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Executive summary

INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION FEATURES

1. The evaluation of the WFP Gender Policy (2015–2020) and the mechanisms developed to implement it is meant to support both accountability and learning. It covers the period from 2015 to 2019 and addresses three standard policy evaluation questions:
   - How good is the policy?
   - What were the results of the policy?
   - Why has the policy produced the results that have been observed?

2. The cross-cutting nature of the topic means that the intended users of the evaluation are all WFP divisions and units at headquarters and in regional bureaux, country offices and the field, as well as WFP’s Executive Board, donors and government and cooperating partners.

3. The evaluation was conducted between July 2019 and March 2020. It used a theory-based approach based on the gender policy theory of change and data collected at the global, regional and country levels through the following lines of inquiry:
   - twelve country assessments, including five field missions and seven desk reviews;
   - a “deep dive” analysis of gender mainstreaming across three programme areas: unconditional resource transfers, asset creation and livelihood support and prevention of malnutrition;
   - a benchmarking analysis using policies of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency and Oxfam;
   - key informant interviews with 212 internal and external stakeholders (59 percent women), focus group discussions with beneficiaries (75 women, 40 men) and a focus group discussion with Executive Board member representatives (8 women, 4 men);
   - an electronic survey of Gender Results Network members that yielded responses from 131 individuals, for a response rate of 20 percent (60 percent female);
   - a review of corporate data sets, including the country office tool for managing (programme operations) effectively (COMET), annual country reports and annual performance reports; and
   - a review of over 400 corporate-, regional- and country-level documents.

4. Limitations included a lack of WFP reporting against the gender policy objectives or established minimum standards; cancellation of the Lebanon country visit due to insecurity; and incomplete data sets for 2019. These limitations did not affect the quality of the data collection process or the validity of the findings.

CONTEXT

5. The WFP Gender Policy (2015–2020) was approved in May 2015. Its primary goal is “to enable WFP to integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) into all of its work and activities, to ensure that the different food security and nutrition needs of women, men, girls and boys are addressed”. It advocates a transformative approach to GEWE to address unequal gender relations and promote sharing of power, control of resources and decision making between women and men. The policy has four objectives:
   - Food assistance adapted to different needs. Women, men, girls and boys benefit from

---

1 No data from the annual country reports or the annual performance report for 2019 were available at the time of the preparation of this report.

food assistance programmes and activities that are adapted to their different needs and capacities.

ii) Equal participation. Women and men participate equally in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of gender-transformative food security and nutrition programmes and policies.

iii) Decision making by women and girls. Women and girls have increased power in decision making regarding food security and nutrition in households, communities and societies.

iv) Gender and protection. Food assistance does no harm to the safety, dignity or integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it and is provided in ways that respect their rights.

6. To transform the gender policy goal and objectives into a set of actions and accountabilities, in 2016 WFP introduced the Gender Action Plan, which sets out implementation arrangements in two “layers”. Layer 1 focuses on driving gender equality programming results in relation to the four policy objectives. Layer 2 details the internal work on organizational change and programme processes to be undertaken by WFP to ensure that the results are achieved (figure 1).

**Figure 1. Gender Action Plan theory of change**

![Figure 1. Gender Action Plan theory of change](image-url)
KEY FINDINGS

7. This section provides the key evaluation findings for each evaluation question.

How good is the policy?

8. The WFP Gender Policy (2015–2020) provides a clear strategic vision, purpose, structure, framework and set of high-level objectives that have been widely communicated across WFP and that remain relevant to WFP's dual mandate of ending hunger and saving lives. The policy is relevant to the objectives of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021); however, the theory of change does not articulate the interlinkages between organizational change and programme processes or their contribution to gender policy objectives.

9. The Gender Policy (2015–2020) builds directly on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the 2014 evaluation of the WFP Gender Policy (2009) by using a “transformative” programmatic lens and assigning responsibilities to “business owners” for the delivery of programme processes and organizational change. The policy recognizes the importance of leadership and capacity strengthening across the organization and the need to incorporate gender into WFP’s strategic and programme cycle.

10. The policy is coherent, strategic and partially aligned with the policies of comparator organizations and has demonstrated innovation with the development of the Gender Action Plan and its associated accountabilities. While WFP has adopted a largely instrumentalist approach, this has been appropriate to its mandate.3

11. The policy was informed by and remains directly or indirectly relevant to a series of international gender norms and standards, including those in the Beijing Declaration and the 2030 Agenda. It has remained relevant and appropriate to the work of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), with WFP being one of two agencies to pilot and adapt the IASC Gender with Age Marker, in 2019.

12. The majority of WFP corporate policies developed since 2015 have undertaken gender analyses and incorporated GEWE concepts. Attention is required to ensure that this continues in future policies, the next WFP strategic plan and second-generation country strategic plans (CSPs) as the international community enters the Decade of Action to deliver the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

13. Both the policy and the action plan recognize the importance of regional gender strategies and gender analysis in ensuring that gender mainstreaming is adapted to the local context. There is, however, considerable overlap between the policy's objectives, the indicators in the Corporate Results Framework (2017–2021) and the Gender Action Plan and minimum standards, creating confusion for country offices about what data should be collected, when and for what purpose, as well as which framework should be used for reporting on GEWE-related activities.

What were the results of the policy?

14. This section provides an assessment of progress towards achievement of the four objectives of the WFP Gender Policy (2015–2020), as well as the programme processes and areas of organizational change defined in the policy.

3While each of the four organizations aspires to achieve gender equality and promote women’s empowerment, the approaches of WFP and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees are oriented towards addressing needs while those of Oxfam and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency are focused on rights.
Results for the objectives of the Gender Policy (2015–2020)

Objective I: food assistance adapted to different needs

15. WFP programmes are not consistently adapted to the specific needs of women, men, girls and boys. While there are examples of programmes in which food assistance has been differentiated, including the targeting of women for cash-based transfers in several countries and the targeting of “at-risk” refugees such as young children and pregnant and lactating women with general food assistance, evidence of significant progress is limited. This is due in part to a lack of reporting on key cross-cutting indicators (for example, “type of transfer by sex and age”) and limited data collection at the individual level. These weaknesses impede robust gender analyses that assess intra-household dynamics affecting the use of WFP food assistance and represent a serious shortcoming in WFP’s monitoring systems.

Objective II: equal participation

16. WFP programmes that support equal participation include community-based participatory planning and the management and oversight of general food distribution committees. The evaluation found that the equal participation of women and men in programme design and the use of sex- and age- disaggregated data was not yet systematic and that equity concerns were not sufficiently considered. A review of country office data found that a majority of offices were not collecting age-related data for their projects, suggesting that such data are only used in programmes like school feeding and nutrition where they are directly relevant. This corroborates findings from past evaluations that criticized WFP for using corporate indicators that quantify the participation of women and men without analysing power structures or changes in gender-based roles, thereby failing to fully capture transformative change.

Objective III: decision making by women and girls

17. WFP supports a growing number of programmes where women, and to a lesser extent girls, have been afforded new opportunities to engage in decision making, including in asset creation and livelihoods, nutrition and school-feeding programmes. WFP targets both women and men with tailored messages aimed at improving intra-household food distribution and dietary diversity. Community-based participatory planning exercises have allowed women to identify community assets that help reduce their unpaid workloads. There is also evidence that women who received training in group farming, value chain facilitation, savings-and-loan groups or latrine construction felt that such activities provided the basis for wider transformative changes in their decision making status in the household and community. WFP needs to ensure that all programmes emphasize the transformative opportunities for increasing the decision making power of women and girls without compromising health and nutrition outcomes.

Objective IV: gender and protection

18. WFP has made moderate progress towards ensuring that food assistance does no harm to the safety, dignity or integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it. Although the majority of women and men report being able to access WFP assistance without protection challenges, this data is undermined by the fact that relatively few assisted people are kept informed of WFP programme interventions, by a weak analytical base and by confusion over the overlapping concepts of gender and protection. Key informants at all levels expressed concern that there was a lack of gender analysis to inform, and provide the basis for oversight over, gender and protection strategies; that concern was also highlighted in other independent evaluations. For instance, the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network concluded in a 2017–2018 assessment that WFP was paying insufficient attention to protection issues such as gender-based violence and refugee-host tensions.

Efforts are being made to improve data collection at the individual level, with the introduction of the new “Gender Equality for Food Security” measure, the individual deprivation measure and a gender-responsive monitoring pilot project.
Intermediary results for programme processes

19. Despite improvements in the systematic collection of sex-disaggregated data, some WFP programmes are still not informed by it. Only 70 percent of projects and CSPs reported on cross-cutting gender indicators in 2018. Where data is collected, it is often not complemented by a qualitative understanding of GEWE; many programmes still view the gathering of data on the “sex of the household head” as synonymous with the use of sex-disaggregated data, to the exclusion of information on other household members.

20. WFP has established clear linkages between the Gender Policy (2015–2020) and CSPs through implementation of the IASC Gender with Age Marker; however, there is a tendency to address GEWE at a generic level rather than in a manner tailored to the specific operational context. While the application of the IASC Gender with Age Marker has contributed to CSP design, the process has often been mechanistic and accountability-focused rather than a dynamic driver of gender mainstreaming.

21. WFP has made significant progress in developing standardized guidance that supports the mainstreaming of GEWE and provides the basis for capacity strengthening efforts, in particular the gender toolkit developed in 2019, guidance on nutrition-sensitive programming developed in 2017 and the food assistance for assets guidance manual developed in 2016. Full integration is yet to be achieved across all policies, action plans and guidelines, however, because not all guidance is shared with the Gender Office for review.

Intermediary results for areas of organizational change

22. Positive shifts in WFP policies and hiring practices to support gender equality since 2015 include commitments by the Executive Director that have been translated into activities to promote gender parity. While these efforts generated some improvement overall (women constituted 38 percent of WFP’s total workforce in 2019, up from 32 percent in 2015), progress has been slow at the P-3, P-5, D-1 and D-2 levels, in certain functions in, for example, the Supply Chain Operations Division and the Information Technology Division, in emergency settings and among national employees (36 percent). Evidence from the 2018 global staff survey and the survey of Gender Results Network members indicates that women employees’ perceptions of gender inequality differ from those of men employees.

23. In the area of capacity development progress is evident in the creation and promotion of the gender toolkit, training programmes and e-learning; however, country-level capacity strengthening has been less encouraging due to a lack of training tailored to on-the-job needs and limited financial commitments for WFP gender advisor positions. WFP has made strides in building and disseminating tools and good practices that support GEWE alongside relevant thematic studies, but many regional bureaux and country offices view themselves as the users of overly theoretical subject matter rather than creators of context-driven knowledge and communications materials. Key informants expressed a strong need for capacity strengthening that uses these materials to integrate gender into programme-specific training and context-specific support.

24. Despite steady engagement by WFP with corporate partners at the global and regional levels, particularly the other Rome-based agencies, the number of corporate-level gender equality partnerships has fallen, from nine in 2016 to seven in 2019, due to financial and staff resource limitations in the Gender Office. Progress at the operational level has been more positive and has focused on the inclusion of GEWE provisions in revised field-level agreements with cooperating partners. Guidance on gender mainstreaming through government partnerships also remains limited, leaving informants in country offices and regional bureaux unclear about WFP’s role in strengthening government contributions to GEWE, particularly with respect to WFP’s strategic shift from delivering to enabling.

25. While WFP’s financial tracking system for gender equality is undergoing review, evidence suggests that the organization is falling significantly behind its 15 percent target for corporate funding for GEWE across the organization. Systems for gender expenditure tracking were withdrawn in 2017, and although a new approach is being tested, WFP – like all United Nations entities – remains without an accurate picture of resources for GEWE and consequently does not meet the requirements of the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN SWAP) performance indicator 9, on financial resource tracking.
26. Programme support and administrative budget allocations for securing gender expertise and supporting gender mainstreaming have fallen during a period of significant growth in overall WFP contribution income (see figure 2). While there were more gender positions at the end of 2019 than in 2015, only 3 regional bureaux and 21 country offices had dedicated gender advisors. When combined with the number of people working at headquarters in the Gender Office, this means there were 30 people focusing on GEWE out of 18,000 WFP employees. While the Gender Results Network has 700 members, it does not make up for this significant capacity gap.

Figure 2. WFP programme support and administrative budget allocations for the Gender Office in contrast with WFP contribution revenue (2016–2020)

27. WFP has been largely successful in meeting oversight standards that reinforce high-level accountabilities for GEWE through mechanisms such as UN SWAP, “exceeding requirements” for nine of 16 UN SWAP performance indicators in 2019, “meeting requirements” for four others and “approaching requirements” for the remaining three.

28. UN SWAP has acted as a driver for the integration of gender into evaluations, as reflected in the WFP Evaluation Policy (2016–2021). While independent quality assessments of evaluations highlighted weaknesses in the handling of GEWE in 2016 and 2017, substantial improvements were made in 2018 and 2019, including the commissioning of gender-focused evaluations in 2019.

29. The recent inclusion of gender in the internal audit programme is also welcome, as prior to 2019 very few country office or thematic audit reports included gender risk analyses. Although WFP risk registers have made significant improvements in citing the protection needs of beneficiaries (operational risk) and workforce planning, gender analysis in strategic, operational and fiduciary risk assessments remains limited.

Why has the policy produced the results that have been observed?

30. The Gender Office and regional gender advisors have made significant steps in supporting the integration of gender equality perspectives into CSPs, high-level strategy documents and guidance materials.
Bottlenecks persist in some regional bureaux and country offices with respect to resourcing and support for regional gender strategies, gender advisors and capacity strengthening for WFP country and field-level employees. Challenges in hiring and retaining gender advisors include the lack of a structured career pathway for national gender advisors and the rotation of senior gender advisors. These challenges dilute the organization's ability to sustain momentum in gender mainstreaming and capacity strengthening.

31. WFP is to be commended for anticipating external requirements to address gender parity in the United Nations system as prioritized by the Secretary-General and having built on external requirements by identifying targets for all country offices and functional areas in the 2018 gender parity action plan. While WFP has focused on a corporate push towards gender parity among WFP staff, however, human-resource-related investments in other areas that would accelerate wider contributions to gender equality (e.g. attention to the burden of unpaid care and domestic work borne by women or the retention of women employees) are comparatively limited, contributing to differing perceptions of progress between women and men employees, as noted in the 2018 global staff survey.

32. Despite significant resource constraints, the Gender Office has provided sustained leadership by establishing the Gender Results Network and developing online training materials. There is substantial evidence that the Gender Transformation Programme and Gender Results Network have helped catalyse change in several country offices by strengthening capacity among WFP employees and partners; however, across all country and field offices, GEWE capacity strengthening approaches are often viewed as too theoretical and insufficiently tailored to everyday needs.

33. There is strong evidence indicating that while WFP has developed gender-targeted knowledge products, their interpretation and use remain limited due to insufficient integration of GEWE into WFP corporate communications.

34. WFP’s failure to fully meet the financial commitments set out in the Gender Action Plan has limited the application of the Gender Policy (2015–2020). Gender Office support for resource mobilization at the country level has not led to shifts in extrabudgetary funding for GEWE.

35. WFP has successfully adopted and used the UN SWAP process to reinforce gender-related accountabilities, with close alignment of UN SWAP, the Gender Action Plan and the Gender Transformation Programme. Attention to gender in WFP evaluations and the integration of gender risk analysis into internal audits are positive shifts and offer a model for enterprise risk management where consideration of gender is weak.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1: Relevance and appropriateness of the Gender Policy (2015–2020)

36. The Gender Policy (2015–2020) remains relevant to WFP’s commitments to the 2030 Agenda, the SDGs and United Nations reform but requires an update to meet the demands of the evolving global context. The policy echoes and aligns with external normative commitments on GEWE, while recognizing the role of regional bureaux and country offices by reflecting the understanding that “context is everything”. The policy’s objectives are coherent and applicable to most operational areas but do not reflect shifts in global and organizational thinking regarding transformational change and intersectionality; nor do they fully reflect WFP’s transition from saving lives to changing lives. The policy needs to be updated to support WFP’s work at the country level firmly within United Nations system efforts to accelerate support for government partners in their efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, which have been articulated through the Decade of Action to deliver the SDGs.

Conclusion 2: WFP culture and leadership

37. WFP has shown leadership in establishing frameworks to support its work on GEWE, including efforts to address gender parity. While this has led to positive change, the leadership focus on gender parity has overshadowed other aspects of the Gender Policy (2015–2020) and presents a barrier to strengthening WFP’s overall approach to GEWE.
Conclusion 3: Building of effective programmes

38. Until the good practices evident in the organization are taken up by all WFP country offices and GEWE principles are translated into pathways for change tailored to the specific needs of women, men, girls and boys in the national context, the Gender Policy (2015–2020) will remain theoretical and distant from the practical day-to-day concerns of many country and field offices. WFP is missing opportunities to ground the design and development of programmes in a comprehensive contextual analysis of the needs and interests of women, men, girls and boys and the pathways needed to deliver the four objectives of the policy. Consequently, country offices often struggle to translate GEWE concepts into clear actions tailored to their individual CSP strategic outcomes.

Conclusion 4: Enabling environment for gender mainstreaming

39. Positive efforts to mainstream gender across WFP’s organizational functions have to some extent complemented and contributed to a more conducive enabling environment for GEWE at WFP. However, performance in some areas of organizational change is more significant than for others. Capacity building and, to a lesser extent, evaluation and oversight have made positive contributions to the implementation of the Gender Policy (2015–2020), whereas the areas of human and financial resources have not yet reached the established targets. WFP’s attention to GEWE is variable and reliant on the individual decision making of regional and country directors to lead gender mainstreaming, rather than ensuring that the accountabilities of all senior managers to the Gender Action Plan are upheld.

Conclusion 5: Human resources for strengthening WFP’s gender architecture

40. WFP’s human resource investments have not met the targets set out in the Gender Policy (2015–2020). In order to ensure that GEWE is integral to the culture, learning and results of the organization, WFP needs to properly resource and support its gender architecture in order to operationalize the tools that exist and build the capacities of its employees at all levels.

Conclusion 6: Financial resources at all levels of the organization

41. Although WFP has been successful in developing regional gender strategies and action plans aligned with those strategies, implementation has been held back by inadequate financial resources and capacity for the decentralized delivery of the Gender Policy (2015–2020). In response to the increasing scale of WFP operations and high level of demand for gender-related support, the reduction in funding allocated to the Gender Office and to regional bureaux for the implementation of regional gender strategies should be a concern for WFP decision makers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

42. The recommendations below build upon the many positive changes that have begun to take root since the introduction of the Gender Policy (2015–2020) and aim to catalyse increased investment in key areas to support the acceleration of WFP’s efforts towards GEWE. The first two recommendations set the strategic direction and resourcing framework and should be acted upon as top priorities. The other recommendations should be addressed systematically in order to strengthen the leadership, accountability and human resources required to deliver the policy and to ensure that gender is fully mainstreamed into the development of second-generation CSPs.
# Strategic recommendations

## Recommendation 1: WFP should update the Gender Policy (2015–2020) to accelerate progress towards the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and strengthen WFP’s work on promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the context of food security and nutrition.

### a. The update should:
- retain the overall structure, narrative and commitments of the WFP Gender Policy (2015–2020) and alignment with the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and reaffirm the importance of accountability as described in the Gender Action Plan (2015–2020);
- review and reframe the governance, leadership, financial, partnership and employee (particularly gender advisor) benchmarks used in gender policy implementation;
- enhance the accountability of WFP regional bureaux and country offices for accelerating the fulfilment of corporate gender commitments;
- use progressive language that seeks to “leave no-one behind” while recognizing that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be possible across all contexts; and
- include an intermediary objective for an enabling environment created by WFP’s areas of organizational change to support programme processes and humanitarian operations.

In updating the Gender Policy (2015–2020), WFP should further:

### b. revise the policy’s theory of change through a participatory and consultative process to articulate the interrelationships between the areas of organizational change, programme processes and the policy objectives, as well as the steps that should be taken to ensure that WFP programmes and operations contribute more to gender equality and women’s empowerment;

### c. ensure coordination and collaboration to incorporate a gender mainstreaming approach in the next strategic plan as a core part of WFP’s enabling role for zero hunger;

### d. ensure that all WFP programme technical guidance (e.g. for cash-based transfers and general food distribution, school feeding, nutrition, resilient livelihoods) is updated in relation to its contributions to gender equality or that a technical note is provided for guidelines not up for review, with specific examples to illustrate how gender equality and women’s empowerment can be used to shape effective, efficient, equitable and empowering WFP programming; and

### e. develop and implement a communication and dissemination plan for promoting the updated policy that highlights and explains the importance of gender to WFP’s mandate and to all its employees, thereby setting the “tone from the top”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, responsibility and deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 1: WFP should update the Gender Policy (2015–2020) to accelerate progress towards the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and strengthen WFP’s work on promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the context of food security and nutrition.</td>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility: Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development Department (PD), with the support of the leadership group and regional directors and in consultation with the Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline: June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 2: WFP should allocate sufficient programme support and administrative budget to implement its corporate commitments, including the work of the Gender Office and implementation of the regional gender strategies, and develop strategies to mobilize extrabudgetary and project funding, including through operational and strategic partnerships, in line with United Nations reform.

a) As WFP continues to mainstream gender into its work it should review the balance of extrabudgetary and programme support and administrative budget funding for securing crucial gender advisor positions and resources at all levels of the organization.

b) WFP should expand its partnerships and funding for gender mainstreaming and targeted programming by building on existing good practices, in line with donor expectations and corporate priorities regarding the need for WFP to adapt to the changing global context and the evolving funding landscape.

c) WFP should ensure that there is an effective corporate mechanism for tracking gender-related planning and expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority, responsibility and deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility: Assistant Executive Director of PD, with the support of regional directors, the Assistant Executive Director of the Partnerships and Advocacy Department (PA) and the Assistant Executive Director of the Resource Management Department (RM) and in consultation with the Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline: June 2021, in line with the updated gender policy and regional gender strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operational recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, responsibility and deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Recommendation 3: The Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development Department should establish a cross-organizational steering group on gender equality and women's empowerment to provide distributed leadership, champion the gender policy and ensure accountability for gender policy implementation at all levels of the organization.** | Priority: High  
Responsibility: Assistant Executive Director of PD, with support from regional and country directors and in consultation with the Executive Board and functional divisions at the headquarters and regional bureau levels  
Deadline: November 2020 |
| a) The steering group should: |  
• include representatives from the organizational, humanitarian and programme divisions and not be assimilated into any other working group or task force;  
• have terms of reference defining its membership and rules of engagement that ensure effective participation and that it holds at least two meetings per year; and  
• have standing agenda items that include:  
  ➢ continued integration of gender into WFP’s work;  
  ➢ progress towards gender equality outcomes, including through CSPs; and  
  ➢ implementation of WFP’s gender mainstreaming mechanisms: gender architecture, the Gender Transformation Programme, the IASC Gender with Age Marker and the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. |  |
| b) Progress reports from WFP’s headquarters divisions and regional bureaux should contribute to the discussions of the steering group and the annual updates to the Executive Board on WFP gender policy. |  |
| **Recommendation 4: WFP should enhance regional- and country-level ownership of the gender policy and the Gender Action Plan through the revision of regional gender strategies and CSP-aligned gender action plans.** | Priority: Medium  
Responsibility: Regional directors, with the support of the Chief of Staff, the Assistant Executive Director of PD, functional units at headquarters and regional bureaux, country directors and deputy country directors  
Deadline: December 2021 |
| a. WFP should review and revise existing regional gender strategies in order to: |  
• identify the key gender equality and women’s empowerment challenges faced in each region and the balance of WFP’s response in each region’s humanitarian, development and “delivering to enabling” contexts;  
• prioritize the organizational changes needed to support gender mainstreaming in country offices and regional bureaux;  
• steer country offices in the preparation and implementation of CSPs that integrate gender and age, the Gender Transformation Programme and the Gender Action Plan to support delivery of gender equality results in the context of food security and nutrition across the humanitarian-peace-development nexus;  
• define clear accountabilities tailored to the regional context; and |  |
| b) Regional directors should review regional and country office resource mobilization opportunities for gender mainstreaming in line with WFP partnerships and funding priority commitments. |  |
| c) Regional directors should create clear regional governance structures for overseeing the development and implementation of regional gender strategies. |  |
### Recommendation 5: WFP should ensure that the development of the new human resources accountability framework – as agreed in response to one of the recommendations of the evaluation of the WFP People Strategy (2014–2017) – is informed by an analysis of gender, diversity and inclusion and ensures that senior managers are accountable for inclusive leadership practices and excellence in all areas of gender mainstreaming, including but not limited to gender parity.

**Priority:** Medium  
**Responsibility:** Director of the Human Resources Division (HRM), in consultation with the Assistant Executive Director of PD and with the support of the Assistant Executive Director of RM and the Gender Office  
**Deadline:** August 2021

#### a) This should encompass:
- Integration of gender, diversity and inclusion analysis into the preparation of the accountability framework, led by the Human Resources Division (HRM) with the support of the Gender Office;
- Commitments to capacity strengthening of WFP employees in gender mainstreaming; and
- Development of specific approaches to strengthening the capacity of individual leaders (regional and deputy regional directors, country and deputy country directors) in gender mainstreaming at the regional and country levels.

---

### Recommendation 6: WFP should invest in dedicated, professional gender advisors at headquarters and regional bureaux and build a cadre of experienced gender advisors to work in its country offices.

**Priority:** High  
**Responsibility:** Assistant Executive Director of PD with the support of regional directors, the Assistant Executive Director of RM and the Director of HRM, the Gender Office and a selection of regional and country directors, deputy country directors and regional gender advisors  
**Deadline:** December 2021, in line with the preparation of regional gender strategies and the human resources accountability framework

#### a) WFP should undertake a workforce planning exercise for gender advisors and introduce a human resource plan to ensure that a consistent, funded and sustainable cadre of gender advisors is accessible at all levels of the organization. This should:
- Establish mandatory, fixed-term professional regional gender advisor positions at the P-4 and P-5 levels with functional links to the Gender Office; and
- Include standard outline terms of reference for regional and country office gender advisors to guide WFP regional bureaux and country offices in determining the roles and responsibilities of gender advisers, adapted to context.

#### b) All organizational realignment exercises should include consideration of gender skills and capacity.

#### c) Consideration should also be given to:
- Establishing a career pathway and professional gender cadre for gender advisors from the country to the regional and global levels, in line with comparative WFP functions; and
- Including a cadre of diverse gender advisors in the Future International Talent pool for deployment across the organization.
Recommendation 7: WFP should ensure that the framework and guidance for mid-term reviews and evaluations of first-generation country strategic plans incorporate quantitative and qualitative analyses of WFP’s gender equality-related activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Assistant Executive Director of PD, with the support of the Director of Evaluation and the Director of the Corporate Planning and Performance Division, in collaboration with regional and country directors, PD technical division leads and the Gender Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development Department, with the support of the Gender Office and the technical divisions, should develop and disseminate a framework that uses the IASC Gender with Age Marker process to guide the inclusion of contextually relevant, gender-integrated programming that aligns with the objectives of the Gender Policy (2015–2020) in the design and implementation of second-generation country strategic plans.

b. The Director of the Corporate Planning and Performance Division should oversee the finalization and roll-out of guidance materials and templates for the integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment into mid-term reviews of country strategic plans by December 2020.

c. The Director of Evaluation should update guidance materials and templates for the integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment into country strategic plan evaluations by December 2020.

Recommendation 8: Country offices should mainstream gender into the mid-term reviews and evaluations of first-generation country strategic plans and the design and implementation of second-generation country strategic plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Country directors, with the support of regional directors, regional gender advisors, gender equality steering group members, the Gender Office and PD technical division leads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Each country office should use the mid-term review, evaluation and gender and age context analyses of its first-generation country strategic plan to integrate gender into its second-generation country strategic plan, including by:

- aligning the country strategic plan with the United Nation's common country analysis process to ensure that WFP responds to nationally identified gender equality and women’s empowerment needs such that “no one is left behind”; and
- ensuring that the planned activities of the second-generation country strategic plan deliver in a way aimed at achieving the objectives of the updated Gender Policy (2015–2020) and equitably address the food security and nutrition-related needs of all beneficiaries.

Deadline: Ongoing as of January 2021, in line with the ongoing preparation of second-generation CSPs
Only through the equal participation of women can we benefit from the intelligence, experience and insights of all of humanity. Women’s equal participation is vital to stability, helps prevent conflict, and promotes sustainable, inclusive development. Gender equality is the prerequisite for a better world.¹

1 Introduction

1.1. EVALUATION FEATURES

Rationale, objectives and scope

1. The World Food Programme’s (WFP) Policy Formulation document specifies that corporate policies should be evaluated within four to six years of implementation.² Approved in May 2015, the WFP Gender Policy (2015-2020) is now in its fifth year and its inclusion in the Office of the Evaluation (OEV) workplan (2019-2021) is timely. This policy evaluation reports against the delivery of WFP Gender Policy commitments and provides an evidence base to inform a potentially new or updated Gender Policy.

2. The evaluation of the WFP Gender Policy (2015–2020) and attendant Gender Action Plan (GAP) (2016-2020), is intended to support both accountability and learning. The evaluation has assessed and reported on the quality and results of the policy, including the enabling and inhibiting factors for results achievement.

3. The evaluation scope covers the period 2015–2019. Its primary focus is to address the quality of the policy and its implementation mechanisms, including guidance, tools, technical capacities and resourcing, as well as the policy results WFP has achieved across the contexts in which it operates. The evaluation began in July 2019 and was completed in June 2020 with submission to the Executive Board’s (EB) annual session. It was managed by the Office of Evaluation and conducted by an independent evaluation team (ET). Terms of reference (ToR) are provided in Annex 1.

Intended users

4. The evaluation findings will be of use across all WFP divisions and units at headquarters (HQ), regional bureau (RB), country office (CO) and field office (FO) levels, as well as the WFP Executive Board, donors and government and operational partners. A list of stakeholders and their interests is summarized in Annex 2. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will be of interest to business owners responsible for the Gender Policy’s nine “drivers of change”, and will inform WFP strategies, processes and programming moving forward.

Methodology, limitations and mitigating measures

5. The evaluation considered the Gender Policy’s theory of change (ToC) as its starting point, which allowed the evaluation to be theory-based and summative. It also recognized the accountabilities laid out in the Gender Action Plan. Three overarching evaluation questions (EQs) were explored: EQ1 – How good is the Gender Policy? EQ2 – What were the results of the Gender Policy? and EQ3 – Why has the Gender Policy produced the results that have been observed? The evaluation questions are aligned to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria of relevance (EQ1), effectiveness (EQ2) and efficiency (EQ3), while the sustainability criterion is supported by analyses under all three evaluation questions. The evaluation logic illustrates how each of the questions fits against the structure of the Gender Policy theory of change (Figure 1). The questions are further elaborated on in the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 3).

---

² WFP, 2011. WFP Policy Formulation. WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B.
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6. During the evaluation, the second part of EQ2 was restructured to integrate the analysis of minimum standards with that of the intermediary results of the Gender Policy’s programme processes and organizational drivers as set out in the Gender Policy theory of change. This allowed for evidence from all programmatic and organizational results to be presented under EQ2, thereby providing clearer interlinkages between the Gender Policy results and causal factors to be reviewed under EQ3.

7. The methodology used by the evaluation team integrated the following mixed methods (more details in Annex 4):

- An inception period involving a briefing in Rome, mission to the Kyrgyzstan country office, preliminary review of WFP documents and data systems, and development of evaluation protocols
- A benchmarking analysis of the WFP Gender Policy and Gender Action Plan against the policies and implementation arrangements of three comparator organizations (UNHCR, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and Oxfam)
- Twelve country case studies, including five field missions (Mauritania, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe) and seven desk reviews (Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Mozambique, South Sudan), identified to represent a range of WFP programming environments
- A “deep dive” analysis of gender mainstreaming across three WFP activity categories from the Corporate Results Framework (CRF): unconditional resource transfers (Activity 1, general food distributions (GFD)); asset creation and livelihood support (Activity 2, food assistance for assets (FFA)); and malnutrition prevention activities (Activity 6)
- An electronic survey of 670 gender results network (GRN) members (Annex 6), with a 20 percent response rate of 131 members (60 percent female, 40 percent male)
- Key informant interviews (KIs) with 230 individuals (including 65 men and 110 women WFP employees and 27 external stakeholders who were men and 28 who were women)
- Gender-specific focus group discussions (FGDs) with 8 beneficiary groups in 4 country offices (75 females; 40 males)
- A focus group discussion involving 12 Executive Board members (8 women; 4 men)
- Review of corporate data sets, including the Country Office Tool for Managing (programme operations) Effectively (COMET), annual country reports (ACRs) and annual performance reports (APRs) (Annex 14)
- A review of reports from country offices that have graduated from the Gender Transformation Programme (Annex 15)
- A review of over 400 corporate, regional bureau (RB) and country office documents, including 50 reviews, evaluations and studies, 62 corporate reports, 231 country office documents, and 47 external documents (Annex 19).

---

\(^{3}\) The criteria used for the sampling/selection of the country visits and desk reviews are provided in Annex 4.
8. A range of analytical tools was used to review evidence and answer the evaluation questions. They included gender policy benchmarking, a programme “deep dive” analysis, timeline analysis, quantitative data analysis, gender results network survey analysis, and a summative analysis of the theory of change. The evaluation team aimed to ensure the analysis and findings draw on a cross-section of views among WFP and external stakeholders (both men and women), triangulated against documentary and survey evidence, where possible. The team has conformed to UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations. All outputs have been subject to Itsd's quality assurance process using the Office of Evaluation's Evaluation Quality Assurance System checklist for policy evaluations.

9. Limitations faced by the evaluation team and mitigation measures included:

- **Data limitations**: WFP does not report against the Gender Policy objectives or minimum standards except through the Corporate Results Framework. The evaluation team has therefore triangulated evidence from a range of sources, including key informants, evaluations, studies and reports, and reviewed their coherence against relevant Gender Policy objectives, Gender Action Plan outcome areas and Corporate Results Framework-related indicators to present evidence to answer the evaluation questions.

- **Cancellation of a country visit**: One of the six country visits (Lebanon) was cancelled due to closure of the country office during unrest. Evidence from the Lebanon country office was included in the desk review.

- **Incomplete 2019 data**: Some corporate data for 2019 was not available at the time of report writing. Data available from other sources for 2019 was gathered and analysed to the extent possible.

- **Employee rotation**: The loss of institutional memory due to the WFP rotation policy affected two country office visits. To fill in gaps, the evaluation team interviewed seven WFP employees now working in other countries.

- **Time lag**: The time lag between policy development to improved capacity, implementation and results is acknowledged as a limitation, particularly when looking at results. The evaluation team has tried to take this into account in their analysis by examining trends rather than single-year data.

10. The evaluation team did not consider these limitations to have affected the overall analysis and findings.

**1.2. CONTEXT**

**External context**

11. A key focus of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Agenda 2030) is to support efforts to address gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE). The prominence of gender equality as a standalone Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 5) and across other SDGs is illustrative of the United Nations “leave no-one behind” efforts to combat poverty, hunger and inequalities and to promote GEWE. A United Nations system-wide shared framework for action aims to ensure a strategic approach is followed.

12. The critical role of gender equality as a fundamental prerequisite for development has been recognized by the United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG), including on International Women's Day in March 2020. United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 (2000) and 2242 (2015) identify GEWE as critical to a growing women, peace and security agenda. The Sendai Disaster Risk Reduction Framework, the Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies, and the New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants all recognize the importance of gender equality and women's empowerment considerations in emergency preparedness and response. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) has

---

4 UNEG. 2018. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.
5 Itad is the company hired by WFP's Office of Evaluation to conduct this evaluation.
8 Resolution 1325 affirms peace and security efforts are sustainable when women are equal partners in the prevention of conflict and provision of relief and recovery support. 2242 places women at the centre of the peace and security agenda.
committed to integrating GEWE into all aspects of its work, and the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) has emphasized the importance of GEWE within global development and humanitarian responses.

13. In 2018, the Commission on the Status of Women stated that gender parity is a priority and operational necessity and a Gender Parity Task Force was established to develop a roadmap, benchmarks and timeframes to achieve parity across the United Nations system before 2030. To complement this agenda, a new generation of the United Nations System-Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-SWAP 2.0) was introduced in 2018 to further promote gender mainstreaming across the United Nations with a stronger focus on results.

14. United Nations approaches to GEWE also continue to be informed by global shifts in women's movements and debates, including the “#MeToo” movement that gained global traction in 2017. The United Nations Secretary-General called for the world to stand in solidarity for zero tolerance towards, and protection from, sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA),

**Programming context**

15. While these shifts demonstrate a strengthened global platform for GEWE, many inequalities remain. The 2018 report on the Sustainable Development Goals noted that, while some forms of discrimination against women and girls are diminishing, gender inequality continues to hold women back and deprive them of basic rights and opportunities, with “no country in the world on track to attain gender equality by 2030”. The 2019 report on the “State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World” shows that the chances of being food-insecure continue to be 10 percent higher for women than for men, that child stunting and anaemia in women are persistent problems in many countries, and that the targeting of “women” as a specific group for support is largely restricted to those who are pregnant and lactating or with young children. Many women and girls also remain unable to access essential services and livelihood opportunities in conflict and post-conflict settings.

16. The WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) recognizes the need for WFP to “integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment into all of its work”, and to build its institutional capacities at regional bureau and country office levels in line with the Fit for Purpose organizational strengthening initiative. The WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CSPs), approved alongside the strategic plan in 2016, is critical to ensuring that WFP operational plans are aligned with national priorities. The policy notes that the lack of GEWE hinders progress in sustainable development, states that GEWE should be incorporated into country strategic plans and notes that progress towards gender equality results should be assessed as part of country level monitoring and evaluation.

17. In his opening remarks to the first regular session of the Executive Board in 2019, the WFP Executive Director (ED), David Beasley, emphasized that “women are the fundamental building block for the future and when women get the same resources as men, you will see an increase of one third in the (crop) yield and you will see 150 million people no longer in hunger. That is why we have been aggressively challenging our
structures and systems inside, making certain that gender is a critical component of every programme we have.” The Executive Director also used the occasion to reiterate the WFP drive to achieve gender parity targets by 2021.24

18. The Executive Director has also made statements about the importance of preventing harassment, sexual harassment, abuse of power and discrimination (HSHAPD). An Executive Director Circular, issued in March 2018, stated that every person has the right to be treated with dignity and respect and to work in safe environments, free from harassment, abuse and discrimination.25 However, WFP acknowledges that more effort is needed, as the findings from the 2018 global staff survey (GSS) and 2019 workforce culture report have illustrated.26

19. The dual humanitarian and development mandate of WFP continues to be challenging as humanitarian needs become increasingly complex and protracted.27 New ways of working across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus have been developed. The work of WFP has been increasing in scale and scope in response to increasing amounts of extreme hunger globally. Funding has subsequently increased, with WFP total contribution revenue of USD 8 billion in 2019 representing an increase of 25 percent over 2017, and with Level 2 and Level 3 emergencies comprising 57 percent of the total programme of work.28

1.3. WFP GENDER POLICY (2015-2020) AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

20. WFP has been guided by four gender policies from 1996 to 2020. Under Gender Policy (1996-2001), five demographics and contexts were identified for gender mainstreaming.29 Whereas Gender Policy (2003-2007) expanded on these commitments in greater detail, Gender Policy (2009) reverted back to three goals and introduced a wider organizational remit in an effort to support the WFP strategic shift from “food aid to food assistance” and increased focus on nutrition under the WFP Strategic Plan (2008-2013). Rather than target specific beneficiary groups, the three revised goals aimed to: (i) strengthen the institutional enabling environment for gender mainstreaming; (ii) improve the effectiveness and sustainability of WFP programmes; and, (iii) promote the integration of gender into the food and nutrition policies, programmes and projects of governments and cooperating partners. A shift from a “women-focused” approach under the two previous policies to one supporting a gender-focused response to differences in the lives of women and men was envisaged, which also recognized men's roles and the importance of improving gender relations.30

21. The evaluation of the WFP Gender Policy (2009) noted that there had been a growing focus on gender and women’s participation and empowerment, but “these shifts are driven from the bottom up and are not guided by a common central vision, framework or learning from the policy”.31 The evaluation recommended that commitments be honoured, resources provided, and the momentum for change accompanied by systemic and comprehensive reform in the subsequent Gender Policy.

**Gender Policy objectives**

22. The Gender Policy (2015-2020) aims to “integrate gender equality and women's empowerment into all of its work and activities, to ensure that the different food security and nutrition needs of women, men, girls and boys are addressed”. A transformative approach to GEWE was advocated to address unequal gender relations, promote shared power, shared control of resources, and shared decision-making through four objectives:

i. **Food assistance adapted to different needs.** Women, men, girls and boys benefit from food assistance programmes and activities that are adapted to their different needs and capacities.

ii. **Equal participation.** Women and men participate equally in the design, implementation, monitoring

---

24 WFP, 2019. Opening remarks by Executive Director to the 2019 first regular session of the Executive Board. EB.1/2019.


29 Objective 1: Nursing mothers; Objective 2: Girls in school; Objective 5: Equal involvement of women in food distribution committees; Objective 8: Gender equality in employee opportunities and duties.


and evaluation of gender-transformative food security and nutrition programmes and policies.

iii. **Decision-making by women and girls.** Women and girls have increased power in decision-making regarding food security and nutrition in households, communities and societies.

iv. **Gender and protection.** Food assistance does no harm to the safety, dignity and integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it, and is provided in ways that respect their rights.  

23. Each objective was supported by a set of benchmarks with related outcomes, activities and indicators identified in two “layers” of the Gender Action Plan theory of change (Figure 2; Annex 7 for details) against which the policy results were evaluated. These include “Layer 1” of the Gender Action Plan, focused on the gender equality results of the four Gender Policy objectives, and “Layer 2”, which details the internal programme processes and organizational drivers that were to create an enabling environment for the “Layer 1” results to be achieved.  

24. The Gender Policy and Gender Action Plan also outlined a set of minimum standards for the delivery of each of the “Layer 2” programme processes and organizational drivers (Box 1). Through these minimum standards, implementation of WFP-funded programmes was to follow a twin-track strategy involving gender mainstreaming, defined as “systematically integrating a gender perspective into the needs-assessment, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of WFP food assistance policies and programmes”; and targeted actions, which were to involve “special measures that respond to a clear need identified through gender analysis that cannot be addressed through gender mainstreaming”.

**Figure 2. Gender Action Plan theory of change**

![Gender Action Plan Theory of Change Diagram]


25. Whereas the majority of programme-related initiatives during the evaluation period focused on gender mainstreaming – notably through the Gender Transformation Programme (GTP) – and were strengthened with the application of the Gender with Age Marker (GaM) and various capacity development initiatives (Annex 8 has more elements of the WFP gender delivery mechanism), the Joint Programme on

---

Rural Women’s Economic Empowerment (JP-RWEE) was one of the few examples of WFP programmes designed to address specific examples of targeted actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1. Gender Policy minimum standards</th>
<th>Targeted actions (TA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender mainstreaming (GM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Sex- and age-disaggregated data</td>
<td>Targeting based on gender and/or age group analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Gender and age analysis</td>
<td>Women's participation in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Programme cycle and quality control</td>
<td>Women's reduced unpaid workloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Gender analysis and country strategic plans</td>
<td>Involvement of men and boys, including behaviour changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Use of outcomes and indicators in country strategic plans</td>
<td>Incentives for girls’ continued participation in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Participation in decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Manuals, guidance and policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Partner budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ IASC marker/Gender with Age Marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Human and financial resources**

26. Implementation of the Gender Policy by units at all levels of the organization was to be supported by the Gender Office in Rome and funded through programme support and administrative (PSA) funds. Regional gender advisors (RGAs) were to be resourced by WFP regional bureaux and 18 P4 country office gender advisors (CGAs) to be resourced by project funding.\(^{34}\) Members of the gender results network were to be recruited from across all WFP country offices, regional bureaux, and headquarters units and divisions. As of January 1, 2020, there were 5 full-time and one part-time employee in the Gender Office, 28 national and international gender advisors in post in WFP country offices (the large majority below P4 level), 4 regional gender advisors across WFP regional bureaux, and 703 members of the gender results network.

27. When the Gender Policy was approved in 2015, a 12 percent target was established for extra-budgetary funding and project budgets as a proportion of WFP funding as a whole, rising by 1 percentage point per annum to 15 percent by 2020.\(^{35}\) By 2018, the latest year for which associated data was available, the planned requirements for GEWE as a percent of overall WFP planned requirements was behind the 14 percent target, having reached 12.3 percent of total planned budgetary requirements.\(^{36}\) This raises a concern, explored in Sections 2.2.6 and 2.3.2, about the extent to which the strong budgetary commitments identified in the Gender Action Plan were translated into practice.

28. It is notable that, in reviewing the WFP gender approach, the 2017-2018 Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) considered the introduction of the Gender Policy, Gender Action Plan and regional gender strategies alongside regular reporting to the Executive Board to have strengthened WFP focus on gender equality, but highlighted gaps in human and financial resources for implementation.\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{34}\) WFP, 2016. Gender Action Plan: Walking the Talk. WFP/EB.1/2016/4-B.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.

\(^{36}\) WFP, 2019. Update to the Executive Board. WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.

2 Evaluation findings

2.1 HOW GOOD IS THE GENDER POLICY?

27. The analysis of the quality and relevance of the Gender Policy (2015-2020) is organized against five sub-questions as stated in the evaluation matrix (Annex 3). The analysis draws on evidence from internal and external key informants, a document review, a review of comparator organizations, quantitative data analysis and field missions, all of which together allowed for the triangulation of data sources and articulation of the findings and that were considered adequate to answer each of the evaluation sub-questions.

2.1.1 POLICY RELEVANCE

To what extent are the Gender Policy conceptual framework, vision, purpose, outcomes, outputs and activities still valid as designed and shared, and relevant to broader gender equality and empowerment considerations?

Finding 1: The Gender Policy provides a clear strategic vision, purpose, conceptual framework and set of high-level objectives that were widely communicated across WFP and remain relevant to its dual mandate of ending hunger and saving lives. The theory of change was innovative but lacked linkages between organizational drivers and programme processes. The contributions of those drivers and processes to the Gender Policy objectives were not clearly articulated.

27. In establishing GEWE as a core component of the WFP dual mandate of ending hunger and saving lives, the Gender Policy (2015-2020) allows the organization to respond to the growing importance of GEWE in wider external debates. The policy is highly relevant as it clearly contributes to the United Nations Secretary General’s Zero Hunger challenge, aligns with evolving United Nations reform efforts, and supports the strategic objectives of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021). The Gender Policy has importantly outlined an enabling environment for GEWE across WFP by describing how the organization would deliver on the inter-governmental mandates of the United Nations system to promote and protect human rights and gender equality, the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals, and benchmarks of the UN-SWAP.

28. Conceptually, the Gender Policy advocates a transformative approach that is relevant to the WFP vision for GEWE. In doing this, it responds to the findings of the evaluation of the Gender Policy (2009), which state that WFP employees and partners lack an understanding of how and why gender issues affect people’s food security and nutrition. The current policy recognizes that gender roles are culture- and context-specific and provides definitions and examples of gender-transformative food assistance.

29. The development of the Gender Action Plan provided WFP with a detailed results framework, including activities, targets, milestones and accountabilities that reach across the organization, establishing roles and responsibilities for business owners across seven organizational drivers and two programme processes (Box 2). WFP has also ensured that the Gender Action Plan is complementary to the UN-SWAP framework, which is reported on annually to the Executive Board. The development of the Gender Action Plan is an example of good practice that has helped strengthen the promotion of GEWE in WFP.

38 The thumbnails presented by each heading locate the evaluation question against the evaluation logic in Figure 1.
39 The WFP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 included four objectives: saving lives, supporting or restoring food security and nutrition, reducing risks, and reducing undernutrition. These were updated in the WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) to five strategic objectives under two strategic goals targeting zero hunger (SDG 2), and implementation partnerships (SDG 17).
43 It is noted that the EB commended the GAP for exceeding the standards of the Gender Mainstreaming Accountability Framework that previously guided WFP work under the Gender Policy (2009-2014). WFP/EB.A/2015/5-G.
Box 2. Gender Policy conceptual framework

Compared to three comparator benchmarking organizations (UNHCR, Sida and Oxfam – Section 2.1.3 below), the WFP Gender Action Plan was found to be more systematic in setting out specific action areas and their associated roles, responsibilities and accountabilities.

30. By developing regional gender strategies (RGS) to guide implementation of the Gender Policy and Gender Action Plan, WFP ensured that the Gender Policy was interpreted appropriately across each of the regional and country contexts of operation. Similarly, in country offices, the structure of the Gender Action Plan has been mirrored by the design of country office gender action plans (CGAPs) to establish local accountabilities. This process has been supported by the Gender Transformation Programme (Box 3), which was developed to provide a holistic approach to gender mainstreaming across both the programming and organizational dimensions of the Gender Policy. It is noted, however, that the decision to enrol in the Gender Transformation Programme is made at the discretion of the country office management team rather than being an organizational requirement.

Box 3. The Gender Transformation Programme

The Gender Transformation Programme was developed by the Gender Office to mainstream gender and provide support for the delivery of the Gender Policy objectives at country level. It focuses on leadership and accountability, programming and organizational change. Participating country offices, with guidance from the Gender Office or regional bureau, complete a baseline assessment, implement an improvement plan and carry out a final assessment against 39 benchmarks. While voluntary, the original intention was that all country offices would participate. As of March 2020, a total of 25 country offices had joined the Gender Transformation Programme (30 percent of all WFP country offices) and 12 had graduated.

31. WFP key informants at all levels expressed an awareness of how the Gender Policy frames WFP commitments toward GEWE, including its objectives. In response to a survey to gender results network members asking about their familiarity with WFP commitments to and work toward GEWE, 96 percent either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (126 of 131 respondents). Key informants also argued that, by framing a transformative agenda for GEWE, the Gender Policy supports a culture shift from fighting hunger to changing lives and helps WFP shape its internal debates to improve understanding of the organization’s role across the humanitarian-development nexus.

The Gender Policy theory of change

32. In the Gender Policy theory of change (Figure 2), which was the first of its kind in WFP, seven organizational change drivers are identified that contribute to two programme processes that then inform the 15 minimum standards for gender mainstreaming and targeted actions. This leads to an implicit assumption that, by addressing the drivers and minimum standards, WFP performance against the Gender Policy objectives would improve. However, neither the Gender Policy nor the Gender Action Plan describes the relationships or pathways that are expected to operate within and between the Layer 2 drivers, the minimum standards and the Gender Policy objectives in order to achieve the policy objective. Furthermore, the mapping of the minimum standards against the Gender Action Plan’s Layer 2 drivers (Annex 9) reveals significant overlaps with the Gender Policy objectives.

33. These weaknesses have led to considerable confusion around the structure and function of the theory of change. None of the annual updates on the Gender Policy (2015-2020) presented to the Executive Board between 2016 and 2019, which focused on reporting against Gender Action Plan outcomes, the regional gender strategy reports, or the annual country reports, included any analysis of minimum standards. As a result, its purpose remains unclear, which has led to a variable interpretation of the minimum standards and confusion as to what constitutes a “gender-transformative” approach - when and

---

44 WFP Gender Transformation Programme, 2020: https://gtp.wfp.org/reports/.
45 WFP CRF indicators were added to the Gender Policy objectives in the annual update on the Gender Policy in 2016.
46 The regional gender strategies were completed by 2016. Three of the six strategies include a link to the minimum standards, three do not refer to them or lack clarity in terms of linkages. Only one includes an accountability framework.
why it is appropriate in different humanitarian and development contexts, for example.\footnote{WFP, 2018. Evaluation of WFP Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts; WFP/EB.A/2018/7-C.} Several key informants argued that the theory of change and minimum standards were not sufficiently unpacked or contextualized. Most country offices rely heavily on gender advisor support and guidance from the regional gender strategy to inform the GEWE contributions to programming.\footnote{Internal RBN, RBP, RBB and Rome KIIs.}

### 2.1.2 DESIGN OF THE GENDER POLICY

To what extent has WFP fully considered the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the 2014 evaluation of the Gender Policy (2009-2014) in the development of the current version of the Gender Policy?

**Finding 2:** The current Gender Policy is built directly on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the 2014 evaluation of the Gender Policy (2009) and was developed using a participatory and consultative design process.

34. A key recommendation of the 2014 Gender Policy evaluation was to make GEWE “everybody’s business”, and to allocate responsibilities across units, functions and individuals, from oversight bodies to field employees. In their response to the 2014 evaluation recommendations, WFP management agreed to the following actions:

- **Recommendation 1 – policy development, strategizing and planning:** WFP developed the new policy through a participatory consultative process, adhered to the United Nations Accountability Framework for Gender, aligned to the external operational context, and demonstrated coherence with WFP Strategic and Management Results Frameworks.

- **Recommendation 2 – programming and operations:** WFP committed to using the IASC gender marker, to review the integration of gender in its strategic and programme cycle, alongside the provision of programme guidance to support gender mainstreaming, and to develop and strengthen its partnerships.

- **Recommendation 3 – capacity development and knowledge management:** WFP recognized the importance of capacity strengthening and committed to achieving gender parity and to establishing a gender results network (that evolved from the gender advocates network). The Gender Office was moved from the Policy and Programmes Division to the office of the Deputy Executive Director in 2014 to support the Gender Policy consultation process and subsequent rollout.

- **Recommendation 4 – roles and responsibilities to address gender concerns across WFP:** WFP assigned responsibilities to business owners for delivery of relevant aspects of the Gender Policy, including a commitment by the Executive Director to send a letter of entrustment to Country Directors (CDs) outlining their expected gender equality-related accountabilities.

35. Each of these recommendations was addressed in the design and development of the Gender Policy (2015-2020), which followed a consultative process with broad participation across the organization, alongside consultations with the Executive Board, an external reference group that brought learning into the process from the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) Gender Seal approach, the UN-SWAP process led by UN Women and the engagement of the WFP Rome-based agency (RBA) partners.

36. In its approval of the Gender Policy, the Executive Board requested regular tracking of, and reporting on, gender issues, including gender parity commitments and reviews of organizational performance against UN-SWAP standards. These are reported against, alongside other topics, by the Gender Office in an annual update on the Gender Policy.

### 2.1.3 BENCHMARKING

To what extent is the Gender Policy innovative, coherent, strategic in focus, and aligned with similar policies of other comparable humanitarian and development organizations?
Finding 3: The WFP Gender Policy is partially aligned with the policies of selected comparator organizations. While the Gender Policy has taken a more instrumentalist approach than those of Oxfam and Sida, this has been relevant to the WFP mandate. The Gender Action Plan and its associated accountabilities were innovative.

37. The WFP Gender Policy and accompanying implementation frameworks (for example, the Gender Action Plan and the Gender Transformation Programme) were compared with similar mechanisms in three comparator organizations – UNHCR, Sida and Oxfam. These agencies were selected on the basis of the following criteria: longitudinal comparison with organizations included in the 2014 WFP Gender Policy evaluation benchmarking exercise, being a humanitarian agency, and being an organization with a similar global mandate to that of WFP. The benchmarking exercise compared the organizations’ gender policies; strategy and approach; use of gender-delivery mechanisms (including capacity development and learning support); financial and human resource investments (including gender architecture); accountability mechanisms; and innovation and response to change. The benchmarking exercise also compared external influences on organizational culture across both humanitarian and development contexts.

38. While each of the four organizations aspires to achieve GEWE, a deeper analysis of the concepts and approaches of the four gender policies indicates areas of difference, with the approach of WFP and UNHCR oriented to addressing needs while those of Oxfam and Sida focused on women's rights (Table 1).

39. Differences emerge in the scope of the organizations’ gender policies, underlying convictions, and GEWE programming goals and approaches (Annex 11). WFP and UNHCR operate from an “instrumentalist” perspective that frames women’s issues in service of another goal, such as more equitable food assistance. While WFP, Oxfam and Sida each sees gender transformation as something that should be mainstreamed across its entire programme and policy portfolio; the primary goal for Oxfam and Sida is to reinforce human, sexual and reproductive health rights and is not limited to the provision of services. 49

40. To frame the implementation of its gender policy, Oxfam provides 16 minimum standards – with elaborate key actions areas – for gender in emergencies, while UNHCR has 10 minimum actions spread over six areas of intervention. WFP also has 16 minimum standards for gender mainstreaming and targeted actions, with the Gender Action Plan and the Gender Transformation Programme representing good practice in the methodical identification of programme and organizational change requirements, specific action areas and accountabilities. Conversely, Sida focuses on providing guidance to employees through documents and tools, tips on achieving changes in behavioural norms, tailored checklists of questions, and key communication messages.

Table 1. Summary of data on comparator organizations and their work on gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational size and scope</th>
<th>Oxfam</th>
<th>UNHCR</th>
<th>Sida</th>
<th>WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approaching GEWE</td>
<td>Gender justice as a standalone goal</td>
<td>Improved delivery of organization’s mandate</td>
<td>Women’s rights as a standalone goal</td>
<td>Improved delivery of organization’s mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning within organization</td>
<td>Gender justice a strategic plan goal that applies to all areas</td>
<td>Standalone age, gender and diversity policy</td>
<td>Standalone gender strategy and feminist foreign policy agenda</td>
<td>Standalone policy supporting policy alignment and regional gender strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender architecture</td>
<td>Gender advisors at headquarters, regional, country and programme areas</td>
<td>Gender equality unit</td>
<td>Gender office</td>
<td>Gender office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender focal points</td>
<td>All staff responsible for gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>Gender advisors in regional bureaux and some country offices</td>
<td>GRN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


50 WFP HRM data, 2002-2019.
41. All four organizations have large numbers of employees who must complete mandatory courses covering PSEA and prevention of gender-based violence. While WFP, UNHCR and Sida promote gender learning through e-platforms, such as Gender Toolkits and the Gender Learning channel (WFP), “Learn and Connect” (UNHCR), and the Gender Toolbox (Sida), Oxfam adopts a more hands-on approach to capacity building facilitated by its gender architecture and expertise.

42. Although Oxfam and WFP both hire gender advisors, Oxfam also allocates gender specialists to specific technical areas of gender mainstreaming in its programmes. The architecture of UNHCR is more focused on protection from sexual and gender-based violence with protection officers required to fulfil both the protection and gender portfolios (though not necessarily with the required expertise).\(^{51}\) At Sida, strong accountabilities require all employees to promote gender mainstreaming, with the support of a small cadre of gender advisors, a gender network, toolbox and help desk.\(^{52}\) While WFP has established the gender results network, the terms of reference for gender results network members are focused on information sharing and advocacy, rather than capacity building and technical support.

43. Oxfam’s policy focus is strongly founded on an evidence-based approach, giving it a reputation as a leading organization that builds its knowledge base on gender, agency, feminist theory and women’s empowerment. Sida’s innovation is premised on Sweden’s feminist foreign policy, with all foreign policy tools designed to address gender equality.\(^{53}\) The focus in UNHCR is on multiple social axes – age, gender and diversity – which add up to a relatively unique “intersectionality” lens amongst comparator organizations. Comparatively, the key innovation in WFP is to have introduced a theory of change and its associated efforts to clarify practical requirements and accountabilities for gender mainstreaming using the Gender Action Plan and the Gender Transformation Plan.

2.1.4 EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

Did the Gender Policy reflect good practice, has it remained relevant, and is it forward looking in the face of evolving gender equality and women’s empowerment concepts and approaches at national, regional and international levels and globally agreed normative standards?

Finding 4: The WFP Gender Policy was informed by, and remains relevant to, a series of international gender norms and standards.

44. The Gender Policy demonstrates a clear commitment to a variety of globally agreed normative standards. It is strongly aligned with the “Zero Hunger challenge” launched by the United Nations Secretary General in 2012, including its emphasis on “women as mothers, farmers and entrepreneurs”\(^{54}\) as well as to the Beijing+20 commitments to GEWE by adopting objectives that prioritize the advancement of women toward food security and nutrition (Figure 3).

---

\(^{51}\) UNHCR, 2016. UNHCR Review of Gender Equality in Operations.

\(^{52}\) Bjarnegard, Elin and Uggla, 2018. Putting Priority into Practice: Sida’s Implementation of its Plan for Gender Integration.


45. Despite the Gender Policy and regional gender strategies being formulated prior to the finalization of the SDGs, they demonstrate relevance to Agenda 2030. The four Gender Policy objectives map directly across to several SDG 5 targets, including equal participation (Objective 2), which links with SDG Target 5.5 (ensuring women’s effective participation and equal opportunities); decision-making by women and girls (Objective 3), which links to SDG 5.A (ensuring equal rights to economic resources); and gender and protection (Objective 4), which links to SDG 5.1 (ending discrimination) and SDG 5.2 (eliminating violence against women and girls).

46. Although one of the Gender Policy’s minimum standards identifies the importance of addressing women’s unpaid care and the domestic work burden as an area of good practice (SDG Target 5.4), the role and contributions of WFP in this area are not clearly elaborated and the ambition is only indirectly covered by Objective 3 (decision-making by women and girls). Areas covered by SDG 5 that are not addressed in the Gender Policy include targets outside of the WFP core mandate, such as ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights (SDG 5.6) and the elimination of trafficking and harmful practices (SDG 5.3). It is nevertheless the role of the regional gender strategy and the country strategic plan to identify needs and outline whether and how WFP could respond, should these considerations be considered a relevant sphere of activity in the WFP operational context.

47. The commitment made in the Gender Policy to meet or exceed the requirements of the UN-SWAP framework\(^ {55}\) enabled WFP to benchmark and build accountability for gender mainstreaming in relation to the wider United Nations system as prioritized by the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review, and adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 2016.\(^ {56}\) Efficiency in demonstrating these commitments was supported by structuring WFP high-level accountabilities under the Gender Action Plan in direct correlation with the indicators of the UN-SWAP framework.

48. The Gender Policy has remained relevant and appropriate to the IASC. WFP was one of two agencies to test the new IASC Gender with Age Marker. The marker was then refined by WFP to be more relevant to its mandate and a platform established for Gender with Age Marker follow-up and accountability.\(^ {57}\) Application of the Gender with Age Marker was mainstreamed into the design and development of country strategic plans and played a significant role in supporting gender mainstreaming at the strategic and, to a lesser extent, operational levels across WFP country offices.

**Figure 3. Timeline analysis for WFP implementation of the Gender Policy**

| Source: Evaluation team elaboration. |

---


\(^{57}\) WFP, 2014. WFP Guidance for the Gender Marker. WFP Gender Office.
2.1.5 INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

To what extent is the Gender Policy coherent with WFP Strategic Plans (2014-2017) and (2017-2021) and relevant to WFP corporate policies or frameworks, and to what extent does it respond to the shift from food aid to food assistance?

Finding 5: The Gender Policy remains largely coherent with the current WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021). It has proven relevant to some of the WFP corporate policies and the shift from food aid to food assistance as articulated in its country strategic plans. Nevertheless, further progress could have been made to improve the systematic alignment of the Corporate Results Framework, financial tracking systems, and the frameworks of all corporate policies to ensure they more clearly reflect and align with the WFP Gender Policy.

WFP Strategic Plans (2014-2017) and (2017-2021)

49. Although the WFP Strategic Plan (2014-2017) called for a relatively passive approach to GEWE, by means of which WFP should adopt a cross-cutting and “gender-sensitive” response to gender challenges,\(^{58}\) some significant areas of gender mainstreaming that were reinforced by the Gender Policy (2015-2020) included the expanded use of the gender marker code, the strengthening of WFP gender and protection efforts, the introduction of gender expenditure analysis, and the roll-out of the Gender Transformation Programme, including certificates from the Executive Director upon completion.

50. The Gender Policy demonstrates continued relevance to WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021), which recognizes that women and girls are more vulnerable in humanitarian situations where GEWE is not integral to agency support and correlates a failure to promote GEWE with holding back achievement of the SDGs. To address this, Strategic Plan (2017-2021) identifies the need to address the structural causes of poverty, including discriminatory institutions, norms and practices that limit opportunities for women and girls. It also reinforces the Gender Policy by committing WFP to developing strategies and designing programmes based on a deeper understanding of how food security and nutrition are affected by gender inequalities and identifies the importance of internal organizational changes, including promoting GEWE in the workplace.

51. As recognized in Strategic Plan (2017-2021), the incorporation of GEWE analysis and design in the strategic and programme cycle is critical to ensuring responses appropriate to local contexts. Guidelines for the design and implementation of country strategic plans explicitly refer to the incorporation of GEWE in line with the Gender Policy, with approval of country strategic plans conditional on a minimum Gender with Age Marker score.\(^{59}\)

Regional gender strategies

52. Regional gender strategies were an essential vehicle for building coherence across WFP regional bureaux, country offices, country strategic plans and programmes. With approval of the Gender Action Plan in 2016, all regional bureaux received a one-off investment of USD 50,000 and a dissemination package to develop an appropriate regional gender strategy. A certain amount of effort was put into contextualizing the Gender Policy, with each regional bureau adopting a different approach to GEWE (Table 2). Where the Johannesburg, Nairobi and Panama regional bureaux gave a primary focus to more effective gender mainstreaming in WFP programming, the Bangkok, Cairo and Dakar regional gender strategies explored the role of employees and the importance of capacity strengthening across WFP country offices within their regions. Despite the development of the regional gender strategy, implementation was constrained due to higher priority being given to the roll-out of first generation country strategic plans, limited investments into WFP decentralized gender architecture and resourcing of regional gender strategy implementation plans, as well as greater strategic focus on largescale L2 and L3 operations.

---


Table 2. Comparative analysis of the primary GEWE focus of regional gender strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RBB | • Empower employees to recognize and address the gender and age aspects of food security and nutrition
• Inspire, inform, guide, support and reward employees for addressing WFP GEWE aspirations
• Build capacities to incorporate gender and age considerations into programme and operations activities
• Develop regional and national partnerships for gender-sensitive and transformative programming |
| RBC | • Make gender equality considerations an inherent part of the project cycle
• Make WFP work on gender equality more visible and credible
• Address the major changes that the regional bureau and country offices will need to make to mainstream gender |
| RBD | • Promote discussion and deepen understanding of GEWE at all levels
• Identify the challenges and opportunities men, women, girls and boys face and how WFP should respond
• Ensure all WFP employees are empowered and accountable for GEWE in WFP programming and organizational change |
| RBJ | • Ensure programmes and technical assistance in Southern Africa are informed by greater gender analysis
• Improve food and nutrition security and learning outcomes for girls
• Improve access to economic and livelihood opportunities for women and men |
| RBN | • Contribute to GEWE in countries assisted by WFP at the household, local and national levels
• Integrate GEWE into all regional activities and programmes
• Promote experience and knowledge and leverage good practices to improve outcomes |
| RBP | • Enhance the linkages between gender equality and food security and nutrition
• Provide technical assistance and capacity strengthening to governments in GEWE mainstreaming
• Design and implement programmes that respond to the different food and nutritional security needs of men and women, boys and girls |

Source: WFP, 2016. Regional Gender Strategies; Update on the Gender Policy; WFP/EB.A/2016/S-F.

### Strategic and corporate results frameworks

53. Both the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) (2014-2017) and the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) (2017-2021) included cross-cutting priorities for “improved gender equality and women's empowerment” and related mandatory cross-cutting indicators (Box 4). Both these, and the disaggregation of person-related data by sex and age were to be used when monitoring WFP activities.60 Under the Corporate Results Framework (2017-2021), country offices have the flexibility to introduce additional country-specific indicators to their “Line of Sight” logframes and monitoring, review and evaluation plans (MRE plans). In 2017, to help country offices measure the progress of gender equality activities, the Gender Office disseminated a suite of 142 gender equality output indicators through the Gender Toolkit for WFP country offices to select and use to monitor relevant activities under their country strategic plans. However, out of these, only five were included in the corporate list, indicating a very low level of integration in the Corporate Results Framework and limited uptake and use by country offices.

#### Box 4. Cross-cutting indicators in WFP Corporate Results Frameworks

The Strategic Results Framework (2014-2017) introduced the following three gender-related cross-cutting indicators:

- Proportion of assisted women, men or both women and men who make decisions over the use of cash, vouchers or food within the household
- Proportion of women beneficiaries in leadership positions of project management committees
- Proportion of women project management committee members trained on modalities of food, cash or voucher distribution.

The Corporate Results Framework (2017-2021) builds on these examples using three cross-cutting indicators that are mandatory for all WFP interventions involving household transfers:

- C.3.1: Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food/cash/vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality
- C.3.2: Proportion of food assistance decision-making entity – committees, boards, teams, etc. – members who are women
- C.3.3: Type of transfer (food, cash, voucher, no compensation) received by participants in WFP activities, disaggregated by sex and type of activity

60 Those COs that focus on technical assistance to governments rather that food transfers do not report against the three CRF 2017-2021 cross-cutting indicators and select alternative indicators appropriate to the context of operation.
54. The revised Corporate Results Framework (2017-2021) introduces a number of SDG-related indicators, which allow for standardized reporting on WFP contribution to national SDGs other than to SDG 2 and SDG 17. SDG-related indicators aggregate information across country strategic plan portfolios, mainly at the output level, and provide visibility for the full range of intended WFP contributions to national efforts. These include 10 indicators related to SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. WFP contribution to SDGs is reported annually, with data collected by country offices available in the COMET system as of 2019 reporting year and therefore not available at the time of writing this report. While reporting on SDG 2- and SDG 17-related indicators is mandatory, reporting on other SDG-related indicators is not mandatory. Therefore, the availability of this data will vary by country office.

55. The Gender Policy (2009) evaluation finding that the “absence of indicators poses risks to both accountability and the future gearing of WFP’s activities towards gender results” has, to some extent, been addressed. However, key informants consider that the reporting against Gender Action Plan Layer 1, which pairs Gender Policy objectives with selected Corporate Results Framework indicators, provides limited support to gender-based programming. Factors that have led to this weakness include: use of the same cross-cutting indicator across different objectives; a reliance on quantitative indicators that can be aggregated but that do not support the qualitative analysis of Gender Policy objectives; and an absence of activities that can be clearly linked to gender equality and transformative change. An unintended effect of these shortcomings is that they have exacerbated the overlaps among the Gender Action Plan, the Gender Policy objectives and the minimum standards, creating confusion among country office and field office key informants as to what precise data should be collected, when and for what purpose, and against which framework, when reporting on GEWE results.

**Financial framework and budgeting**

56. The Gender Policy (2015-2020) and the Gender Action Plan were coherent with the expectations of the Executive Board that WFP should allocate and track gender equality financial expenditures across all areas of work. These were benchmarked at 11 percent in 2015, with 15 percent budgeting for GEWE across all areas targeted by 2020. From December 2015, all country offices were required to budget gender-related costs and estimate expenditures. Although gender budgeting has progressed, annual expenditure tracking was quickly criticized for yielding data of questionable validity. It was put on hold in 2017, though key informants report some country offices are continuing the analysis without guidance. A new process for tracking gender equality-related expenditures has since been developed and WFP plans to integrate this process into its online WFP Information Network and Global System (WINGS) in 2020.

**Corporate policies**

57. The Gender Policy is relevant to all WFP policy areas reviewed and an increasingly clear articulation of GEWE objectives is apparent in more recent policy documents compared to those that predate the policy (Annex 12 has a detailed policy coherence analysis). Prior to 2015, the Humanitarian Principles and Humanitarian Access policy statements (2004, 2006 respectively), the Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy (2012), the revised School Feeding Policy (2013), and the Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017) made limited reference to gender issues and a focus on transformative change was absent. Further, the People Strategy (2014-2017) did not comprehensively address issues of gender equality, diversity and inclusion.

58. Although the Nutrition Policy (2012) provided a limited articulation of gender in relation to nutrition or the incorporation of gender in WFP nutrition programming, the revised Nutrition Policy (2017-2021) recognizes gender as an underlying determinant of nutrition. This includes the need to build demand for nutritious diets and complementary services among women and men, and to improve intra-household decision-making through gender-transformative social and behaviour change communications (SBCC).

59. Other policies introduced since 2015 have also incorporated gender. The Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition identifies the need for gender analyses to target resilience-building approaches by gender and age but does not detail how to apply GEWE concerns in practice. The Climate

---

61 WFP, Introduction to COMET Manual, “SDG related Indicator”.
Change Policy (2017) references the Gender Policy, identifies gender inequalities as a cause and result of climate change impacts, and recognizes that addressing GEWE will strengthen the impacts of WFP efforts to tackle the food security and nutrition consequences of climate change. The Emergency Preparedness Policy (2017) identifies gender-transformative food assistance as one of its six principles, promotes gender and protection, and supports investments in gender-sensitive employee wellness, safety and security. The corporate School Feeding Strategy (2020-2030) also recognizes the role of gender, including the relationship between gender and nutrition, as both a barrier to education and a benefit of improving access to education through school-based programmes. However, gender is not yet prominent across all recent WFP policies, with the Environmental Policy (2017) providing only a short reference to the need for gender-based analysis.

2.2 WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE GENDER POLICY?

60. This section provides an assessment of progress towards the four Gender Policy objectives (2.2.1 to 2.2.4), and the results of programme processes (2.2.5) and organizational drivers (2.2.6). Cutting across each of the programme and organizational ‘intermediary’ results areas are the minimum standards (Annex 9 has detailed mapping of the Gender Action Plan, minimum standards and the Gender Transformation Programme). This structure follows the summary evaluation logic (Figure 1) and Gender Policy theory of change (Figure 2).

61. To build an understanding of results against the four Gender Policy objectives, WFP has relied on a set of cross-cutting, outcome and output level indicators reported on in the COMET database and in the annual performance reports (Annex 14).64 Because many annual country reports in 2018 did not report comprehensively against corporate indicators, the data in COMET was found to be a more reliable source. Although WFP annual country reports do include a cross-cutting section on gender, this focused at the activity level and the evaluation team found no evidence that the section was used to report against the Gender Policy objectives. As a result, to build up a sufficient body of evidence for the analysis, the evaluation team has triangulated COMET and, where available, annual country report and annual performance report data with evidence from key informants (through interviews and focus group discussions) and a review of secondary documentary sources.

2.2.1 OBJECTIVE 1: FOOD ASSISTANCE ADAPTED TO DIFFERENT NEEDS

To what extent have women, men, girls and boys benefited from food assistance programmes and activities that are adapted to their different needs and capacities?

Finding 6: The evaluation found examples of food assistance activities that were adapted to the specific needs and capacities of women, men, girls and boys and others that were not. WFP vulnerability assessments and performance management systems are not enabling data collection and reporting at the individual level or on key cross-cutting, gender-related indicators. However, such data collection and reporting is fundamental to the integration of strategies for the provision of food assistance adapted to different needs (Gender Policy Objective 1) with approaches supporting equal participation (Objective 2), decision-making (Objective 3) and protection (Objective 4).65

Evidence of progress towards Gender Policy Objective 1.

62. Selected outcome and cross-cutting indicators linked to Gender Policy Objective 1 (Table 3) aim to enable WFP to create a picture of the extent to which its food assistance programmes and activities are adapted to the different needs, capacities and constraints faced by women, men, girls and boys. Substantial information could have been taken from the reporting and analysis of cross-cutting indicator “C.3.3: Type of transfer (food, cash, voucher, no compensation) received by participants in WFP activities disaggregated by sex and type of activity”, introduced with the Corporate Results Framework (2017-2021). However, the

---

64 Although layer 1 of the GAP also maps CRF output indicators against the objectives, the data is not sex-disaggregated when reported in ACRs and its application at the project level is too granular to provide policy-level insights.

document and data review provided no evidence of country offices reporting on this cross-cutting indicator in 2018.

Table 3. WFP reporting and performance against corporate indicators for Gender Policy Objective 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Policy Objective 1 - Food assistance adapted to different needs</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) treatment performance</td>
<td>7 of 12</td>
<td>COs in the evaluation sample - Data disaggregated by sex</td>
<td>COs in the evaluation sample - Progress against targets</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Food Consumption Score (FCS) by sex of household head</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minimum dietary diversity score (DDS) for women</td>
<td>10 of 12</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proportion of population reporting benefits from an enhanced asset base (by sex and age)</td>
<td>3 of 12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROSS-CUTTING INDICATOR</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3: Type of transfer (food, cash, voucher, no compensation) received by participants in WFP activities disaggregated by sex and type of activity</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>COs in the evaluation sample - Data disaggregated by sex</td>
<td>COs in the evaluation sample - Progress against targets</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Columns A, B and C: WFP COMET, SRF 2017 data for outcomes indicators; CRF 2018 for cross-cutting indicators; Column D: APR 2018. Key: Column B: Red - less than half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Amber - over half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Green all country offices collect sex-disaggregated data. Column C: Red - over half country offices behind target; Amber – over half country offices on or ahead of target; Green >85% country offices on or ahead of target; Black – no data.

63. In 2018, reporting rates against the Corporate Results Framework outcome indicators ranged from 88 percent for the indicator on moderate acute malnutrition treatment to just 67 percent for the minimum dietary diversity scores for women. This level of reporting showed little change over the evaluation period (Annex 14). Even where data for outcome indicators is collected, key informants identified that their primary use was to review changes in food security and nutrition resulting from food transfers rather than to analyse associated shifts in gender equality. An unintended effect of this oversight was identified by the evaluation of WFP Regional Response to the Syrian Crisis (2015-2018), which found that even when Corporate Results Framework indicators showed households headed by women were less food secure than households headed by men and a widening gap was evident in food consumption scores, WFP had not adjusted transfer values for households headed by women. While the use of outcome indicators to inform an integrated analysis of food security, nutrition and gender is appropriate, capacity building is needed to ensure that country- and field-based colleagues understand and apply all dimensions of analysis.

64. Key informants also noted that understanding the extent to which the provision of food assistance responds to the specific needs of women, men, girls and boys relies on the collection and interpretation of data at the individual level. This perspective was corroborated by the 2019 multi-country study of the potential of cash-based interventions to promote GEWE, which highlighted the need for WFP to understand and monitor the food security and nutrition of individuals in order to understand the factors that influence their food and nutritional status. This is not currently supported by the Corporate Results Framework, for which the primary unit of food security analysis is the household. This represents a serious shortcoming in WFP monitoring systems.

65. The WFP Cash and Gender Study (2019) found that household level targeting excluded an understanding of individual needs, and that the registration of households headed by men in many camps often led them to become the primary recipients of information and transfers. This illustrates the importance of data collection at the individual level and the integration of strategies for the provision of food assistance adapted to different needs (Gender Policy Objective 1) with approaches supporting equal participation (Objective 2), decision-making (Objective 3) and protection (Objective 4).

**Examples of WFP food assistance adapted to different needs**

66. Regional syntheses of operations evaluations from 2013 to 2017 found that while food assistance for assets activities were largely relevant and appropriate in terms of operation type, objectives and alignment with the general needs of beneficiaries (Box 5), there were weaknesses at the individual beneficiary level, with some activities selected without attention to the specific needs of women and men. The strategic evaluation of WFP's Support for Enhanced Resilience in 2019 also noted that despite use of community-based participatory planning (CBPP), gender-differentiated needs are not always well understood, including the specific vulnerabilities and capacities of women, men, girls and boys, or how they may be affected differently by the same shock or stressor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5. Examples of food assistance for asset programmes adapting to needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Rwanda and Zimbabwe, vulnerable groups, such as people living with HIV-AIDS and the elderly, were given fewer or less demanding tasks, prioritized to avoid long queues when collecting transfers and able to designate a family member to take their place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Mauritania and Sri Lanka, food assistance for assets activity selection took into account the situation of women by targeting households headed by women for food assistance for asset activities. It also used food assistance for assets resources to support activities traditionally implemented by women, as well as supporting the reduction of labour burdens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. This varied picture was identifiable in other areas of WFP programming (Annex 13a). A 2016 nutrition study of rice fortification in Latin America identified examples of good practice for targeting and SBCC, but did not assess gender influences on food access, provision and decision-making. The evaluation of the Nutrition Policy (2012) in 2015 also identified a tendency for WFP nutrition programmes to rely on the “inherent targeting” of women (including pregnant and lactating women (PLW)) and introduction of SBCC, rather than use gender analysis and targeting to identify and address the gender dynamics affecting the nutrition status of women, men, girls and boys. In response, nutrition key informants identified efforts to improve the application of sex- and age-disaggregated monitoring and integration of gender analysis in the mainstreaming of nutrition-sensitive programming.

68. Evaluations of WFP school feeding activities found strong attention to equal school attendance, enrollment, learning and nutrient fortification for girls and boys, but less to enhancing gender equality, gender and nutrition (for example, the nutrition of adolescent girls), opportunities for women farmers, or involving both women and men in food preparation. Some examples of school feeding have relied on women providing voluntary labour or working for low remuneration rates, which may reinforce social norms and negatively affect women unless linked to wider support. Good practices identified in the countries studied in this evaluation included strategies to address male dominance of food preparation where financial incentives are strong, promote women and men’s joint participation in the provision of home-grown school

---

69. WFP. 2019. The Potential of Cash-Based Interventions to Promote Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.
73. WFP. 2016. Latin America and the Caribbean: Supporting National Priorities on Nutrition through Multiple Platforms.
75. WFP. 2018. Decentralized Evaluation of the Lesotho National School Feeding Programme,
meals, and improve the school environment by constructing and rehabilitating separate latrines for girls and boys.

69. In the review of targeting for general food distributions, key informants provided evidence of where vulnerable refugees, such as young children, pregnant and lactating women and people living with HIV and AIDS and/or tuberculosis, receive supplementary food or cash transfers to prevent or treat malnutrition. In Rwanda, the One UN nutrition programme and refugee response addressed gender-specific nutritional concerns by targeting pregnant and lactating women. In Sri Lanka, vulnerable groups such as households headed by widows, elders, war-affected women and people with disabilities were targeted. In Lebanon, at e-card distribution-validation sites, WFP prioritized services to pregnant and lactating women, people with disabilities and the elderly, and in country offices such as South Sudan, cash-based transfers have targeted women.

2.2.2 OBJECTIVE 2: EQUAL PARTICIPATION

To what extent have women and men participated equally in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of gender-transformative food security and nutrition policies and programmes?

Finding 7: WFP is not yet systematically supporting the equitable participation of women and men across its programmes. Although good examples exist, such as community-based participatory planning and the management and oversight of general food distribution committees, equal participation in the design or adjustment of programmes is not yet actively promoted and Corporate Results Framework indicators do not capture transformative change.

Evidence of progress towards Gender Policy Objective 2

70. WFP programmes seek to support the equal participation of women and men in decision-making as members of management committees, farmers’ groups, cooperatives, distribution committees and school feeding committees. The evaluation found that 10 of the 12 sample country offices and 71 percent of all WFP country offices measured progress against Gender Policy Objective 2 in 2018 using a mandatory cross-cutting indicator for the “proportion of food assistance decision-making group members that are women” (Table 4, Indicator C.3.2).

71. In reporting against the two outcome indicators linked to Gender Policy Objective 2, seven of the eight sample country offices were on or ahead of target for the outcome indicator on coverage in 2017 and six of the eight sample country offices were on or ahead of target for the outcome indicator on adherence (Table 4). Use of both indicators has particular relevance in programmes such as school feeding, which aim to promote equal access to education for girls and boys. However, the COMET database does not enable the reporting of sex- and age-related data for these indicators, even where, in some instances, the evaluation team found evidence that this data was captured in cooperating partner and field level reports.

76 Examples from KIIs in 4 COs, ACRs for 9 COs and the Final Stakeholder Workshop,
Table 4. WFP reporting and performance against corporate indicators for Gender Policy Objective 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Policy Objective 2 - Equal participation</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># CDIs in the evaluation sample where data is collected</td>
<td>CDIs in the evaluation sample - Data disaggregated by sex</td>
<td>CDIs in the evaluation sample - Progress against targets</td>
<td>% all relevant CDIs reporting on the indicator in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME INDICATOR</td>
<td>Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage) disaggregated by sex and age</td>
<td>8 of 12</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of target population that participates in an adequate number of distributions (adherence) disaggregated by sex and age</td>
<td>8 of 12</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS-CUTTING INDICATOR</td>
<td>C.32: proportion of food assistance decision-making entity – committee, board, team etc. - members who are women</td>
<td>10 of 12</td>
<td>71% across projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**: Columns A, B and C: WFP COMET, SRF 2017 data for outcomes indicators; CRF 2018 for cross-cutting indicators; Column D: APR 2018. **Key**: Column B: Red - less than half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Amber - over half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Green - all country offices collect sex-disaggregated data. Column C: Red – over half country offices behind target; Amber – over half country offices on or ahead of target; Green – >85% country offices on or ahead of target; Black – no data.

72. Even in country offices where relevant corporate data is collected, many key informants did not use it to illustrate programme strategies supporting equal participation but focused instead on beneficiary numbers, suggesting further capacity building is needed to better relate Corporate Result Framework indicators to the application of gender mainstreaming concepts. A similar finding was reflected in two synthesis reports of evaluations from 2017 and 2019 that criticized WFP use of Corporate Result Framework gender indicators for focusing on quantifying women’s participation while not capturing transformative changes in power structures or gender-based roles.

**Examples of WFP programmes demonstrating the equal participation of women and men**

73. Beneficiaries of the JP-RWEE in Kyrgyzstan and Rwanda reported that the process of bringing women and men together to work on a shared asset provided opportunities for women and men to form new friendships and strengthen their sense of self-worth. Women reported using new networks to seek or provide advice and model gender relations where women and men worked as equals. The importance of technical training to bring about changes in women’s empowerment and nutrition was also highlighted, reinforcing earlier evaluation findings that training women as committee members improved the balance of decision-making in relation to food transfers and provided entry points for nutrition-sensitive programming.

74. It was encouraging that nine of the ten country offices with asset-recovery programmes reviewed by the evaluation team had documented examples of CBPP or gender analyses supporting asset recovery and creation. Good practice beyond CBPP included the aforementioned efforts in Rwanda to increase WFP procurement of commodities traditionally farmed and controlled by women and to enhance their

---

78 Findings of programme- and field-level KIs across all CDIs.
80 Beneficiary focus group discussions, Kyrgyzstan and Rwanda.
81 See also: WFP, 2019. Synthesis report of WFP’s country portfolio evaluations in Africa (2016-2018), WFP/EB.A/2019/7-C.
participation in cooperatives. In Nicaragua, surveys of school children and parents explored perceptions of fortified rice used in school feeding and household promotion. Many WFP school feeding programmes have been designed to tackle social barriers preventing girls from attending school, with take-home rations for girls to support household food consumption and promote girls’ access to education.83

75. Nevertheless, a 2017 five-country study of food assistance for assets found the use of low value cash transfers had led to higher participation ratios of women when compared with men, which risked reinforcing pre-existing gender roles and undervaluing women’s work both socially and financially.84 WFP also faces challenges understanding the specific needs of target groups in contexts with heightened security risks. The 2017 South Sudan country portfolio evaluation found that, while more women than men were registered as beneficiaries due to demographic and conflict dynamics, the food committees were just 20 percent women, due to an inability to break through social norms.85 Both the 2019 Nigeria Emergency Response and 2018 Somalia Country Portfolio evaluations found a heavy reliance on community-based targeting that risked sustaining discriminatory practices.86

76. Even where programmes target women with positive outcomes, some key informants identified unintended consequences, whereby the absence of a gendered approach, particularly in many general food distribution settings, had led some men to feel excluded, and their traditional role as household head had been challenged. The evaluation of WFP’s Humanitarian Protection Policy (2018) also identified examples where men were “left in a more passive state” by WFP operations due to a lack of attention to the equal participation of both women and men in programme design.87

2.2.3 OBJECTIVE 3: DECISION-MAKING BY WOMEN AND GIRLS

To what extent have women and girls increased decision-making power regarding food security and nutrition in households, communities and societies?

Finding 8: WFP has a growing number of programmes that have been able to provide women and, to a lesser extent, girls with new opportunities to engage in decision-making in areas such as cash-based programming, assets and livelihoods, nutrition and school feeding. There are significant opportunities for WFP programmes to emphasize the transformative benefits of increasing the decision-making power of women and girls.

Evidence of progress towards Gender Policy objective 3

77. WFP aims to strengthen the decision-making power of women and girls as an important factor in improving food security and nutrition. The corporate cross-cutting Corporate Result Framework indicator for Objective 3 (C.3.1) allows programmes to explore decision-making with respect to the role of women and men in choosing how to use WFP in-kind or cash-based transfers. The evidence presented in Table 5 shows that 11 out of 12 country offices in the evaluation sample reported on this indicator. The only outlier is Nicaragua, which is struggling to develop monitoring systems that are more effectively tracking GEWE in relation to country strategic plan strategic outcomes. Eight country offices reporting against cross-cutting indicator C.3.1 have programmes that are on, or ahead of, targets. The three that are behind (Mauritania, Burkina Faso and South Sudan) represent contexts where there are strong political, economic, and sociocultural factors driving the under-representation of women in decision-making. However, when questioned about decision-making by women and girls, key informants referred primarily to household use of WFP transfers, leading to concerns that analysis of the wider community and societal dimensions of women's

84 WFP, 2017. The Potential of Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) to Empower Women and Improve Women’s Nutrition. This was also highlighted by beneficiary FGDs in Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Rwanda and Zimbabwe.
85 WFP/EB.2/2017/6-A.
86 WFP/EB.2/2019/6-A; WFP/EB.2/2018/7-D.
87 WFP/EB.A/2018/7-B.
empowerment in decision-making is not being promoted and is only a focus of attention when prioritized by individual managers.

Table 5. WFP reporting and performance against corporate indicators for Gender Policy Objective 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Policy Objective 3 - Decision-making by women and girls</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CROSS-CUTTING INDICATOR</td>
<td>C.3.1: proportion of households where women, men or both women and men make decisions on the use of food-cash-vouchers, disaggregated by sex and age</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>77% COs for women</td>
<td>45% both women and men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># COs in the evaluation sample where data is collected</td>
<td>COs in the evaluation sample - Data disaggregated by sex</td>
<td>COs in the evaluation sample - Progress against targets</td>
<td>% reported country offices meeting targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Columns A, B and C: WFP COMET, SRF 2017 data for outcomes indicators; CRF 2018 for cross-cutting Indicators; Column D: APR 2018. Key: Column B: Red - less than half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Amber – over half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Column C: Red – over half country offices behind target; Amber – over half country offices on or ahead of target; Green – >85% country offices on or ahead of target; Black – no data.

Examples of WFP programmes increasing decision-making power for women and girls

78. Activities where WFP sought to increase the decision-making power of women have included nutrition programmes that target both women and men with tailored SBCC messages to improve intra-household food distribution and encourage dietary diversity. Efforts have also been made to incorporate SBCC messaging in wider WFP programmes, suggesting important opportunities to integrate gender mainstreaming in the growing WFP agenda for the prevention of malnutrition.88 A significant benefit of gender and nutrition mainstreaming efforts is their ability to take a transformative agenda beyond the programme and into communities and households (Box 6).

Box 6. Examples of transformative gender mainstreaming

In Nicaragua, masculinity training for men and boys has been held with farmer organizations (and WFP and partner staff members) to promote positive attitudes and behaviours towards women’s inclusion in decision-making. The 2018 JP-RWEE review provided case studies supported by field visits in Rwanda and Kyrgyzstan where women were capacitated to take greater decision-making roles within their homes and communities, learn their rights and challenge discriminatory practices. In the Liberia Mid-Term Review (2018), the country office achieved a “very good” rating for impact by recognizing and addressing prevailing social norms, as well as legal and policy barriers.

79. Although there is evidence from Rwanda that women and men are represented in parent-teacher committees that oversee school feeding, there is little wider documentary evidence to suggest this an area that WFP has systematically promoted. Most WFP programme examples have instead emphasized women’s, rather than women’s and girls’, participation in programme decision-making. Examples such as CBPP have nevertheless allowed women to identify community assets that help reduce their unpaid workloads and identify food assistance for assets activities that were mindful of the needs of vulnerable groups. Women who also received support for group farming, value chain facilitation, savings-and-loan groups and latrine construction argued that it provided them the basis for wider transformative changes in their decision-making status.89 A nutrition case study of refugee women in Ecuador noted the empowering nature of cash-based transfers, sensitization and training,90 and the 2019 global study on the “Potential for Cash-Based Interventions to Promote GEWE” linked cash transfers to improved decision-making and mobility for women in Bangladesh, El Salvador and Rwanda.

---

89 Examples included KIIs with three COs, documentary examples from a further three desk-review COs and case studies from: WFP, 2017. The Potential of Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) to Empower Women and Improve Women’s Nutrition.
90 WFP, 2016. Latin America and the Caribbean: Supporting National Priorities on Nutrition Through Multiple Platforms.
2.2.4 OBJECTIVE 4: GENDER AND PROTECTION

To what extent has food assistance “done no harm” to the safety, dignity and integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it, and is it provided in ways that respect their rights?

Finding 9: WFP has made moderate progress toward ensuring food assistance does no harm to the safety, dignity and integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it. Attention to gender and protection is undermined by the relatively low proportion of assisted people who are informed of WFP programme interventions, a weak analytical base, and confusion over the complementary but separate gender and protection demands.

Evidence of progress towards Gender Policy Objective 4

80. The Gender Policy highlights gender and protection as cross-cutting issues that must be integrated into all aspects of WFP work and activities. In 2018, WFP country offices reported that over 90 percent of women and men benefitting from WFP programmes were able to access assistance without protection challenges (Table 6, Indicator C.2.1). While all country offices in the evaluation sample met their targets for Indicator C.2.1 in 2018, significant concerns were expressed by some key informants and corroborated in the evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (2018) over the validity of this data. In particular, the policy evaluation noted a “striking...lack of clarity regarding protection reporting, hotlines and referral systems”,91 which is reinforced by the fact that only 5 of the 12 country offices in the evaluation sample with relevant projects reported on the proportion of project activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented and used in 2018 (Table 6, Indicator C.1.2).

81. WFP should also be concerned with the very low proportion of assisted people who were informed about WFP programme activities in 2018 (Corporate Result Framework Indicator C.1.1), which remains at just 54 percent for women and 49 percent for men across all WFP country offices. Furthermore, both the findings from the evaluation of the Humanitarian Protection Policy and key informants highlighted the narrow scope of corporate protection indicators.

Table 6. WFP reporting and performance against corporate indicators for Gender Policy Objective 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Policy Objective 4 - Gender and protection</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># CDs in the evaluation sample where data is collected</td>
<td>8 of 12</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>10 of 12</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Policy Objective 4 - Gender and protection</td>
<td># CDs in the evaluation sample where data is collected</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93% men across COs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS-CUTTING INDICATOR</td>
<td># CDs in the evaluation sample - Data disaggregated by sex</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49% meeting targets for men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.1: Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what they’ll receive, for how long), disaggregated by sex and age</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>10 of 12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93% men across COs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.2: Proportion of project activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented, analysed and integrated into programme improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.1: Proportion of targeted people accessing assistance without protection challenges, disaggregated by sex and age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Columns A, B and C; WFP COMET, SRF 2017 data for outcomes indicators; CRF 2018 for cross-cutting Indicators; Column D: APR 2018. Key: Column B: Red - less than half country offices collect sex-disaggregated data; Amber – over half country offices collect sex-disaggregated; Green – all country offices collect sex-disaggregated data. Column C: Red – over half country offices behind target; Amber – over half country offices on or ahead of target; Green – >85% country offices on or ahead of target; Black – no data.

WFP food assistance in relation to the safety, dignity and integrity of women, men, girls and boys

82. Although WFP committed to implementing a comprehensive action plan for PSEA as part of the Gender Action Plan, key informants and evaluations confirm that work is still needed to familiarize WFP employees and communities on PSEA and gender-based violence, to inform beneficiaries of their entitlements, and to mainstream complaints and feedback mechanisms. There was also noted confusion on the part of key informants about how best to operationalize the 2016 Protection Guidance Manual in different contexts. Although WFP introduced ToRs for country-level PSEA focal points to support inter-agency PSEA networks in 2018, the evaluation found these networks to be dormant in some countries and their role inadequately understood by field offices.

83. Several evaluations also found that the oversight of gender and protection required improvement in WFP, including a focus on reporting gender results against corporate indicators, rather than reviewing and addressing underlying power imbalances and how they relate to protection needs of beneficiaries and the wider crisis-affected population. The 2018 MOPAN assessment of WFP concluded that attention to protection is inconsistent, with insufficient attention paid to special protection issues, such as gender-based violence and refugee-host tensions, while other protection targets were achieved despite significant challenges. A synthesis of country portfolio evaluations from Africa (2019) found that while most country offices had adopted proactive approaches to protection, many protection activities were based on an inconsistent analysis.

84. Key informants corroborated this evidence by stating that, while WFP approaches to gender and protection benefit from coherent institutional frameworks, their implementation needs to be based on a more robust analytical base to ensure structural gender inequalities and protection challenges are understood and addressed. The weak analytical base of WFP to inform gender and protection strategies may have compounded confusion among many WFP employees and partners as to how to respond to overlaps in the Gender Policy, the Protection Guidance Manual (2016) and Corporate Result Framework gender and protection indicators. As a result, in some emergency contexts, gender has been conflated with efforts to prevent gender-based violence and support PSEA. Many WFP key informants argue that as gender and protection roles are often the duty of the same individual (who may have expertise in one area but rarely both), it is essential that WFP provide adequate specialist support across both gender and protection dimensions at regional bureau and headquarter levels. This is to ensure all country offices are able to properly identify, differentiate and respond to the specific gender and protection needs of beneficiaries across the different contexts of the WFP operation.

85. Nevertheless, some country office and regional bureau key informants could point to examples where significant improvements to gender and protection have been made (Box 7), suggesting examples of good practice are available for WFP to build on in future. The 2019 multi-country study of the potential of cash-based interventions to promote GEWE identified examples where violence was reported to have decreased or even been prevented, and reductions in negative coping strategies, such as the collection of fuel, which had placed women at risk of gender-based violence.

---

92 Key informants in 2 RBs, 3 COs, and the final stakeholder workshop. See also: WFP, 2018. Evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (WFP/EB.A/2018/7-B*).
95 KIs in 3 RBs and 5 COs and the final stakeholder workshop.
Box 7. Examples of good practice in sample country offices in the provision of WFP food assistance that does no harm to the safety, dignity and integrity of women, men, girls and boys

- Introduction of a gender and protection action plan under the Rwanda GTP that includes a focus on GBV awareness-raising and support to WFP programme partners
- Contextualization of WFP global gender and protection strategy in Afghanistan, leading to greater attention to the protection of boys and girls in school feeding and vocational training programmes
- Nutrition education and counselling projects in refugee camps in Mauritania and Rwanda, which include messaging that challenges discriminatory gender norms and GBV
- Use of FFA as a platform in Zimbabwe and Burkina Faso from which WFP and other actors provide messaging, referrals or service delivery in GBV and sexual and reproductive health
- Support to national Ministry of Education efforts in Nicaragua and Kyrgyzstan to prevent GBV and sexual abuse of schoolgirls through early interventions that integrate protection in school feeding logistics planning
- Gender needs assessments of farmer associations in Nicaragua and Rwanda that reviewed local dimensions of empowerment and GBV and provided follow-up training for women and men
- Collaboration with UNHCR in Rwanda and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in Mauritania and Lebanon to establish protection task forces, action plans and complaints and feedback mechanisms
- E-card distribution/validation sites prioritize services to pregnant and lactating women, women with small children and people with disabilities, as well as the elderly, at distribution sites in Lebanon, alongside the provision of wheelchairs and personal assistance to prevent harassment
- Promotion of women’s groups to support food assistance activities in South Sudan and efforts to improve the gender balance in food assistance committees and nutrition teams

2.2.5 INTERMEDIARY RESULTS OF PROGRAMME PROCESSES

To what extent were results achieved in terms of the Gender Policy’s programme processes as defined by the Gender Action Plan and associated minimum standards?

95. WFP has identified a series of “programme processes” – important actions that WFP programmes should put in place to enable the achievement of the Gender Policy objectives. They include the collection and use by WFP of sex- and (where appropriate) age-disaggregated data, application of complaints and feedback mechanisms for affected populations, integration of gender and age dimensions into standardized guidance, and incorporation of gender analysis into the design of country strategic plans and programmes (Box 8). The evaluation findings against these intermediary programme processes are reviewed in turn to build an evidence base of the factors supporting or hindering WFP progress towards its four Gender Policy objectives.

Box 8. Importance of gender analysis to WFP

“Operations that are not based on sound gender analysis are likely to be less effective because they risk failing to reach a large part of the population, often the most vulnerable, or not responding appropriately to specific needs. Such operations can even expose beneficiaries to additional risks, including life-threatening gender-based violence.”

WFP Gender Policy (2015-2020)

**WFP collection and use of sex and age-disaggregated data**

Finding 10: While WFP has made improvements in the collection of sex-disaggregated data, further progress is needed to ensure that it is collected systematically and then used to inform the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting across all programmes and in all country offices.

96. Across WFP, the proportion of all projects reporting on Corporate Results Framework cross-cutting gender indicators was just 70 percent in 2018 and 73 percent in 2017, marking a substantial decrease from 2016, when 85 per cent of all projects reported on such indicators (Table 7). Encouragingly, all country offices in the evaluation sample reporting against indicators C. 3.1 and C. 3.2 in 2018 (Table 5), demonstrated the systematic use of sex-disaggregated data (Table 4).96

---

96 WFP COMET, data for 2017 and 2018. See also Annex 14 and Column B of Tables 4 and 5.
Table 7. WFP performance against the use of gender equality analysis and data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Percentage of projects/CSPs reporting on CRF cross-cutting gender indicators</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>100% (2020)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Percentage of food security assessment reports that collect, analyse and use sex-disaggregated data</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100% (2020)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source - Updates on the Gender Policy: WFP/EB.A/2016/5-F; WFP/EB.A/2017/5; WFP/EB.A/2018/5-G; WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.
No data available for 2019 at the time of writing.

97. A review of 11 decentralized evaluations and 2 country portfolio evaluations from 2018 and 2019 was carried out to assess the extent to which WFP programmes used sex-disaggregated data in line with Gender Policy commitments. From the sample of 13 evaluations, 6 found WFP programmes to have included the systematic collection and use of sex-disaggregated data, while two found no evidence of sex-disaggregated data being used. Five evaluations found that WFP had collected some sex-disaggregated data, but that this was not systematically used due to gaps in disaggregated data collection by partners, for example.

98. This analysis suggests that, while WFP has made improvements to the collection of sex-disaggregated data in its corporate monitoring, this has not yet translated into its systematic collection, analysis and use across all programmes and country offices. Key informants also argued that, for many WFP programmes, identifying the sex of the household head was considered synonymous with the collection and use of sex-disaggregated data, even though this risked excluding other household members from the analysis (see also Finding 6).

99. Good examples of the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data can be found in context analyses (for example, emergency preparedness and response, seasonal livelihood programming and nutrition-sensitive analyses), assessments (for example, the comprehensive food security and vulnerability assessments, food and nutrition security monitoring system and joint assessment missions), and studies (for example, the 2017 five-country study on food assistance for assets to improve women’s nutrition, and the 2019 multi-country “cash and gender” study). Documentation from country office school feeding and nutrition programmes and decentralized evaluations also confirmed the consistent use of both sex- and age-disaggregated data in these specific programme areas.

100. Collectively, the evaluation team considers WFP to have made improvements in the collection and use of sex- and age-disaggregated data. These efforts can be strengthened by the recent introduction of a Gender with Age Marker in 2019 that requires the systematic use of sex- and age-disaggregated data in all WFP project monitoring. Nevertheless, key informants at all levels expressed concerns that initiatives to promote the collection of sex- and age-disaggregated data can lead WFP programme monitoring to focus on numbers rather than a broader gender analysis that informs WFP programming. To this end, efforts to extend

97 The proportion of projects/CSPs that reported monitoring values in baselines and follow-up.
98 See Annex 4, Methodology for a full list of evaluations consulted.
the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data across all programmes need to be coupled with capacity building to ensure robust gender analysis based on qualitative and quantitative data.\footnote{101}

**WFP complaints and feedback mechanisms for affected populations**

**Finding 11**: Greater attention is required to ensure that safe and accessible complaints and feedback mechanisms are in place across all programme areas in all country offices to ensure that each WFP beneficiary is aware of targeting criteria, entitlements and complaint procedures, and that their preferences are correctly identified, understood and responded to.

86. Relatively low levels of corporate reporting on gender and protection identified in Section 2.2.4 are further substantiated by data showing that only 80 percent of country offices had functioning complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFM) in 2018 (Table 8). While this represented a significant increase over the 2014 baseline, key informants argued that significantly more progress is required to ensure that complaints and feedback mechanisms are mainstreamed across all WFP programmes and mechanisms including, but not limited to, general food distributions, food assistance for assets, nutrition, school feeding and supply chain.

**Table 8. WFP country offices with functioning complaints and feedback mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Percentage of country offices with a functioning complaints and feedback mechanism for affected populations</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Updates on the Gender Policy: WFP/EB.A/2016/5-F; WFP/EB.A/2017/5-D; WFP/EB.A/2018/5-G; WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.

No data available for 2019 at the time of writing.

87. This analysis corresponds to the evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (2018), which found WFP use of complaints and feedback mechanisms to be inconsistent, exacerbating the difficulties of weak or inadequate exit strategies. The synthesis of WFP’s Country Portfolio Evaluations in Africa (2019) found only scant attention had been paid to complaints and feedback mechanisms: with Ethiopia the only country office out of eight where most beneficiaries had been made aware of targeting criteria, complaints and entitlements and feedback mechanisms. The synthesis concluded that accountability for a complaints and feedback mechanism should “not be left to the discretion of country offices, which generally prioritize the delivery of rapid assistance over more strategic engagement in protection”.\footnote{102} Likewise, the strategic evaluation of WFP’s Capacity to Respond to Emergencies (2020) found that, while WFP had developed a practical approach to complaints and feedback mechanisms, significant delays between making commitments and developing guidance had hindered the pace of scale-up, and called for WFP to significantly strengthen support for mainstreaming complaints and feedback mechanisms to support WFP gender responsiveness in emergency operations.\footnote{103}

**WFP Integration of gender and age dimensions into standardized guidance**

**Finding 12**: Guidance that supports the practical application of gender and, to a lesser extent, age dimensions in WFP programmes has been developed and integrated into many WFP manuals. However, full integration is yet to be achieved across all policies, action plans and guidelines. Tailored capacity strengthening is required to ensure that the mainstreaming of gender and age dimensions are adequately understood, adapted and applied.

101. To address gaps in how gender and age concepts are understood and applied by WFP programmes and operations, the Gender Office reviews the policies, action plans, papers and guidelines developed by other units and has developed a comprehensive portfolio of standardized guidance to support WFP employees and partners. The baseline figure was calculated based only on guidance developed by the Gender Office. The basis for judgement was expanded in 2017 to include all guidance produced by WFP, some of which is not shared with the Gender Office for review. As a result, the amount of guidance incorporating gender in 2017 and 2018 dropped and remained at the same level over the two-year period (Table 9).
Table 9. WFP performance in the provision of standardized guidance to support gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2016</th>
<th>Target 2017</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Target 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Percentage of WFP standardized guidance (manuals) into which gender and age dimensions are integrated</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100% (2020)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Updates on the Gender Policy: WFP/EB.A/2016/5-F; WFP/EB.A/2017/5; WFP/EB.A/2018/5-G; WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.

No data available for 2019 at the time of writing.

102. Examples of technical guidance that successfully integrated gender and age dimensions include: the 2016 Food Assistance for Assets Manual, the 2016 Gender Marker, the 2017 Guidance for Nutrition-Sensitive Programming, and Vulnerability and Mapping (VAM) Guidance on Gender and Food Security Analysis. Programme-specific guidance is complemented by the Gender Toolkit, developed by the Gender Office, that covers a comprehensive range of topics including sex and age analysis tailored to specific operational and programming areas and accessible to WFP employees and partners in English, Arabic, French and Spanish (Box 9).

Box 9. Topics covered in the Gender Toolkit

The Gender Toolkit comprises detailed guidance, as well as quick guides, checklists, templates and brief videos, on:

- Gender “basics” (concepts, frameworks, minimum standards, strategic planning, leadership)
- All stages of programming (gender analysis, participation, programme design, stakeholder review, budgeting, monitoring and complaints mechanisms)
- Operational functions (safety and security, communications, supply chain analysis)
- Sector-specific dimensions of WFP work (for example, climate change, emergency preparedness and response, social protection, asset creation, food assistance).

103. The integration of gender and age dimensions into technical guidance meets the demands of key informants who expressed a strong preference for programme-specific GEWE materials to be provided, rather than more generic learning materials. Similar calls for practical examples were identified in the strategic evaluation of WFP’s Capacity to Respond to Emergencies.104 Evidence also points to the need for more tailored, hands-on, specialist gender advisor support to be provided to help WFP programme officers and partners interpret and apply guidance materials in the local context.

WFP integration of gender and age dimensions in country strategic plans

Finding 13: While WFP has established important linkages between the Gender Policy and country strategic plans through implementation of the gender and age marker, relatively few in-depth, context-specific gender analyses have been undertaken at country office level. This has led to generic gender analyses rather than those that are tailored to a specific operational context.

104. In the 2016 Gender Action Plan, WFP committed to using the gender with age marker to steer the integration of its Gender Policy commitments in its high-level strategy documentation, such as country strategic plans. The Gender Office has led WFP work to tailor the IASC Gender Handbook and establish an online gender with age marker platform to support country strategic plan development, enabling WFP to become the first IASC member to mainstream the gender with age marker across the organization.105

105. For country strategic plans to be approved by the Executive Board, each country office must receive a gender with age marker rating of three (“fully integrates gender”) or four (“fully integrates gender and age”) across four categories covering gender analysis, tailored activities, participation, and contributions to gender equality. Country offices provided self-assessed inputs to the online gender with age marker platform, following which, according to the availability of regional gender advisors, some country office country strategic plans were then reviewed by their respective regional bureau. All were validated by the Gender Office. As a result, all approved country strategic plans have met the Gender Action Plan criteria for the integration of gender, and some for age (Table 10).

---

104 Ibid.
105 WFP, 2019. Update to the Executive Board. WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.
Table 10. WFP performance against integration of GEWE in country strategic plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Percentage of country strategic plans (CSPs, interim CSPs and transitional interim CSPs) with gender marker code 2a (2017) or gender with age marker code 4 (2018–2020)</td>
<td>79% (2014)</td>
<td>100% (2018)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Gender only: 83% Gender &amp; Age: 17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


106. The 12 draft country strategic plans in evaluation sample countries that used the gender with age marker platform and received both regional bureau and Gender Office feedback show clear benefits, especially in the case of country strategic plans that included only a weak gender analysis in early drafts. The Burkina Faso country strategic plan shifted from an absence of gender analysis to one that was gender responsive, while the Sri Lanka country strategic plan improved from a basic use of sex-disaggregated data in the draft to address gender equality in the final approved country strategic plan. Key examples of changes in the content of sample country strategic plans following gender feedback are summarized in Box 10.

Box 10. Summary changes to the design of country strategic plans resulting from gender with age marker feedback to early drafts

Low integration
- Introduction of basic sex-disaggregated secondary data or explanations for its absence in the context analysis
- Minor adjustments to the presentation of the context analysis
- Language changes such as the insertion of “women, men, girls and boys” without anchoring them in a wider analysis or showing how specific actions will benefit sub-groups
- Structural changes to the presentation of the country strategic plan document without adjustments to purpose or activity

Medium integration
- Improved use and relevance of sex- and occasionally age-disaggregated data
- Improvements in the presentation of gender considerations behind the broad strategic focus
- Activity level changes: e.g. participatory gender analysis added to an activity-related study; inclusion of attention to gender-based violence; inclusion of attention to participation in decision-making

Medium to high integration
- Strategic commitments to evidence-based programming toward GEWE and the protection of all groups
- Gender included as a factor that better determines strategic orientation
- The use of national capacity building in GEWE under one strategic outcome as a catalyst to support other strategic country strategic plan outcomes

Source: Evaluation team analysis.

107. Despite positive changes to country strategic plan documents following Gender Office and regional gender advisor inputs, the reference to and use of gender analysis varied. Where Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Rwanda, South Sudan, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe used gender context analyses to support the design of their country strategic plans,106 most WFP country offices relied on secondary data, or national Zero Hunger strategic reviews, where the gender context analysis was comparatively weak.107 Country strategic plan feedback from the Gender Office also indicated that country offices had often missed out on relevant analyses, such as gender dynamics in agriculture (Bolivia, Afghanistan and Zimbabwe); gender-based violence (Afghanistan); nutrition and markets (Sri Lanka); labour markets (Nicaragua); and the role of men in nutrition and childcare (Mauritania). As a result, the use of gender analysis was often at a generic level rather than

---


107 Secondary documentary review for 12 CO sample; KIs in 5 COs, 3 RBs, head office and the Stakeholder Workshop.
specific enough to inform context-specific programme strategies and country strategic plan strategic outcomes.\(^{108}\)  

108. Similar findings were identified in a review of 11 decentralized evaluations conducted in 2018-2019, in which 6 found WFP programmes lacked a gender analysis or its use was insufficient.\(^{109}\) The Somalia Country Portfolio evaluation (2017), Annual Evaluation Report (2018) and evaluation of WFP’s Corporate Emergency Response in Northern Nigeria (2020) also noted insufficient analysis and response to gender and protection issues, as did the 16-country review of school feeding programmes in Latin America,\(^{110}\) while the 2018 MOPAN review saw room for improvement in the integration of GEWE analysis into the design of WFP interventions.\(^{111}\)  

109. Although WFP use of gender analysis is improving, its use is confined to country offices where leadership has clearly prioritized gender mainstreaming, including country offices that have enrolled in the Gender Transformation Programme. However, Gender Transformation Programme benchmarking by the Gender Office also indicated an inconsistent use of gender analysis and, in the assessment of gender results network survey respondents, only 60 percent agreed or strongly agreed that “WFP systematically uses gender and age analysis to inform its strategic plans”, indicating significant progress is still to be made to routinely apply gender analysis to inform WFP strategic planning (Annex 6 has the results of the survey of gender results network members).

### 2.2.6 INTERMEDIARY RESULTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL DRIVERS

**Human Resources**

Finding 14: While there have been significant efforts to achieve gender parity in WFP since 2015, the organization has not yet achieved gender parity across all levels or in all functions and evidence suggests that gender inequalities continue in the workplace.

110. WFP has made significant efforts toward achieving gender parity that have contributed to modest improvements in the proportion of women relative to men employees across WFP (Table 11, Gender Action Plan Indicator 3.1). The evidence in Table 11 shows there is also variation by employment grades, with a higher ratio of women to men P2 staff evident in 2019, but lower percentages of women compared with men staff at D1, P5 and P3 levels (Figure 4). Encouragingly, each of these grades showed marginal improvement in 2019. However, there has also been a marginal decline at D2 level compared with the 2014 baseline with still only a quarter of D2 staff grades represented by women in 2019.

**Table 11. WFP performance against gender-related human resources targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Percentage of national, international and senior staff who are women (by contract type)</td>
<td>U/ASG 43%, D2 29%, D1 38%, D5 38%, P4 44%, NOC 100%, P3 42%, NOA 35%, GS Field 31%</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>U/ASG/ASG 29%; D2 29%; D1 39%; P4 43%; NOD 80%; NOC 34%; NOB 37%; NOA 35%</td>
<td>USG/ASG 17%; D2 35%; D1 37%; P4 44%; P2 47%; NOD 57%; NOC 34%; NOB 37%; NOA 34%</td>
<td>USG/ASG 20%; D2 33%; D1 38%; P4 45%; P2 52%; NOD 50%; NOC 34%; NOB 39%; NOA 36%</td>
<td>USG/ASG 33%; D2 26%; D1 42%; P4 44%; P2 52%; P1 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{108}\) Evaluation team analysis of draft and final CSPs for 12 countries in the evaluation CO sample.

\(^{109}\) Two of the remaining four evaluations did not review the use of gender analysis in the design of programmes.

\(^{110}\) WFP, 2017. Smart School Meals: Nutrition-Sensitive National Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean.

\(^{111}\) MOPAN, 2018. WFP 2017-2018 Assessment, which explored 16 evaluations and one internal review.
3.2. Percentage of respondents in the global staff survey who strongly agree or agree that they are treated with respect regardless of their job, age, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnicity, and physical ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GS HQ; Int. 45%; Nat. 30%</th>
<th>GS Field 31%; GS HQ 73%; Int. 43%; Nat. 31%</th>
<th>GS Field 31%; GS HQ 73%; Int. 46%; Nat. 32%</th>
<th>National data not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS HQ 74%; Int. 45%; Nat. 30%</td>
<td>GS Field 31%; GS HQ 73%; Int. 43%; Nat. 31%</td>
<td>GS Field 31%; GS HQ 73%; Int. 46%; Nat. 32%</td>
<td>National data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72% (2015)</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


111. The picture is also less positive for national employees, of whom only 36 percent were women in 2019, compared with 44 percent of international staff (Table 11). This may be due to a combination of weak historical attention to gender parity in recruitment practices, lower employee turnover rates, and difficulties hiring women in some contexts and for certain positions (see para 113).112

Figure 4. Percentage of international professional staff who are women

112. Evidence from WFP key informants suggest a strong correlation between the Executive Director's commitment to gender parity and the focus and language of regional bureau and country office directors and managers. Parity was often the first example given of WFP efforts toward GEWE, indicating that internal stakeholders recognize this common objective. Senior manager performance and competency enhancement (PACE) objectives include a gender parity key performance indicator, and WFP has introduced a requirement that at least one woman candidate is put forward for consideration for mid- to senior-level professional positions. However, it remains a significant challenge for WFP to achieve the United Nations Secretary General's target for gender parity for international staff by 2021 and for national staff by 2028.113

113. Parity differences also continue across functions. For example, in 2018 the proportion of women in functions with high total numbers of WFP employees ranged from just 25 percent in Supply Chain and 37 percent in field operations management, to 44 percent in Programmes and Policy, 65 percent in Partnerships, and 70 percent in both resource management and human resources.\textsuperscript{114} Although the evaluation team found evidence of recruitment strategies to secure women in male-dominated technical areas, like IT and Security, the 2019 People Strategy Evaluation concluded that gender parity efforts needed to go further in developing and retaining the women and men already in post, and to ensure that proper technical, functional and operational on-boarding support is always provided.

114. Both the 2018 global staff survey and the 2019 workforce culture survey found significant variances in the experiences of female and male respondents to all questions. The global staff survey found a 14 percent difference in perceptions of WFP standards of conduct.\textsuperscript{115} There was also a fall in the percent of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they are treated with respect regardless of their job, age, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnicity and physical ability compared to the 2015 global staff survey.\textsuperscript{116}

**Capacity building to achieve gender policy objectives**

**Finding 15:** Despite the development and promotion of gender learning materials (for example, the Gender Toolkit), training and e-learning, capacity-strengthening results in the field have been less encouraging due to limited training tailored to on-the-job needs and the weak resourcing of WFP gender advisor positions.

115. The primary capacity-building objective for WFP under the Gender Action Plan is to ensure adequate technical and professional expertise is available to support GEWE at all levels of the organization. Progress against this outcome is reviewed by indicators that explore self-learning, country office employee participation as members of the gender results network, and the employment of specialist gender advisors at P3 level or above (Table 12).

**Table 12. WFP performance against capacity-building indicators to support gender equality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Number of employees who complete a basic gender learning course on the Gender Learning channel of the WFP WeLearn portal</td>
<td>60% (2020)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Percentage of WFP offices with members of the GRN</td>
<td>48.6% (2014)</td>
<td>100% (2020)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Number of gender advisors (employees) in WFP – P3 level and above</td>
<td>1 P5 at HQ (2016)</td>
<td>HQ – 1 P5; 1 P4; 1 P3; RBX – 1 P4 or NOC; large COs 1 P3 or NOB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


116. Over the evaluation period there has been a notable expansion in the development and promotion of gender-related e-learning courses, with two courses launched in 2016 ("I Know Gender" and "I Know Gender in Emergencies"), a “Gender Basic Learning Journey” launched in 2017, and the "Social Norms Learning Journey" introduced in 2018. The analysis of completion rates (Figure 5) indicates that with the introduction of the Gender Policy there was an immediate rise in completion rates for the mandatory courses on the “Prevention of Fraud, Corruption and Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA)” and “Prevention of Harassment, Sexual Harassment, Abuse of Power and Discrimination (HSHAPB)”. While uptake in such


\textsuperscript{116} WFP, 2018. Global staff survey; HRM gender analysis extract and presentation. The evaluation team note that GSS reporting of Standards of conduct/ethical behaviour relating to harassment and fraud was confidential.
mandatory courses remained quite strong over the evaluation period, completion rates of non-mandatory trainings rose in 2017 with the launch of the “Gender Learning channel” but then declined in 2018.

117. When questioned about the uptake of gender e-learning courses, key informants expressed greater interest in tailored courses with content directly relevant to their work, rather than generic learning around gender. There was also frustration with remote rather than hands-on learning that may have contributed to the fall in non-mandatory course completion rates. A positive step was the 2019 WFP introduction of “Leading on Gender Equality Learning Journey”, which targeted WFP managers. Further, key informants at all levels expressed support for the “Social Norms Learning Journey” introduced in 2018. However, key informants also called for a greater focus on support from gender advisors that responds to immediate rather than generic programme needs and links employees to relevant quick guides, checklists, templates and videos available in the Gender Toolkit.

118. The development and expansion of the gender results network has improved WFP capacity to promote GEWE, particularly at country office level. Establishment of the gender results network responded to a recommendation in the evaluation of the 2009 Gender Policy (2014) that WFP transform its gender advocates network to make it more visible and effective. Supported by a P4-level programme policy officer in the Gender Office, the number of WFP country offices with nominated gender results network members rose quickly from 48 percent in 2015 to 100 percent in 2017. Gender results network membership also rose from 294 in 2016 to 703 in 2019, 61 percent of whom were women and 70 percent of whom were national employees, confirming widespread support for the initiative.117

119. Key informants at all levels consider this expansion to have enabled WFP to build a “community of practice” across its country offices and create a platform through which senior managers can promote gender as part of everyone’s business. This has been reinforced by regional efforts to build a gender results network platform and build its capacities through regional meetings, workshops, webinars, and close support and follow-up.118 Evidence of the integration of gender in gender results network member activities is supported by the gender results network survey results, which show nearly 70 percent of respondents have at least one PACE objective that supports gender mainstreaming (71 percent of women and 68 percent of men). Guided by country office gender action plans, and the growing gender results network membership, this suggests many WFP country offices are demonstrating greater commitments to capacity building.

Figure 5. Completions of gender-related learning over the WeLearn portal (2014-2019)


118 Source: RBC RGA Evaluation Communication and Final Stakeholder Workshop. It is also noted that RBC has the largest regional GRN membership of 170 individuals.
120. Nevertheless, there remains significant room for progress. Although mandatory gender training is included in employees' PACE for Gender Transformation Programme-graduated country offices and for gender results networks, only Kyrgyzstan and Zimbabwe were found to have provided this for all employees. While good practice was found in the regional bureau of Cairo, where WFP employees were expected to address at least one gender competency per year, and Nicaragua, where all managers include gender objectives in their PACE that extend beyond gender parity, the majority of WFP employee PACE objectives do not address gender-related competencies or activities.

121. Furthermore, while the gender results network is complemented by an online gender community open to all WFP employees wishing to learn about, support and engage with gender-related topics,\(^\text{119}\) with only 400 members the total size of both the gender community and gender results network remain limited relative to the overall number of employees in WFP. There are also significant differences between country offices in the amount of time individual gender results network members are encouraged to spend on gender-related activities. Gender results network reports from 2018 show that many of its members in Gender Transformation Programme countries are able to dedicate more than 20 percent of their time compared with the majority (54 percent of all gender results networks) who are able to dedicate less than 5 percent of their time, suggesting considerable opportunities for more country offices to promote the gender results network as part of their capacity-building efforts.\(^\text{120}\)

122. While the 2016 Gender Action Plan called for resourcing of 5 P4s and 1 P5 in the Gender Office alongside 18 P4 posts for very large country offices and 6 P4 posts for regional gender advisors across six WFP regional bureaux, investments into WFP gender architecture have fallen a significantly short of target.\(^\text{121}\) At the end of 2019 there were just 20 gender advisor posts in WFP at level P3 or above, including only four regional gender advisors (Annex 16), representing a level of recruitment that is particularly questionable when contrasted with the more than 18,000 employees in WFP overall.\(^\text{122}\) It is also notable that the limited WFP investments in its gender architecture relate closely to a fall in overall funding to the Gender Office in 2017-2018, despite significant increases in WFP contribution revenues over the evaluation period (Finding 19).

**Communications, knowledge and information**

Finding 16: WFP has made good progress in building and disseminating tools and good practice that support the goals of the Gender Policy at all levels. However, WFP country offices are largely the recipients rather than co-producers of these materials. As a result, knowledge and communications outputs are often viewed as theoretical and insufficiently tailored to programme needs.

123. All WFP country offices have included information on Corporate Results Framework indicators and a section that focuses on cross-cutting gender equality-related activities in their standard project and annual country reports since 2016 (Table 13). While this is positive, the primary focus has been in providing examples of gender-related activities rather than a strategic analysis of gender mainstreaming efforts.\(^\text{123}\) Key GEWE-oriented studies led by the Gender Office over the evaluation period have included the five-country study on the Potential of Food Assistance for Assets to Empower Women and Improve Women’s Nutrition (2017) and the 2019 multi-country study on cash and gender.\(^\text{124}\) These have been communicated globally, complementing external knowledge-sharing, including contributions to the Committee on World Food Security's Forum on Women's Empowerment in 2017 and the revision and piloting of the 2017 IASC Gender in Humanitarian Action Handbook.\(^\text{125}\) Significant examples from WFP regional bureaux include the West

---


\(^{120}\) WFP Gender Office, Country Office GRN reports for 2018 indicate a majority 54 percent of GRNs were able to dedicate less than 5 percent of their time to gender related activities.

\(^{121}\) WFP, 2016. Gender Action Plan: Walking the Talk. WFP/EB.1/2016/4-B.

\(^{122}\) COs with dedicated gender advisors include Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Malawi, Myanmar, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic and Uganda. Many COs have joint gender and protection officers.

\(^{123}\) Review of ACRs from the 12 country evaluation sample (2016-2018).

\(^{124}\) WFP, 2017. The Potential of Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) to Empower Women and Improve Women’s Nutrition; WFP, 2019. The Potential of Cash-Based Interventions to Promote Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

Africa study on Women’s Access to Markets, and ongoing Regional Situation Analysis on the Lives of Women and Girls in the Arab World co-led by WFP and UNICEF.126

Table 13. WFP performance in the provision of relevant communications, knowledge and information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Percentage of relevant project reports and annual country reports reporting on gender equality results and lessons learned</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Number of gender-specific research products produced by WFP</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 (2020)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


124. The evaluation team also found examples of Gender Transformation Programme countries that have recognized the importance of gender context analyses to programme and country strategic plan development, or that support evidence-gathering under gender-targeted programmes, such as the JP-RWEE.129 While this demonstrates the successful application of Gender Transformation Programme benchmark category 5, which focuses on the integration of gender equality in knowledge products and communications, key informants expressed concerns that gender communications and knowledge were hard to initiate or fund; they remain highly dependent on gender advisor support and the leadership priorities of the country office management teams.130 With few gender advisors available in WFP and many country offices not giving priority to this area, key informants at all levels argued that most country offices largely remain the end-users of these resources rather than proactive participants in their development.131

125. Nevertheless, gender results network members do remain largely positive with respect to their understanding of GEWE. Of the gender results network survey respondents, 72 percent agreed or strongly agreed they have had adequate access to knowledge on GEWE, and 76 percent reported that they have applied learning from associated knowledge products, including Gender Toolkit resources and quarterly gender results network digests. There is also strong evidence of regional efforts to support the capacity building of gender results networks led by regional gender advisors, signifying WFP has a bedrock of support to build on and accelerate its gender-related communications and knowledge efforts.

**WFP Engagement in partnerships for the integration of GEWE in food assistance**

**Finding 17: WFP engagement with partners at global level to deliver on its Gender Policy commitments has fallen in recent years. Cooperating partners have been supported by improved field level agreements (FLAs) that include gender and protection accountabilities.**

126. WFP recognizes that diverse and strategic partnerships are essential for the delivery of transformative change on GEWE.132 However, despite a strong GEWE relationship with the Rome-based agencies, there has been a fall in corporate-level gender equality partnerships from nine in 2016 to seven in 2019 due to financial and human-resource limitations in the Gender Office (Table 14).

---

127 2018 ACRs included a section on Progress Towards Gender Equality (Source, WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.).
130 See also the summary of GTP benchmarking reports provided in Annex 15.
131 Sources: CO and RB key informants, Gender Office GTP final assessments; GRN reports for 2018; Secondary review of CO documentation.
132 WFP, 2019. Annual Update to the Executive Board. WFP/EB.A/2019/S-E.
The WFP Gender Office has actively led its corporate GEWE partnerships with the Rome-based agencies in the JP-RWEE, the Committee on World Food Security, and events such as International Women’s Day and 16 Days of Activism against GBV. It has supported partnerships on “gender equality for food security” with Gallup, Gender in Humanitarian Action with the IASC, gender equality with the United Nations Statistics Division “Group Task Team”, a Gender Standby Capacity Project, and strategic dialogues with Women Deliver, the International Women's Development Agency, UNDP, Plan and Care. There is also strong evidence that the Gender Office supported other headquarter divisions, including the Office of Evaluation’s collaboration with the United Nations Evaluation Group on gender in evaluations, and the launch of the European Union-supported global initiative to “address the root causes of rural gender inequalities and strengthen efforts to end hunger” led by other headquarters divisions.133

Progress at the operational level has been more positive. The 2017 evaluation of WFP’s Corporate Partnership Strategy found that WFP had encouraged partners to close gender gaps, ensure gender was not framed as “women and girls”, and address the protection of beneficiaries. However, it noted that WFP partnership guidance lacked detail on the means to promote, monitor or address potential barriers to GEWE and ensure partner compliance.134 In part, these concerns were addressed by the introduction of a revised field level agreement framework by the Partnerships and Gender Offices in 2017, alongside regional bureau and country office teams, which includes annexes outlining commitments to gender and protection, the provision of effective complaints and feedback mechanisms, and a budget template that contains a gender budget statement with a breakdown of gender activity cost categories.135

### Financial tracking of gender-related budgets and costs

**Finding 18:** Although the Gender Office and Resources Management Division have cooperated to develop a standard template and process for gender equality budgeting, the organization is behind target on planned resourcing. Systems for gender expenditure tracking are not yet fully developed, and there is a lack of common understanding and interpretation, which has led to concerns over the accuracy and utility of gender-related financial tracking.

In line with commitments set out in the Gender Action Plan in 2016, WFP aims to track the contributions of corporate funding to GEWE across all operations and functional areas. The Gender Office has developed a gender budget monitoring approach and has actively sought the support of WFP Resource Management Divisions. Guidance on “Country Strategic Plan Gender-Responsive Planning and Budgeting” was introduced in 2017, and the Gender Office contributed to briefings of WFP reporting and finance officers through 2017 and 2018.136

In the preparation of programme support and administration budgets, budget holders estimate the gender-related costs of each deliverable and enter this in WINGS, alongside estimates of gender-related employee costs (including, but not limited to, gender officers, advisors, consultants, focal points and gender results network members). Planned country office, regional bureau and headquarters gender equality budget allocations are totalled and presented in the management plan. Table 15 shows that, by 2018, WFP had fallen behind the 14 percent target for the year, with 12.3 percent of budgeted resources allocated to activities promoting gender equality. This represented a fall from 13 percent in 2017 despite significant increases in the total contribution value to WFP over the same period.

### Table 14. WFP performance against targets to improve gender equality through partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Number of gender equality partnerships established at corporate level</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Number of field level agreements at country office level (for CSPs) that contain GEWE provisions</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2 per CO (2020)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Updates on the Gender Policy: WFP/EB.A/2016/5-F; WFP/EB.A/2017/5; WFP/EB.A/2018/5-G; WFP/EB.A/2019/5-E.

137 FAO, 2019. UN Food Agencies Step Up Joint Efforts to Tackle Rural Gender Inequalities.
135 United Nations Partner Portal: WFP Partner Guidelines, Templates and Agreements.
136 WFP Gender Office, Internal communications, CSP Gender Equality Budget.
Table 15. WFP performance against financial resources targets for gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Planned requirements for GEWE as percentage of total WFP planned requirements</td>
<td>11% (2015)</td>
<td>15% (2020)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Actual expenditures on GEWE as percentage of WFP actual expenditures</td>
<td>11% (2015)</td>
<td>15% (2020)</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


131. In comparing interviews with finance staff and managers at all levels, a range of views on the utility and accuracy of the WFP gender budgeting approach were expressed. While all agreed that gender budgeting remains a potentially useful indicator of WFP support to GEWE, many key informants consider the tagging of gender-related costs across budgets to be imprecise and open to wide variances in interpretation. Overall, the evaluation team was unable to determine the balance of real increases in funding for GEWE.

132. Efforts to develop and implement a framework for GEWE-related expenditure tracking in line with Gender Action Plan commitments (Indicator 7.2 in Table 15) were postponed in 2017 following feedback that the exercise was too complex, open to differences in interpretation, and of limited utility. The suspension has meant WFP is unable to cross-reference planned, gender-related budget cost estimates against actual expenditures, and has failed to meet UN-SWAP performance indicator 9 for financial resource tracking as a result.137 All interviews exploring WFP experiences of gender expenditure tracking agreed with the suspension. In a positive effort to move this agenda forward, in 2018 the Gender Office started a collaboration with the Resources Management Department to incorporate a more reliable expenditure-tracking process into the WFP financial management system and WINGS. This is being piloted by the Jordan country office. Integration into the WFP Resources to Results framework is planned for 2020.

WFP Fund Allocations for GEWE

Finding 19: The programme support and administration budget allocations for gender advisor positions and gender mainstreaming have been falling significantly relative to the growth in resources for WFP operations since 2015 and the scale of demand for support across WFP country offices and regional bureaux.

133. WFP ambitions for resourcing the implementation of the Gender Policy, including its gender architecture and capacity-building efforts were outlined in the 2016 Gender Action Plan (Section 1.3).138 In 2016, only three of six regional bureaux recruited regional gender advisors. Due to resource constraints, WFP entities were expected to seek multilateral and direct contributions to fill funding gaps and integrate gender dimensions into management plans for 2016-2021. As of January 1, 2020, there were 5 full-time and one part-time employee in the Gender Office, 4 regional gender advisors across WFP regional bureaux, 28 national and international gender advisors in post in WFP country offices (the large majority below P4 level) and more than 700 members of the gender results network.

134. This picture of under-resourcing is reflected in the review of investments into the Gender Office, where a USD 1.8 million programme, support and administration allocation to the Gender Office in 2019 covering employee and operational (policy, advisory, research and other) costs was lower than the nearly USD 2 million actual contributions in 2017 (Figure 6).139 The drop in Gender Office funding was particularly acute in 2017-2018. While it was followed by a modest recovery in 2018-2019, it is notable that the fall in overall funding for the Gender Office over the evaluation period coincided with a highly significant 37 percent

137 UN-SWAP Indicator 9 includes: (i) Financial resource-tracking to quantify disbursement of funds that promote GEWE; and, (ii) Results of financial resource tracking [that] influence central strategic planning concerning budget allocations.


139 Data sources presented derive from WFP management plans 2016-2018 to 2020-2022. While all data has been cross-referenced against Gender Office PSA budgets, the two do not fully correlate, suggesting PSA tracking weaknesses in WFP.
increase in the annual contribution revenue of USD 8.1 billion to WFP in 2019 relative to 2016,\textsuperscript{140} and an increase of USD 47.8 million (14.8 percent) in WFP overhead recovery for indirect support costs relative to the programme, support and administration budgets in 2018.\textsuperscript{141} In response to the increasing scale of WFP operations and high levels of demand for gender-related support, the reduction in funding to the WFP Gender Office should be a significant concern for WFP decision-makers for both the strategic positioning of the Gender Office and its support for gender mainstreaming.

**Figure 6. WFP Gender Office programme support and administration investments in relation to contribution revenue (2016-2019)**

![Figure 6](image)

Sources: Gender Office annual budgets (2016-2019); WFP contributions by year (2016-2020) provide actual contribution revenue as of 26 January 2020 based on WFP audited accounts (2016-2018) and latest 2019 estimates.

**WFP incorporation of GEWE in evaluations**

Finding 20: While independent quality assessments of evaluations highlighted weaknesses in GEWE integration in 2016 and 2017, substantial improvements were made in 2018 and 2019, showing a positive trend that has been reinforced by the commissioning of gender-focused evaluations since 2018.

In 2016, the Office of Evaluation established an outsourced post-hoc quality assessment (PHQA) service for the independent assessment of the quality of evaluation reports. A key part of the assessment is the extent to which WFP integrates GEWE into centralized and decentralized evaluations (CEs and DEs).\textsuperscript{142} The results from these assessments are used for the computation of the UN-SWAP evaluation performance indicator (EPI) report (Table 16).\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{140} WFP, 2020. Contributions by year. Data summarizes actual contribution revenue as of 26 January 2020 based on WFP audited accounts (2016-2018) and 2019 estimates. See also WFP management plans (2016-2021) for PSA budgets.


\textsuperscript{142} This analysis uses UN-SWAP criteria that assess GEWE integration in: (i) the evaluation scope and criteria; (ii) the methodology, methods and tools and data analysis; and (iii) evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

\textsuperscript{143} Post-hoc quality assessments are carried out in three batches (May, October, February). The UN-SWAP overall score is calculated in January and only considers the results of the first two batches.
Table 16. WFP performance in the UN-SWAP and post-hoc annual meta-reviews of WFP evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Score awarded in the annual meta-review of WFP evaluations under UN-SWAP</td>
<td>7.51-10.50 (2014)</td>
<td>10.51-12.00 (2020)</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CE and DE reports included in UN-SWAP EPI report</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 CE 5 DEs</td>
<td>7 CEs 17 DEs</td>
<td>4 CEs 10 DEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score awarded in the annual post-hoc quality assessment of evaluation reports</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CEs: 5.7 DEs: 4.5</td>
<td>CEs: 6.1 DEs: 5.7</td>
<td>CEs: 6.9 DEs: 7.4</td>
<td>CEs: 8 DEs: 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CE and DE reports included in post-hoc quality assessments</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16 CEs 6 Des</td>
<td>7 CEs 10 DEs</td>
<td>9 CEs 23 DEs</td>
<td>6 CEs 14 DEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


136. As Table 16 shows, WFP UN-SWAP 2.0 evaluation ratings for 2018 and 2019 show improvement over 2016 and 2017.144

137. To understand the nature of GEWE improvements identified in the 2018 and 2019 PHQAs, the evaluation team reviewed 18 centralized and decentralized evaluations published in 2018 and 2019 (Annex 17). Seven out of the 13 decentralized evaluations included specific evaluation questions relating to the extent to which the programme was informed by gender analysis.145 All of the evaluation reports included a recommendation relating to gender. However, the evaluation team also found the decentralized evaluation recommendations focused on the use of sex-disaggregated data, gender analysis and integration of gender in programme design in a general sense, rather than providing specific, context-relevant insights as to how or where programmes may have identified opportunities to clearly deliver against the Gender Policy objectives.

138. While no gender-focused evaluations were commissioned between 2016 and 2017, WFP has increasingly supported gender-focused evaluations since 2018. These include this evaluation of the Gender Policy (2015-2020), four gender-focused joint decentralized evaluations,146 three decentralized evaluations commissioned by country offices,147 and four centralized evaluations under the cash-based transfers and gender impact evaluation window introduced in 2019. Finally, at the time of writing, WFP is supporting an inter-agency humanitarian evaluation of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.

WFP oversight of GEWE

Finding 21: WFP has been largely successful in meeting oversight standards that reinforce high-level accountabilities for GEWE through mechanisms, such as the UN-SWAP and the recent inclusion of gender in the corporate internal audit programme, but could go further to systematically apply a gender analysis to enterprise risk assessments.

139. WFP oversight of GEWE is based on adherence to UN-SWAP standards and integration of GEWE into the WFP approach to risk management (with a focus on internal audit). Over the evaluation period, WFP was largely successful in meeting its UN-SWAP commitments, having met or exceeded 13 of the 15 UN-SWAP 1.0 indicators in 2017 (compared with 12 in the 2014 baseline), and 13 out of 17 UNSWAP 2.0 indicators in 2018 and 2019 (Table 17, Figure 7). While this performance is to be commended, WFP has shown little progress in

---

144 The increase from a score of 6 in 2017 to 10.4 the following year can in part be attributed to an ongoing improvement of 1.4 points across both DEs and CEs, and the commissioning of Gender Policy evaluations (in 2014 and 2019) that merited 3 further points. The global PHQA data for the analysis of CEs and DEs shows a steady improvement in the gender equality component of CEs, which rose from 5.7 in 2016 to 7.8 in 2019, as well as DEs, which rose from a score of 4.5 in 2016 to 7.3 in 2019. OEV post-hoc quality assessment reports 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019.

145 Kenya, Laos and Rwanda included the question: “To what extent was the design and implementation of the program gender sensitive and informed by gender analysis?”; Nigeria, Ethiopia and Malawi included a section on gender analysis.

146 These include evaluations of the JP-RWEE in Kyrgyzstan commissioned by UNWOMEN; global JP-RWEE commissioned by the WFP Gender Office; and the Joint Program on Girls’ Education (phases I and II) commissioned by WFP Malawi.
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developing the areas of financial-resource tracking, gender architecture, and equal representation of women throughout the evaluation period (Annex 18 has details of performance against each UN-SWAP indicator by year), suggesting a clear need for the organization to show greater strategic leadership and focus on improving performance across these areas.

Table 17. WFP oversight to enhance accountability for delivery on corporate commitments to GEWE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP outcome indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Percentage achievement of requirements for the UN-SWAP performance indicators</td>
<td>80% (2014)</td>
<td>100% (2020)</td>
<td>93% 14 of 15 indicators</td>
<td>87% 13 of 15 indicators</td>
<td>75% 13 of 17 indicators</td>
<td>75% 13 of 17 indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2. Percentage of audits undertaken where gender is integrated into the risk assessment approach</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2016 Gender Audit</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Since 2017, the participatory gender audit approach has been superseded by efforts to integrate gender risk analysis in the WFP approach to internal audit. Although figures for 2018 show only 52 percent of audits included gender risk analysis in 2018 (Indicator 9.2, Table 17), this position shifted in 2019, with the introduction of a Gender Audit Programme that provides auditors with a library of audit tests to apply across country offices and organizational risk assessments.\(^{148}\)

Figure 7. WFP accountability to UN-SWAP commitments\(^{149}\)


Prior to 2019, very few country office and thematic audit reports included a gender risk analysis.\(^{150}\) Exceptions included: a review of gender parity and the country office’s gender committee in Afghanistan (2014); livelihood and gender programming in Zimbabwe (2016); sex-disaggregated beneficiary lists and gender parity in Mozambique (2017); and a PSEA hotline in South Sudan (2018). While it is unclear if these examples responded to locally identified issues or the systematic auditing of gender risk across country offices, more recent country office audits show a consistent use of the Gender Audit Programme since its introduction in 2019 involving a more systematic use of assessments and commentaries in internal audit reports (Table 18).

\(^{148}\) Gender was included in just 11 of 21 audits conducted in 2018.
\(^{149}\) Source, Gender Office, 2018 Annual Update to the Executive Board.
\(^{150}\) https://www.wfp.org/audit-inspection-reports
### Table 18. Summary of gender analysis in WFP internal audit reports (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country office</th>
<th>Audit assessment summary</th>
<th>Audit commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Parity: 25% women employees. Security priorities and training for women employees. Data collection disaggregated by sex</td>
<td>Audit judges that parity ratios are acceptable in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Parity: 62% representation of women in the country office, but only 25% in national employees. Cross-cutting gender outcome indicators not yet integrated with country office use of sex but not age-disaggregated gender data. Planned gender equality activities were not funded for 2019</td>
<td>Constraints recruiting national women for higher job grades; focal point and action plan. Country office should allocate resources for GEWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Low overall representation of women. Programmes did not achieve gender targets. Country office had not monitored or reported on gender markers.</td>
<td>County office needs a tailored recruitment initiative for women employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Parity: 67% representation of women, including management, but 75% of GTP benchmarking criteria not met in 2018. GTP actions planned 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Parity: Low representation of women in the country office. Country office reviewing gender in programme teams and beneficiaries.</td>
<td>Senior international and national women recruitment drive initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.wfp.org/audit-inspection-reports](https://www.wfp.org/audit-inspection-reports)

### 2.3 WHY HAS THE GENDER POLICY PRODUCED THE RESULTS THAT HAVE BEEN OBSERVED?

This section examines the factors that have enabled or hindered the results described in Section 2.2. Each of the Findings outlined in sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.6 above correlates with causes reviewed in Sections 2.3.1 to 2.3.9 below.

#### 2.3.1 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PROGRAMME PROCESSES

**Finding 22:** While the compulsory use of sex- and age-disaggregated data required by the Gender Policy, Gender Action Plan and Corporate Results Framework has acted as a driver to establish a basic level of gender analysis across WFP programmes, the primary focus has been on quantitative reporting on beneficiaries rather than also including a qualitative gender analysis. A richer, more detailed gender analysis is needed to ensure that all WFP programmes have an improved understanding of, and respond to, the different needs of women, men, boys and girls within each country office’s specific operational context.

The compulsory inclusion of sex- and age-disaggregated data in corporate monitoring systems and country strategic plans has been a strong internal driver for action; however, it is not yet universally applied. Although the Gender Policy objectives were found to be relevant to the analysis of GEWE across WFP programmes, an unintended effect of the Corporate Results Framework has been a focus on collecting quantitative data rather than building a qualitative understanding of GEWE in relation to WFP programming. This has reinforced interpretations of gender as being primarily about increasing the participation of women and girls in relation to the “type of transfer”, or “proportion received”, “missing the point of real gender
transformation, which could be sought through enhanced attention to empowerment and attitudinal changes at community and household levels.\textsuperscript{151}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Box 11. New approaches to monitoring} \\
\hline
In 2019, Bolivia and Jordan began to explore gender analysis at the individual level. At the regional level, WFP introduced the Pacific Gender and Inclusion Emergency Preparedness Capacity Index. In 2019, the Gender Office and Gallup also began to develop a quantitative tool that uses a cognitive interview approach to generate gender equality data for the analysis of food security experiences in relation to decision-making, financial self-sufficiency, labour, reproductive freedom, and freedom from violence. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

144. Difficulties with the Corporate Results Framework have been reinforced by a focus on the household as the unit of analysis for many of its outcome indicators: an approach that does not allow WFP to understand crucial issues influencing food and nutritional security that operate at an individual and intra-household level. The evaluation team takes note of recent initiatives WFP has introduced to explore alternative monitoring approaches (Box 11). Similar initiatives are needed to support country offices like Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Rwanda, which have struggled to apply Corporate Results Framework indicators to “delivering to enabling” initiatives that aim to strengthen government partner capacities.

145. WFP collection, analysis and use of sex- and age-disaggregated data relies heavily on the capacities and interests of cooperating partners (CPs). Although field level agreements incorporate gender-related annexes and clauses, cooperating partners focus on activity reporting rather GEWE and the cooperating partners’ use of their own gender-related indicators is rarely presented. Although WFP training of cooperating partners, specifically supported by the Gender Transformation Programme framework and applied in Gender Transformation Programme countries, has led to improvements, even basic approaches, such as separate focus group discussions for women and men, can be overlooked by cooperating partners that do not receive appropriate training and support.

146. A key driver behind country offices that prioritized gender context analyses to inform their country strategic plans, and that put in place gender-responsive monitoring strategies, was the individual country office management team, rather than corporate accountabilities. In many, but not all, cases this can be linked to country offices that participate in the Gender Transformation Programme process. Where the majority of WFP country offices have instead relied on regional and corporate gender studies, this has led to a generic interpretation of GEWE that may not be sufficiently tailored to the specific operational context of WFP programmes and the different needs of women, men, girls and boys.

**How have WFP planning and guidance supported the achievement of the Gender Policy objectives?**

**Finding 23: The Gender Office has taken significant steps to integrate gender equality perspectives in country strategic plans and in developing appropriate GEWE guidance and support. Bottlenecks persist in some regional bureaux and country offices with respect to the consistent resourcing and support for regional gender strategies, gender advisors and capacity-strengthening of WFP country and field level employees.**

147. Demonstrating a gender with age marker rating of 3 in country strategic plans has been a mandatory requirement since 2017, with a review of country strategic plans undertaken by regional gender advisors and the Gender Office and supported by the gender with age marker webpage. While this has been key in driving the WFP Gender Action Plan commitments, many regional bureau and country office key informants consider the process of using and responding to the gender with age marker and associated comments to have verged on the mechanistic, with significant changes to the gender focus of country strategic plans made only by country offices whose early drafts were gender blind or lacked any gender analysis. There were also concerns that the focus on compliance to gender with age marker ratings led to tensions between the Gender Office and some country offices, a point recognized by the Gender Office. Given the number of country strategic plan drafts the Gender Office had to review, the evaluation team consider the focus on assuring the inclusion of GEWE language in country strategic plans as a benchmark for future accountability to have been appropriate.

\textsuperscript{151} WFP, 2017. Operation Evaluations Series, Regional Synthesis 2013-2017, West and Central Africa Region. This was a common finding of all six regional synthesizes of WFP Operations Evaluation Series, finalized in 2017.
148. Guidance on the collection and use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and gender context analysis is available to WFP and its partners. Use of the Gender Toolkit is prevalent in country offices where the management team promotes gender analysis, and there have been conscious efforts to build skills, resources and support for GEWE through capacity strengthening and the recruitment of gender results network members and gender advisors (where appropriate). In Kyrgyzstan, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Rwanda, leadership has been supported by enrolment in the Gender Transformation Programme, which has helped the country offices build momentum toward achieving WFP Gender Policy commitments. Although there has been a reluctance to invest in the Gender Transformation Programme in some country offices, demand to register in the graduation process is significantly ahead of the Gender Office’s resource capacities to invest in the process and should be given greater support in future.\(^{152}\)

149. Support for the design, circulation and use of regional gender strategies, developed in 2015-2016, was evident at all levels. This led to the updating of regional gender strategies in 2018 to ensure their alignment with the Integrated Road Map and associated country strategic plans.\(^{153}\) It also led to the regional bureau of Cairo initiating its own review of its regional general implementation strategy in 2019, focusing on integrating gender in the programme cycle, accelerating uptake of the Gender Transformation Programme and gender results network, and building regional gender advisor capacities. However, a combination of WFP corporate focus on fast-tracking country strategic plans, limited financial support and intermittent recruitment of regional gender advisors to positions of influence in some regional bureaux (commensurate with a high level of gender expertise and experience) created critical barriers to regional gender strategies that undermined the decentralized implementation of the Gender Policy through WFP regional bureaux and country offices.

### 2.3.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL DRIVERS

How has human resources supported and been supported to promote GEWE through its policies and hiring practices?

**Finding 24:** While WFP has focused on a corporate push toward gender parity, human resource-related investments in other areas that would accelerate wider contributions to gender equality are comparatively limited, contributing to different perspectives of WFP progress among women and men employees.

150. Progress towards gender parity targets in mid-level positions can be attributed to internal targets for gender parity improvements that were set for national and international employees in the 2014 People Strategy and 2016 Gender Action Plan.\(^{154}\) WFP is to be commended for pre-empting external efforts to address gender parity in the United Nations system as prioritized by the United Nations Secretary General,\(^{155}\) and to have built on these external drivers by identifying targets for all country offices and functional areas in the Gender Parity Action Plan (GPAP, 2018).\(^{156}\)

151. Nevertheless, some key informants noted that gender parity can be interpreted as “women for promotion”, and risks creating barriers between men and women employees. This is not helped by the GPAP focusing on women rather than gender and referring to women rather than both women and men as caregivers.\(^{157}\) It is therefore important that a stronger gender lens is applied. For example, although the GPAP recognizes gender parity differences exist across functional areas, its focus on recruitment of women to areas dominated by men (Finding 14) needs to be balanced by attention to areas such as human resources, resource management, evaluation and partnerships where women employees outnumber men.

---

\(^{152}\) Gender Office, evaluation communication. This includes countries with emergency contexts like Syria (graduated in 2018), Yemen, and Libya that are currently progressing with their improvement plans with RBC support.


\(^{155}\) UN Women, 2017. System-Wide Strategy on Gender Parity, 2017

\(^{156}\) WFP, 2018. The Gender Parity Action Plan

\(^{157}\) This perspective was repeated across key informants at country, regional and Rome levels, and across functions.
152. Significant variances in the perceptions of men and women employees concerning HSHAPD were revealed in the 2019 general staff survey. While efforts to improve the workplace experiences of women employees and increase employee protection from HSHAPD have been in place since 2018 (including roll-out of the Respect Campaign in more than 40 countries, extending face-to-face awareness raising to more than 3,400 employees, establishing a Joint Working Group to respond to the Workforce Culture Report in 2019, and recruiting a senior advisor to the Executive Director in 2020), just 60 percent of women gender results network members agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “there is strong leadership in WFP to support the mainstreaming of gender equality and women’s empowerment” compared with 80 percent of men (Annex 6). Significantly more attention is needed to extend WFP human-resource priorities and communications beyond gender parity to address all dimensions of gender equality and women’s empowerment in the WFP workplace.

**How have capacity-development initiatives supported and been supported to improve technical and professional expertise in GEWE?**

Finding 25: Capacity building to support implementation of the Gender Policy (2015-2020) is clearly integrated across WFP support structures, and there is good progress across most Gender Action Plan areas. Nevertheless, limited resources have led to a reliance on e-learning that has, in turn, led many stakeholders to view capacity building as too theoretical and insufficiently tailored to the everyday needs of country and field offices.

153. Despite significant resource constraints, the Gender Office has shown leadership in establishing the gender results network members and developing online GEWE e-learning materials. Capacity building across WFP functions has been aided by the strategic positioning of the Gender Office with the Deputy Executive Director. This provided leverage for the 2018 Gender Capacity Development Plan (GCDP) in becoming a priority for both the Gender Office and Human Resources Division. The GCDP capacity-building modalities developed by the Gender Office responded appropriately to strong demand for person-to-person training to complement guidelines and tools, case studies and good practice summaries identified by gender capacity assessments in 2014 and 2016 (Box 12). However limited WFP financial and human resources investments over the evaluation period have led to a reliance on e-learning resources and services relative to hands-on capacity building.

### Box 12. Summary of gender capacity-development plan modalities

- **Online:** E-courses, videos, lunch time sessions, webinars, web portals
- **In-person:** Classroom sessions, workshops, sessions with experts – gender advisors and gender focal points
- **Self-study:** Handbooks, guides and manuals in online, offline or printed form
- **Blended:** Online & classroom; self-study & group discussion, application of learning in on-the-job tasks
- **Learning by doing (action learning):** Acquiring new knowledge and applying it to current work with colleagues
- **Group-based learning:** Onsite and virtual groups where all contributions are valued and well facilitated
- **Mentoring:** Supporting targeted technical and soft skills in an informal space

Source: Evaluation team assessment.

154. Evidence of positive change comes from country offices that have participated in the Gender Transformation Programme and recruited gender results network members to unlock broad-based support from WFP employees. Annex 15 provides examples of self-reported Gender Transformation Programme achievements summarized against the Gender Action Plan Layer 2 programme processes and organizational drivers. Due to the concrete aspects of capacity building and self-analysis supported by the Gender Transformation Programme, the evaluation team consider it to have been a highly successful driver of change that, in gaining the leadership support of senior management teams, has also helped strengthen gender results network commitments alongside country office contributions to the Gender Policy objectives.

---

158 WFP, General Staff Survey, 2018.
159 Executive Director’s Circular (Human Resources Division). OED 2018/007
160 WFP, 2018. Update on the Gender Policy to the Executive Board. WFP/EB.A/2018/5-G
155. Nevertheless, a significant capacity-building challenge is the demand from country office programme and field office employees and partners for more face-to-face support from specialist gender advisors. This finding was also identified by the 2019 strategic evaluation of WFP’s Capacity to Respond to Emergencies, which related gaps and delays in the integration of GEWE in WFP humanitarian response to a lack of available expertise that led to the limited use of guidance materials. Notable exceptions exist in regions that have successfully recruited and retained regional gender advisors, which, in an example highlighted by many key informants, led to the successful involvement of gender advisors in the Cox’s Bazar L3 surge response.

156. Unfortunately, fewer gender advisor posts have been filled than anticipated in the Gender Action Plan. With no career pathway for gender advisors in WFP, those who are recruited either need to shift technical focus to gain promotion or leave the organization, thereby diminishing institutional memory. In addition, having no specialized, non-rotational gender advisor roles as there are in other WFP divisions leads to diluted momentum to support gender mainstreaming and capacity strengthening as a result of staff reassignment.

**Finding 26:** While WFP has made good progress in developing GEWE-specific knowledge products, the interpretation and uptake of these products across the organization remains limited due to insufficient progress integrating gender equality and women's empowerment into WFP communications. A common framework for these, and interpretation and understanding of, roles and responsibilities related to gender in WFP communications is required.

157. The Gender Office has used limited human and financial resources to successfully build a WFP knowledge base, despite the MOPAN assessments that the “use of the evidence base remains inconsistent across the organization”, and that “WFP recognizes the need for a more systematic approach to the use of evidence in designing new interventions and to knowledge management for the uptake of lessons learned.”

158. Although a variety of gender-related communications activities have been undertaken at country office level (for example, development and dissemination of communication and advocacy materials during the 16 Days of Activism against Gender-Based Violence), the management of these activities has lacked a clear corporate directive or support. For example, while key informants at all levels consistently highlighted examples where WFP had communicated women's stories, many were concerned that the WFP approach to gender communications was confused, leaving them unclear whether or how to advocate on gender issues. This has not been facilitated by the 2014 Communications Strategy, which included high-level references to gender, such as “empowering women is the first step towards a world with zero hunger”, or the 2017 Corporate Communications and Branding Strategy, which provides no reference to GEWE or gender concepts other than recognizing differences between women and men. Portraying women's stories is not synonymous with gender and can at times lead to communications messaging that reinforces gender stereotypes. It is important for future internal collaboration to establish a common framework for, and interpretation and understanding of, roles and responsibilities relating to gender in WFP communications.

**Finding 27:** While WFP has successfully used partner dialogue and capacity building to incorporate gender requirements in field level agreements, its ability to monitor the contributions of cooperating partners to the Gender Policy objectives remains limited. The role of WFP in promoting gender equality through its government partnerships needs to be clarified.

159. WFP dialogue with cooperating partners on gender-related requirements is increasingly used to support the preparation of field level agreements, especially in, but not limited to, Gender Transformation Programme-graduated countries. There was also evidence of WFP country offices providing gender-related

---

161 For example, gender newsletters and digital updates are disseminated to COs and RBs, with awareness raising such as the “Shifting Perspectives, Living Vulnerable Lives” given to RBJ country directors and direct support to RBs and COs.

training for cooperating partners, including with regional gender advisor support in areas such as gender transformation (for example, in Zimbabwe), and gender-based violence and safe referrals (for example, in Lebanon). Despite this progress, weaker cooperating partners struggle to embed GEWE considerations in their field level agreements and reports, and there remains a need to provide practical guidance and support to help them address barriers to GEWE. The WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017) noted that, beyond specific field level agreement targets, WFP has limited means to promote, monitor or ensure partner compliance toward GEWE principles. This is also apparent for cooperating partners with strong gender commitments, where the evaluation team found significant under-reporting of GEWE contributions relative to general activity delivery and expenditures. As a result, WFP is unable to assess the contributions of its partners to the Gender Policy objectives, leading to lost opportunities to build understanding of GEWE and gender and protection risks.

Although a key dimension of the Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and the Policy on Country Strategic Plans focuses on the strategic shift “from delivering to enabling”, there is confusion as to how WFP should promote GEWE through its government partnerships. While good practice examples exist, such as gender-informed consultations with government, donors, NGOs and civil society in Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Timor Leste and Zimbabwe, key informants at all levels consider the role of WFP to be ambiguous. This reflects the evaluation of the WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014-2017), which found that neither the WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) nor its operational guidelines explored the gender or equity dimensions of partner governments. The summary evaluation report of the WFP Policy on Capacity Development (2017) also found only a basic level of gender awareness in the design, implementation and monitoring of government capacity building, which had led WFP to track sex-disaggregated participation in capacity-building initiatives rather than on wider contributions to the strengthening of GEWE. The evaluation team agrees with both internal and external key informants who argue that WFP must be much clearer as to the focus of its capacity strengthening in support of gender mainstreaming within specific, targeted national Zero Hunger policies and programmes.

To what extent have funds been raised, allocated and tracked to contribute to the gender policy objectives?

Finding 28: The failure of WFP to fully meet its financial commitments under the Gender Action Plan has limited progress against the Gender Policy. Although the Gender Office has provided guidance to support country offices in gender-related resource mobilization, this has not led to shifts in WFP extra-budgetary funding for GEWE or new partnerships that might support future resource mobilization for gender mainstreaming.

WFP ambitions for funding the implementation of the Gender Policy were outlined in the 2016 Gender Action Plan, with a focus on combining programme support and administration with extra-budgetary resources for gender-related activities. In 2016, the Gender Office produced a reference document for country offices listing gender equality-related donor interests and funding opportunities. Integration of gender in country office resource-mobilization strategies has also been included as a benchmark of the Gender Transformation Programme, with guidance for a package of learning materials, tools and support.

The evaluation team consider the scale of these initiatives to have been appropriate relative to the limited resourcing of the Gender Office identified in Finding 19. However, WFP has failed to match high levels of demand across its country offices for resource-mobilization support to gender mainstreaming (as opposed to stand-alone gender-related projects), and it was disappointing to find few resource-mobilization programme or partnership examples that had been specifically designed to support GEWE in WFP country offices, regional bureaux or Rome headquarters.

163 WFP, Rwanda, 2017. SPR., and KIIs; WFP, Zimbabwe, 2019. SPR., and KIIs and FGDs; WFP, Lebanon, 2019. SPR.
164 Sources: CO documentary reviews and key informant interviews for Kyrgyzstan Nicaragua, Rwanda, Zimbabwe. Key informant evaluation communication for Nepal and Timor Leste.
166 An exception is the Government of Denmark funding for sexual and reproductive health launched in 2017. Both the JP-RWEE and Government of Australia funding for Enhancing Food Security and Nutrition were introduced in 2014.
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Given that the most recent available data shows funding for GEWE globally to have reached USD 41.4 billion in 2015-2016 (including USD 4.6 billion that specifically prioritized gender as its main objective),

the evaluation team considers the failure to invest in resource mobilization for gender mainstreaming to have been a significant lost opportunity for WFP. Interviews with donors in the strategic evaluation of Funding for WFP’s Work (2020) confirmed the opinions of some WFP Executive Board Members that WFP is still not recognized as a strong, gender-focused organization. Key informants at all levels argue that a primary cause is the limited number of gender advisors and employees in key areas of the organization who can identify gender-related funding opportunities, build donor relationships around gender mainstreaming, or explore joint fundraising and programming partnerships with the Rome-based agencies and gender-specialized organizations, such as UN Women and UNFPA.

To what extent do WFP evaluations support the achievement of the Gender Policy objectives?

Finding 29: WFP UN-SWAP and post-hoc quality assurance ratings have together acted as a key driver for the integration of gender in evaluations. However, while guidance and support have been provided, barriers to incorporating gender analyses have included weaknesses in the framing of programme designs around GEWE, a lack of quality data, and limited gender capacities. This limits the extent to which evaluations are able to contribute to WFP GEWE-related accountability and learning needs.

The Evaluation Policy (2016-2021) includes gender equality as one of its guiding principles. This can be linked to UN-SWAP, which has been a clear driver for performance in evaluation. The Office of Evaluation's transition from UN-SWAP 1.0 to UN-SWAP 2.0 in 2018 demonstrates a commitment to align with other United Nations agencies.

Improvements in the integration of GEWE in evaluations in 2018 and 2019 can be explained by a combination of factors. A report commissioned by the Office of Evaluation in 2016 recommended the integration of gender-focused questions in evaluation terms of reference for both centralized and decentralized evaluations. The Office of Evaluation guidance on GEWE is provided through the Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS), which has supported WFP staff at different levels with a process guide, technical notes, templates and quality checklists. Further, a capacity development programme (EvalPro) has been offered on the WeLearn platform to build capacities surrounding WFP evaluation principles and management that include the integration of GEWE concerns. WFP PHQA includes a criterion on gender and equity and integrates gender into several other assessment criteria to ensure evaluation managers and teams consider gender in their evaluations.

Nevertheless, constraints remain. Most WFP programmes were not framed around GEWE outcomes at the design stage and this has led to a lack of any clear relationship between planned outcomes and the Gender Policy objectives, and weaknesses in the collection and use of relevant Corporate Results Framework- or programme-specific gender indicators. Key informants identified capacity gaps in the ability of evaluation and programme teams to undertake this retrospective exercise while also evaluating GEWE. This may in part explain why only 7 out of 19 evaluations reported since 2018 made recommendations that could be mapped directly to the Gender Policy objectives (Table 19), while the remainder focused on general improvements to areas such as strengthening coordination between units, reinforcing gender mainstreaming, integrating gender into guidance, boosting the recruitment of women, improving gender analysis, or disaggregating data (Annex 17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Policy objective</th>
<th>Related evaluation recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women, men, girls and boys benefit from food assistance programmes and activities that are adapted to their different needs</td>
<td>Malawi DE: Identify communication channels that support each other to achieve impact and gender equality relating to access to and use of different services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

165. WFP, 2016. Meta Assessment of Gender Integration in WFP’s Evaluations (internal).
Women and men participate equally in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of gender-transformative food security and nutrition policy and programmes

Laos PDR: Strengthen gender dimensions of cooking (break down stereotypes of gender roles) and management of commodities (equal participation from men and women for handling operational activities)

Women and girls have increased decision-making power regarding food security and nutrition in households, communities and societies

Evaluation of WFP’s Policies on Humanitarian Principles and Access in Humanitarian Contexts (CE): Increase coherence of efforts related to gender and protection

Food assistance does no harm to the safety, dignity and integrity of the women, men, boys and girls receiving it, and is provided in ways that respect their rights

Evaluation of Humanitarian Protection Policy (CE): Articulate linkages to, and accountability for, gender and CFM

Georgia DE: Separate boys and girls’ education in food-insecure/pastoral societies

Evaluation of Gender Action Plan (CE): Gender Action Plan application in support of GEWE commitments

Evaluation of Humanitarian Protection Policy (CE): Articulate linkages to, and accountability for, gender and CFM

Kenya DE: Collaborate with partners to address the demand for firewood (in relation to safe access to fuel and energy)

Somalia CE: Strengthen capacities of partners in gender and protection analysis

Finding 30: By aligning the Gender Action Plan and Gender Transformation Programme with the UN-SWAP process, WFP has successfully reinforced its gender-related accountabilities for business owners. This is reinforced by the integration of gender risk analysis in internal audits and there are opportunities to further apply gender analysis in enterprise risk management.

167. The introduction of UN-SWAP has supported gender mainstreaming in WFP through its provision of a United Nations system-wide framework to which WFP is held accountable at the highest levels. The close alignment of the UN-SWAP, Gender Action Plan and Gender Transformation Programme frameworks allows WFP to be efficient in identifying relevant divisions, regional bureaux and country offices as business owners.

168. While UN-SWAP reporting framework works well at a corporate level, with business owners submitting annual reports against their designated indicators,170 for some regional bureau and country office key informants the UN-SWAP has been considered extractive and providing little resonance to local needs. This is less apparent in Gender Transformation Programme countries where there is a better understanding of GEWE requirements and reporting flows. With WFP headquarter divisions reporting on UN-SWAP indicators and meeting or exceeding over 75 percent of indicators over the evaluation period, the performance of regional bureaux and country offices has not been scrutinised as closely as it might have had the UN-SWAP process been more integral to the WFP decentralized approach to accountability. Using the Gender Transformation Programme and regional gender strategies to support the development of country office and regional bureau gender action plans offers opportunities for WFP to systematically achieve this goal of organization-wide GEWE commitments.

169. While the systematic introduction of gender in the WFP internal audit programme has been a positive step that is aligned with WFP UN-SWAP commitments, the shift is yet to be mirrored by the systematic use of gender risk assessments in WFP country office and regional bureau risk registers.171 Even where risk examples were cited at country office and regional bureau levels, there was little evidence that they were

Source: https://www.wfp.org/independent-evaluation, publications.


171 Gender risk assessments are conducted on an assignment-to-assignment basis (key informants).
used to inform a dynamic or systematic risk analysis. The opportunity to integrate gender risk analysis in enterprise risk management is currently overlooked by the Gender Transformation Programme and not factored into the Gender Action Plan. Both enterprise risk management and the Gender Transformation Programme need to be clearer as to WFP commitments to GEWE and its “risk appetite” with respect to the effectiveness of its programmes in relation to the Gender Policy objectives, the PSEA and prevention of gender-based violence towards beneficiaries, and protection of all WFP employees from HSHAPD.

Relevant ERM risk categories include: meeting humanitarian commitments (risk indicator 1), strategic results (2), workforce planning (6), accountability to affected populations (9), perceptions of WFP’s work (10), and organizational readiness (14)
3 Conclusions and recommendations

3.1 CONCLUSIONS

170. The following conclusions are drawn from the findings in Section 2 and represent an analysis of the evidence that emerged from the examination of the Gender Policy’s programme processes and organizational drivers. Framed around opportunities to further develop GEWE across WFP, the conclusions explore the drivers and barriers to change in relation to: the relevance of the Gender Policy; the culture and leadership of WFP; gender resources and delivery mechanisms; the building of effective programmes; and ensuring WFP organizational drivers are supported across decentralized structures. Each should be seen as mutually reinforcing, conveying an overall sense of the opportunities and constraints facing WFP in ensuring the effective and productive integration of GEWE in all areas of the organization.

Conclusion 1: The Gender Policy remains relevant to WFP commitments to Agenda 2030, the SDGs and UN Reform but requires an update to meet the demands of the evolving global context, including the Decade of Action initiative.

171. The WFP Gender Policy (2015-2020) and Gender Action Plan have been appropriately informed, designed and conceived in relation to the dual mandate of WFP and the shift from food aid to food assistance. The Gender Policy’s strength is that it recognizes the multiplicity of drivers that affect organizational and programme change, while providing a comprehensive outline of associated accountabilities and business owners. The Gender Policy echoes and aligns with external normative commitments on GEWE, including the UN-SWAP, while also recognizing the role of regional bureaux and country offices in understanding that “context is everything”.

172. While the objectives of the policy remain appropriate for most WFP programme contributions, it does not reflect the shifts in global and organizational thinking around transformation change and intersectionality or the WFP transition from “saving lives to changing lives”. Further, it is silent on the need to articulate WFP work at country level firmly within the United Nations system efforts to accelerate the support to government partners to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, which have been articulated through the Decade of Action from 2020 to achieve targets set for 2030.

Conclusion 2: WFP has shown some leadership in establishing frameworks to support its work toward GEWE, including efforts to address gender parity. While this has led to positive change, the leadership focus on gender parity has overshadowed other aspects of the Gender Policy and presents a barrier to strengthening the overall approach of WFP to gender equality and women’s empowerment.

173. WFP leadership has supported GEWE through efforts to address gender parity and ensure its country strategic plans meet gender with age marker standards. Many Regional and Country Directors have initiated change processes that align with the organizational and programmatic ambitions of the Gender Policy. However, WFP is a large, decentralized, multi-cultural organization that operates across many contexts with different human and financial capacities. A failure to address all dimensions of the Gender Policy – to adapt food assistance to different needs, to promote equal participation of women and men, to enhance decision-making by women and girls, and to enhance gender and protection - poses significant operational risks to WFP. More balanced leadership is required.

Conclusion 3: While WFP has established the basic resources to support its work toward GEWE, its human resources investments have not met its Gender Action Plan commitments. In order to ensure that GEWE is integral to the culture, learning and results of the organization, WFP needs to properly resource and support its gender architecture in order to operationalize the tools that exist and build the capacities of its employees.

174. The Gender Office and regional gender advisors have demonstrated significant added value in leveraging the WFP Gender Policy since 2015. They have developed and implemented a range of mechanisms to deliver on the Gender Policy commitments, including the Gender Action Plan, minimum gender and age marker requirement for all country strategic plans, the Gender Transformation Programme, the Gender Toolkit and the gender results network. Despite the responsiveness of regional gender advisors and the Gender Office to requests for learning and support, the limited human and financial resource investments
into WFP gender architecture have impeded its ability to provide the necessary specialist support to its operational and programme functions across regional bureaux and country offices. Many country offices have been the passive consumers of gender-related resources, rather than owners, and this has impacted on the organization’s ability to support gender mainstreaming. There are, however, numerous examples where country office leadership has actively promoted GEWE, identified appropriate staff needs and responsibilities, promoted gender context analyses and used the Gender Transformation Programme to build capacities.

175. Observed bottlenecks preventing further engagement on Gender Policy commitments at regional bureau and country office levels included a slow uptake of capacity-building opportunities, such as the Gender Transformation Programme, weaknesses in the WFP gender architecture with regional gender advisor positions unfilled and few gender officers in country offices, and structural constraints that arise from employee rotation. WFP employees are often unable to meaningfully use training materials or guidelines without specialist gender advisor support, leading to an inability to incorporate a gender lens into everyday practice. The rotation of senior Gender Office advisors and a reliance on short-term consultancy contracts for the employment of gender advisors constitute a barrier to progress on GEWE, and there is a need for WFP to carefully review and resource the on-boarding, training and career progression needs of its gender advisors at all levels.

Conclusion 4: More work is needed for WFP to translate the objectives of the Gender Policy into pathways for change tailored to the specific needs of women, men, girls and boys in each country context.

176. While the gender with age marker is ensuring that a basic level of gender analysis is incorporated into country strategic plans, this represents only a contributing step toward gender mainstreaming. The Gender Policy objectives, regional gender strategies and the country and programme level gender context analyses have not been systematically used to configure WFP country strategic plan contributions toward GEWE. Good practice examples have remained isolated and there has been only a limited use of gender analyses to examine the intra-household, community and structural barriers to GEWE in local contexts. The system used to monitor and report on country level progress, including the annual country reports and data stored in the COMET database, should be strengthened to ensure that it provides a platform that fully supports the sex- and age-disaggregated data requirements of the Gender Policy.

177. There also remains a tendency to interpret WFP approach to GEWE as increasing the participation of women and/or responding to women’s needs, rather than as an opportunity to add significant value to WFP programme contributions and guarantee the “do no harm” principle in contexts that span the humanitarian and development nexus.

178. As a result, while the principles of the Gender Action Plan Layer 2 programme processes - analysis and data; strategy and the programme guidance - remain highly relevant to gender mainstreaming across WFP programmes, they constitute a list of high-level rather than essential action areas for many employees. To mitigate this, all WFP regional bureaux and country offices need to prioritize the design and development of programmes informed by a strong contextual analysis of the different needs of women, men, girls and boys. Until this happens, country offices will continue to struggle to translate GEWE concepts and the four objectives of the Gender Policy into clear actions tailored to each of their country strategic plan strategic outcomes.

Conclusion 5: Positive efforts to mainstream gender across WFP organizational functions have contributed to a more conducive enabling environment for GEWE in WFP. However, gender is more effectively mainstreamed in certain areas of the organization than others.

179. The Gender Policy’s organizational drivers have enabled WFP to strengthen capacities towards gender equality and women’s empowerment in certain areas. Broad capacity-building initiatives led by the Gender Office and regional gender advisors have included the successful roll-out of the Gender Transformation Programme and expansion of the courses offered through WeLearn. WFP has made progress mainstreaming gender into its evaluations and has been largely successful in using UN-SWAP oversight standards to reinforce high-level accountabilities for GEWE. While there has been progress towards gender parity this has not yet penetrated all levels and functions. More needs to be done to move beyond overall numbers and develop strategies to improve gender parity in those areas that have been historically dominated either by men or by women employees.
180. Areas with more limited progress against the organizational commitments in the Gender Action Plan included communications, knowledge and information, and finance. A focus of internal messaging on gender parity, and a lack of guidance on the incorporation of GEWE in external messaging appears to have limited the role and function of communication teams to support the Gender Policy at regional bureau and country office levels. This may have led to views from external stakeholders that WFP “does not do gender”. While efforts to develop systems for gender budgeting have been welcomed, programme, support and administration and extra-budgetary funding for gender mainstreaming have fallen behind target. WFP has failed to match increases in contribution revenues and overhead recovery with investments in its gender architecture and gender delivery mechanisms (including, but not limited to the Gender Transformation Programme), creating a significant barrier affecting all dimensions of the Gender Policy. Funding of the Gender Office and specialist gender advisor positions has not, however, been commensurate with these overall budgetary increases. Given that these resource constraints have been apparent for some time, the evaluation team considers the failure to argue the case, or promote relevant resource-mobilization efforts and partnerships to “make up the gap”, to have been a major barrier to the delivery of the Gender Policy.

**Conclusion 6: Weaknesses in WFP resourcing for, and accountabilities to, operationalizing the Gender Policy across headquarters, regional bureaux and country offices have undermined the organization's ability to ensure that GEWE becomes integral to the culture and learning of WFP.**

181. Although WFP was largely successful in developing regional gender strategies and country gender action plans that align with them, the implementation of regional gender strategies was held back by the inability of WFP to meet critical commitments to secure the necessary resources - human and financial - for the decentralized delivery of the Gender Policy across all but a few regional bureaux and country offices. The problem of consistent leadership and support for gender mainstreaming was identified by internal and external informants across WFP regional bureaux, country offices and headquarters, who showed strong demand for greater professional guidance and support to operationalize regional gender strategies and country gender action plans, and for the expansion of the Gender Transformation Programme across all country offices.

182. While many country offices and regional bureaux have sought to address these shortcomings, WFP corporate attention to GEWE is variable. Leading work to enhance gender equality and women's empowerment relies on the decision-making of Regional and Country Directors as individuals, rather than on being an integral part of their leadership role.
### 3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

183. The recommendations below build upon the many positive changes that have begun to take root since the introduction of the Gender Policy (2015–2020) and aim to catalyse increased investment in key areas to support the acceleration of WFP’s efforts towards GEWE. The first two recommendations set the strategic direction and resourcing framework and should be acted upon as top priorities. The other recommendations should be addressed systematically in order to strengthen the leadership, accountability and human resources required to deliver the policy and to ensure that gender is fully mainstreamed into the development of second-generation CSPs.

**Strategic recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommendation 1: WFP should update the Gender Policy (2015–2020) to accelerate progress towards the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and strengthen WFP’s work on promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the context of food security and nutrition. | Priority: High  
Responsibility:  
Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development (PD), with the support of the leadership group and regional directors and in consultation with the Executive Board  
Deadline: June 2021 | • The WFP Gender Policy (2015-2020) has been relevant, applicable and appropriate to the WFP mandate, strategic plan, management priorities and UN Reform  
• Links between the Gender Policy, Gender Action Plan, UN-SWAP, regional gender strategies and Gender Transformation Programme have provided a coherent framework for organizational development that needs to be translated across all regional bureaux and country offices  
• WFP should recognize the many positive examples of progress and use these as a basis for promoting the Gender Policy to ensure GEWE is understood to be an organizational priority, led from the top and part of everybody’s business  
• A window of opportunity for WFP to build momentum is to align a Gender Policy update with CSP mid-term reviews and evaluations, the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• include an intermediary objective for an enabling environment created by WFP’s areas of organizational change to support programme processes and humanitarian operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>preparation of second-generation CSPs, the WFP budget review, UN Reform, Agenda 2030 and the 25th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In updating the Gender Policy (2015–2020), WFP should further:

b. revise the policy’s theory of change through a participatory and consultative process to articulate the interrelationships between the areas of organizational change, programme processes and the policy objectives, as well as the steps that should be taken to ensure that WFP programmes and operations contribute more to gender equality and women’s empowerment;

c. ensure coordination and collaboration to incorporate a gender mainstreaming approach in the next strategic plan as a core part of WFP’s enabling role for zero hunger;

d. ensure that all WFP programme technical guidance (e.g. for cash-based transfers and general food distribution, school feeding, nutrition, resilient livelihoods) is updated in relation to its contributions to gender equality or that a technical note is provided for guidelines not up for review, with specific examples to illustrate how gender equality and women’s empowerment can be used to shape effective, efficient, equitable and empowering WFP programming; and
develop and implement a communication and dissemination plan for promoting the updated policy that highlights and explains the importance of gender to WFP’s mandate and to all its employees, thereby setting the “tone from the top”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommendation 2: WFP should allocate sufficient programme support and administrative budget to implement its corporate commitments, including the work of the Gender Office and implementation of the regional gender strategies, and develop strategies to mobilize extrabudgetary and project funding, including through operational and strategic partnerships, in line with United Nations reform. | Priority: High  
Responsibility:  
Assistant Executive Director of PD, with the support of regional directors, the Assistant Executive Director of the Partnerships and Advocacy Department (PA) and the Assistant Executive Director of the Resource Management Department (RM) and in consultation with the Executive Board  
Deadline: June 2021, in line with the updated gender policy and regional gender strategies | • Regional bureaux and country offices have lacked clarity over their accountabilities and commitments to the Gender Policy, regional gender strategies and Gender Action Plans  
• Gender mainstreaming requires clear and frequent high level communication and oversight around the goals and progress of the Gender Policy  
• There is clear precedence in WFP of the formulation of effective change management steering groups to oversee policy implementation of cross-cutting functions, such as the Evaluation Function Steering Group |

a) As WFP continues to mainstream gender into its work it should review the balance of extrabudgetary and programme support and administrative budget funding for securing crucial gender advisor positions and resources at all levels of the organization.

b) WFP should expand its partnerships and funding for gender mainstreaming and targeted programming by building on existing good practices, in line with donor expectations and corporate priorities regarding the need for WFP to adapt to the changing global context and the evolving funding landscape.

c) WFP should ensure that there is an effective corporate mechanism for tracking gender-related planning and expenditures.
Operational recommendations

Recommendation 3: The Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development Department should establish a cross-organizational steering group on gender equality and women's empowerment to provide distributed leadership, champion the gender policy and ensure accountability for gender policy implementation at all levels of the organization.

a) The steering group should:
   - include representatives from the organizational, humanitarian and programme divisions and not be assimilated into any other working group or task force;
   - have terms of reference defining its membership and rules of engagement that ensure effective participation and that it holds at least two meetings per year; and
   - have standing agenda items that include:
     - continued integration of gender into WFP's work;
     - progress towards gender equality outcomes, including through CSPs; and
     - implementation of WFP's gender mainstreaming mechanisms: gender architecture, the Gender Transformation Programme, the IASC Gender with Age Marker and the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

Progress reports from WFP's headquarters divisions and regional bureaux should contribute to the discussions of the steering group and the annual updates to the Executive Board on WFP gender policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation 3</td>
<td>Priority: High</td>
<td>• UN Reform under the Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (SDCF) prioritizes a regional approach and system-wide partnerships that should enshrine WFP commitments to GEWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility: Assistant Executive Director of PD, with support from regional and country directors and in consultation with the Executive Board and functional divisions at the headquarters and regional bureau levels</td>
<td>• Greater responsibility for overseeing implementation of the Gender Policy should lie with WFP Regional Directors, regional gender advisors and PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline: November 2020</td>
<td>• Regional gender strategies allow WFP to translate the Gender Policy into practical actions across regional bureaux, country offices and SDCF partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The absence of dedicated resources, inadequate capacities and the intermittent nature of regional gender advisors has limited delivery of the Gender Policy and Regional Gender Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There has been no oversight structure to support regional gender strategies, steer regional and country gender context analyses, or guide regional resource mobilization and associated partnership strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Recommendation 4:** WFP should enhance regional- and country-level ownership of the gender policy and the Gender Action Plan through the revision of regional gender strategies and CSP-aligned gender action plans. | **Priority:** Medium  **Responsibility:** Regional directors, with the support of the Chief of Staff, the Assistant Executive Director of PD, functional units at headquarters and regional bureaux, country directors and deputy country directors  **Deadline:** December 2021 | - There is clear evidence of progress on all areas of the Gender Policy and GAP in regional bureaux and country offices where Directors and managers have prioritized gender equality and women’s empowerment  
- It is important for the leadership agenda of WFP to move beyond gender parity and address the wider programme, humanitarian operations and organizational drivers of the Gender Policy |
| a. WFP should review and revise existing regional gender strategies in order to:  
  • identify the key gender equality and women’s empowerment challenges faced in each region and the balance of WFP’s response in each region’s humanitarian, development and “delivering to enabling” contexts;  
  • prioritize the organizational changes needed to support gender mainstreaming in country offices and regional bureaux;  
  • steer country offices in the preparation and implementation of CSPs that integrate gender and age, the Gender Transformation Programme and the Gender Action Plan to support delivery of gender equality results in the context of food security and nutrition across the humanitarian-peace-development nexus;  
  • define clear accountabilities tailored to the regional context; and | | }
| b) Regional directors should review regional and country office resource mobilization opportunities for gender mainstreaming in line with WFP partnerships and funding priority commitments. | | }
| c) Regional directors should create clear regional governance structures for overseeing the development and implementation of regional gender strategies. | | }
| d) Regional reports to the gender equality steering group should provide a quantitative and qualitative analysis of gender equality | | }
## Recommendation

and women's empowerment changes in terms of organizational shifts and of programme results against gender policy objectives.

### Recommendation 5: WFP should ensure that the development of the new human resources accountability framework – as agreed in response to one of the recommendations of the evaluation of the WFP People Strategy (2014–2017) – is informed by an analysis of gender, diversity and inclusion and ensures that senior managers are accountable for inclusive leadership practices and excellence in all areas of gender mainstreaming, including but not limited to gender parity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> Medium</td>
<td>• WFP has fewer than 10 P4 or higher gender advisors to support 18,000 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong> Director of the Human Resources Division (HRM), in consultation with the Assistant Executive Director of PD and with the support of the Assistant Executive Director of RM and the Gender Office</td>
<td>• WFP has made greater progress toward GEWE where gender advisors are available, valued and able to use the wealth of WFP capacity building materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> August 2021</td>
<td>• High levels of demand for the roll out of the GTP, alongside support to GRN members, humanitarian operations and programmes, are evident across country offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) This should encompass:

- integration of gender, diversity and inclusion analysis into the preparation of the accountability framework, led by the Human Resources Division (HRM) with the support of the Gender Office;
- commitments to capacity strengthening of WFP employees in gender mainstreaming; and
- development of specific approaches to strengthening the capacity of individual leaders (regional and deputy regional directors, country and deputy country directors) in gender mainstreaming at the regional and country levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority: Medium</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility:</strong> Director of the Human Resources Division (HRM), in consultation with the Assistant Executive Director of PD and with the support of the Assistant Executive Director of RM and the Gender Office</td>
<td>• Placing low ranking and/or insufficiently trained or experienced officers in gender advisor roles can hold back WFP contributions toward GEWE and create risks that endanger employees, partners and beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> August 2021</td>
<td>• While the integration of gender and protection roles may be appropriate at country office level, especially in mid-sized offices, clarity is needed on how the different functions will be met, and gaps in professional training and experience need to be backstopped by regional bureaux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 6: WFP should invest in dedicated, professional gender advisors at headquarters and regional bureaux and build a cadre of experienced gender advisors to work in its country offices.**

- **a)** WFP should undertake a workforce planning exercise for gender advisors and introduce a human resource plan to ensure that a consistent, funded and sustainable cadre of gender advisors is accessible at all levels of the organization. This should:
  - establish mandatory, fixed-term professional regional gender advisor positions at the P-4 and P-5 levels with functional links to the Gender Office; and
  - include standard outline terms of reference for regional and country office gender advisors to guide WFP regional bureaux and country offices in determining the roles and responsibilities of gender advisers, adapted to context.

- **b)** All organizational realignment exercises should include consideration of gender skills and capacity.

- **c)** Consideration should also be given to:
  - establishing a career pathway and professional gender cadre for gender advisors from the country to the regional and global levels, in line with comparative WFP functions; and
  - including a cadre of diverse gender advisors in the Future International Talent pool for deployment across the organization.

**Priority, Responsibility, Deadline**

- **Priority:** High
- **Responsibility:** Assistant Executive Director of PD with the support of regional directors, the Assistant Executive Director of RM and the Director of HRM, the Gender Office and a selection of regional and country directors, deputy country directors and regional gender advisors
- **Deadline:** December 2021, in line with the preparation of regional gender strategies and the human resources accountability framework

**Rationale**

- Decentralized ownership and conversion of the Gender Policy into practical actions tailored to specific contexts of operation relies on their effective integration in CSP evaluations, design and implementation
- WFP technical guidance has been supportive of gender mainstreaming but requires regular review and update
- WFP has identified global operations that can be built upon, including (but not limited to) gender in relation to: cash transfers, the prevention of malnutrition, social protection, asset creation and supply chains
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Recommendation 7:** WFP should ensure that the framework and guidance for mid-term reviews and evaluations of first-generation country strategic plans incorporate quantitative and qualitative analyses of WFP’s gender equality-related activities. | Priority: Medium  
Responsibility: Assistant Executive Director of PD, with the support of the Director of Evaluation and the Director of the Corporate Planning and Performance Division, in collaboration with regional and country directors, PD technical division leads and the Gender Office  
Deadline: December 2020 (a–c) | • The evaluation of 1st generation CSPs provides a window of opportunity to assess progress in line with WFP strategic commitments at the country level  
• CSPs need to clarify their aims and identify actions and gender-equitable and/or gender transformative approaches based on gender and age context analyses  
• Through the Common Country Analysis, UN Reform seeks to ensure all pillars of United Nations work in-country to determine “who is being left behind and why”, including in relation to gender and SDG 2 outcomes  
• Defining CSP activities to deliver gender equality results will allow WFP to clarify its partnerships, identify capacity-strengthening needs, define monitoring requirements and respond to gender equality and protection demands |
| a. The Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development Department, with the support of the Gender Office and the technical divisions, should develop and disseminate a framework that uses the IASC Gender with Age Marker process to guide the inclusion of contextually relevant, gender-integrated programming that aligns with the objectives of the Gender Policy (2015–2020) in the design and implementation of second-generation country strategic plans. |  |  |
| b. The Director of the Corporate Planning and Performance Division should oversee the finalization and roll-out of guidance materials and templates for the integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment into mid-term reviews of country strategic plans by December 2020. |  |  |
| c. The Director of Evaluation should update guidance materials and templates for the integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment into country strategic plan evaluations by December 2020. |  |  |
| **Recommendation 8: Country offices should mainstream gender into the mid-term reviews and evaluations of first-generation country strategic plans and the design and implementation of second-generation country strategic plans.** | Priority: Medium  
Responsibility: Country directors, with the support of regional directors, regional gender advisors, gender equality steering group members, the Gender Office and PD technical division leads | • Financial investments and resource mobilization efforts to support gender mainstreaming and finance a cadre of gender advisors have fallen far short of levels agreed in the 2015 Gender Policy  
• Evaluations and assessments have repeatedly highlighted a lack of dedicated resources to build |
<p>| a) Each country office should use the mid-term review, evaluation and gender and age context analyses of its first-generation country strategic plan to integrate gender into its second-generation country strategic plan, including by: |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority, Responsibility, Deadline</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• aligning the country strategic plan with the United Nation's common country analysis process to ensure that WFP responds to nationally identified gender equality and women's empowerment needs such that “no one is left behind”; and</td>
<td>Deadline: Ongoing as of January 2021, in line with the ongoing preparation of second-generation CSPs</td>
<td>• understanding and integrate gender in WFP programmes and operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ensuring that the planned activities of the second-generation country strategic plan deliver in a way aimed at achieving the objectives of the updated Gender Policy (2015–2020) and equitably address the food security and nutrition-related needs of all beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity strengthening, such as through the Gender Transformation Programme, requires dedicated expertise and resources at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Investments in gender fell during 2017-2019 over a period when the corporate income growth grew by 25 percent, potentially posing significant strategic, operational and fiduciary risks to the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-PA</td>
<td>Three-pronged approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Accountability to Affected Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>Annual Country Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Annual Performance Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPP</td>
<td>Community-based Participatory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Centralized Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>Country Gender Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGAP</td>
<td>Country Office Gender Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMET</td>
<td>Country Office Tool for Managing (programme operations) Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cooperating Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF</td>
<td>Corporate Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Country Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
<td>Commission on the Status of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Decentralized Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>Evaluation Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness and Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQAS</td>
<td>Evaluation Quality Assurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM</td>
<td>Enterprise Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>Food Consumption Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA</td>
<td>Food Assistance for Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFT</td>
<td>Food Assistance for Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT</td>
<td>Future International Talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA</td>
<td>Field Level Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GaM</td>
<td>Gender with Age Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Gender Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCDP</td>
<td>Gender Capacity Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEWE</td>
<td>Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFD</td>
<td>General Food Distributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAP</td>
<td>Gender Parity Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN</td>
<td>Gender Results Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Global Staff Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTP</td>
<td>Gender Transformation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSHAPD</td>
<td>Harassment, Sexual Harassment, the Abuse of Power and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRG</td>
<td>Internal Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRM</td>
<td>Integrated Road Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP-RWEE</td>
<td>Joint Programme – Rural Women's Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAM</td>
<td>Moderate-Acute Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDD</td>
<td>Minimum Dietary Diversity (scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPAN</td>
<td>Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEV</td>
<td>Office of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Performance and Competency Enhancement Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Programme and Policy Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQA</td>
<td>Post-Hoc Quality Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLW</td>
<td>Pregnant and Lactating Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Programme Support and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Regional Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td>Rome-based Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGA</td>
<td>Regional Gender Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGS</td>
<td>Regional Gender Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>Social and Behaviour Change Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCF</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>Standard Project Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF</td>
<td>Strategic Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-UNSWAP</td>
<td>UN System-wide Action Plan (on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSCEBC</td>
<td>United Nations System Chief Executive Board for Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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