planning and Coverage tool is being developed to enhance planning and oversight on the monitoring coverage and monitoring/assessment budgets.</p> <p>Country level monitoring capacity and competencies will be addressed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Workforce analysis</li> </ul>	<p>Completed Jan 2018</p> <p>Completed Nov 2018</p> <p>Q4 2019</p> <p>Q4 2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>b) Monitoring and Evaluation Fitpool exercise c) Monitoring requirements incorporated in the CSP budget and Country office MRE plan.</p> <p>Enhancements to COMET will be implemented to improve data quality and reduce errors.</p> <p>To improve monitoring data the revised CRF provides further development of cross-cutting indicators.</p>	<p>Completed Q2 2019 End November 2019 Completed 2018</p> <p>End Nov 2019</p> <p>Completed Nov 2018</p>
<p><b><u>Finding 18</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Performance Management</i></b> <b>*KPI: 7.5: Performance data transparently applied in planning and decision-making</b></p> <p>WFP has considerably strengthened its commitment to a results-based focus, but continued attention is needed to ensure the quality and use of data on which the system is based. It was felt that categories and indicators, in particular, were insufficiently comprehensive to capture the intended results of WFP’s work.</p>	<p>Performance Management and Reporting Division (RMP) in collaboration with Research Assessment and Monitoring Division (RAM) and Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)</p>	<p>Country Strategic Plan (CSP) Mid-term reviews will be focused on performance and mainly implemented for country office (CO) learning, with guidance outlining the establishment of mechanisms to ensure adequate follow-up for the recommendations. The recommendations will be monitored and tracked through the R2 (a corporate platform to track status of recommendations from risks/audits/evaluations).</p> <p>When the first round of Mid-term reviews is completed, RMP will work with Knowledge Management and Programme and Policy Development to ensure that the lessons learned are captured and available at all levels of the organization.</p> <p>CSP Mid-term reviews will provide a focus on performance at the output level with the report outlining adjustments to be made to implementation if/as required.</p>	<p>End March 2020</p> <p>End March 2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
		<p>A COMET Control Panel has been developed to improve headquarters, regional bureaux and country office (CO) oversight on CO monitoring data, stimulate regular data entry and validation, and thus improve the quality of data.</p> <p>For process, output and outcome monitoring at country level, COs have their own systems in place to ensure that issues are shared with key stakeholders and addressed in a timely and effective manner. For process monitoring, many countries also have follow-up action matrices which are populated and assign responsibilities. Some use different systems such as ODK/ONA to ensure that any process monitoring findings are being acted upon and tracked. Output data is closely followed up, with distribution reports completed monthly and outcome information reported on through regular monitoring, surveys (including PDM) and corporate reports.</p> <p>WFP is working on systematizing approaches and tools for the use of performance data for programming and operational decision-making.</p>	<p>Completed Nov 2019</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>Q4 2020</p>
<p><b><u>Finding 19</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Performance Management</i></b></p> <p><b>KPI: 8.4: Mandatory demonstration of the evidence base to design new interventions.</b></p> <p>While there is reporting on the overall commitment to mainstream lessons learned in the Annual Performance</p>	<p>Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO) in collaboration with Office of</p>	<p>In addition to the corporate and decentralized evaluations that offer evidence to support new programmes, Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) are also underpinned by the Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews. The latter are government-led and provide the national context analysis and evidence to identify and prioritise the planned CSP activities. The Strategic Reviews are complemented with specific impact assessments that serve as a baseline for new interventions (i.e., micro-insurance, blockchain), or proof of concept efforts. As the</p>	<p>2019-2020</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p>Reports, neither the number nor proportion of new operations that draw on lessons is recorded or made public.</p>	<p>Evaluation (OEV)</p>	<p>Integrated Road Map (IRM) becomes a more mature process, the premium put on evidence and analytics is expected to increase, not only for CSP design, but also to measure performance. To better facilitate assessment of WFP’s contribution to development results, WFP will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• introduce a KPI for gauging whether the use of evidence in a CSP or interim CSP meets or exceeds requirements.</li> <li>• continue to review CSP and ICSPs to ensure that centralized and decentralized evaluations are planned and budgeted and that the evaluation evidence is used to inform the design of the CSPs.</li> <li>• continue to develop capacities for synthesizing evaluative evidence in order to enhance its use and will build on its experience by producing further products specifically to address evidence gaps</li> </ul> <p>Progress will be monitored and reported in the Annual Evaluation Report presented to the Executive Board each year.</p> <p>In the second generation (2G) CSP template a new section has been included on achievements and lessons-learned where main evaluation findings and achievements under the previous CSP cycle will be summarized and linked to proposed changes for the current CSP cycle.</p>	<p>Dec 2019</p>
<p><b><u>Finding 20</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Performance Management</i></b></p> <p><b>*KPI: 8.5: Poorly performing interventions proactively identified, tracked and addressed</b></p>	<p>Performance Management and Reporting Division (RMP)</p>	<p>The revised Corporate Results framework (CRF) further develops the approach to management performance which is measured by functional area. Business processes are grouped by expertise under functional areas enabling the implementation of CSP activities. The revised CRF includes Key Performance Indicators to track results on implementation progress for country strategic plans. These</p>	<p>Completed Dec 2018</p>

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE:  
WFP INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT Report (2017 – 2018) MOPAN**

Synthesised Findings	Action by	Management response and action taken/to be taken	Implementation deadline
<p>The Corporate Monitoring Strategy Workstream on Utilising Monitoring states that APPs should be conducted six-monthly to assess progress to date, there is no detail provided specifically on poor performance, with the statement rather that, where targets had not been met, some progress had been made.</p>		<p>indicators measure the percentage level implementation, and outcome and output indicators that achieve targets or are on track. Annual Performance Plans are updated at a mid-year review and articulate the deliverables and resources required in each functional area to support program implementation.</p> <p>The CSP Mid-term reviews will highlight areas of poor performance in order to address and correct issues as appropriate. The first round of mid-term reviews is scheduled June to December 2019. A Lessons Learned workshop will be held in Q1 2020 with findings to inform the second generation of CSP's and the Strategic Plan mid-term review.</p> <p>The management KPI's will be displayed in the WFP dashboard as well as in the COMET Control Panel for enhanced oversight by headquarters, regional bureaux and country offices.</p> <p>Annual Performance Report (APR) reporting for 2019 will have a stronger focus on identifying and disseminating information on poorly performing programme and management areas.</p>	<p>March 2020</p> <p>Nov 2019</p> <p>June 2020</p>