

Evaluation of WFP's Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition

Terms of Reference

January 2022

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1. Background.....	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 CONTEXT	1
2. Reasons for the evaluation	5
2.1. RATIONALE	5
2.2. OBJECTIVES	5
2.3. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS.....	6
3. Subject of the evaluation	7
3.1. WFP'S POLICY ON RESILIENCE.....	7
3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	10
4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations.....	10
4.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA	10
4.2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	11
4.3. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT	12
4.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	13
4.5. QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	14
5. Organization of the evaluation	14
5.1. PHASES AND DELIVERABLES	14
5.2. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION	15
5.3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	15
5.4. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS	16
5.5. COMMUNICATION	16
5.6. BUDGET	16
Annex I. Timeline	17
Annex II. Role and composition of internal reference group.....	19
Annex III. Communication and knowledge management plan	22
Annex IV. Preliminary stakeholder analysis.....	24
Annex V. Preliminary evaluability assessment.....	28
Annex VI. Preliminary criteria for country selection	40
Annex VII. Evaluative evidence on resilience from recent centralised evaluations	45
Annex VIII. WFP Policies, Strategies and Guidelines and the Definition of Resilience.....	48
Annex IX. Mapping policy scope	58
Annex X. WFP Criteria for Policy Quality.....	62
Annex XI. Bibliography.....	63
Annex XII. Acronyms and abbreviations	66

1. Background

1.1. INTRODUCTION

1. Policy evaluations focus on a WFP policy and the activities put into place to implement them. They evaluate the quality of the policy, its results, and seek to explain why and how these results occurred.
2. These Terms of Reference (ToR) are for the evaluation of the Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition¹ (hereinafter referred to as Resilience Policy) approved by Executive Board (EB) in May 2015 and included in WFP's Policy Compendium thereafter. As with all WFP policies issued after 2011, their evaluation is covered by the Policy Formulation arrangements², which include an evaluation four to six years from the start of policy implementation.
3. These ToR were prepared by OEV based upon an initial document review and consultation with stakeholders. Their purpose is to provide key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation, to guide the evaluation team and specify expectations that the evaluation team should fulfil. The ToR are structured as follows: Chapter 1 provides introduction and information on the context; Chapter 2 presents the rationale, objectives and stakeholders of the evaluation; Chapter 3 presents an overview of the policy and defines the scope of the evaluation; Chapter 4 spells out the evaluation questions, approach and methodology; Chapter 5 indicates how the evaluation will be organized.
4. The evaluation will cover the period from 2015 when the WFP Resilience Policy was approved to October 2022, with an emphasis on the 2017-2022 period. The evaluation will be submitted to the Executive Board for consideration in June 2023. It will be managed by OEV and conducted by an external evaluation team.

1.2 CONTEXT

External

5. Strengthening resilience, with the ultimate aim of supporting people's well-being in the face of multifaceted threats, has become an increasing priority across development and humanitarian programming. Building resilience is considered a critical step towards achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.³ Resilience is also a common thread across the three United Nations (UN) pillars of development, human rights, and peace and security⁴ – and is reflected in many important global policy agendas and frameworks that acknowledge that risks and their manifestation can hinder the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustaining Peace Agenda.⁵
6. Over the past decade, the concept of “enhancing resilience” has moved from a loosely interpreted, desirable quality of human, economic and environmental systems to a mainstreamed, operationalised approach for developing programmes, policies, partnerships and investments. The objective of enhancing resilience has been used for some years, in the context of specific interventions and technical approaches to reduce vulnerability and manage risks, such as disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation.⁶ The definition of resilience continues to evolve from its origins in the study of eco-systems⁷ and earlier conceptions that focused on absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities in response to natural hazards event, with less emphasis on proactively preventing or resisting them.⁸
7. Several important global milestones have informed WFP's resilience agenda:

¹ WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C.

² WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B.

³ United Nations 2020. *UN Common Guidance on helping Build Resilient Societies*. Page 18.

⁴ United Nations CEB. 2017.

⁵ United Nations. 2020. *UN Common Guidance on helping Build Resilient Societies*. Page 18.

⁶ Turnbull, M. et al. 2013. *Toward Resilience : A Guide to Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation*.

⁷ Holling, C.S., 1973. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4:1-23

⁸ CEB. 2017. *Adopting an analytical framework on risk and resilience: a proposal for more proactive, coordinated and effective United Nations Action*. (CEB/2017/6)

- i. 1994 – The first World Conference on Natural Disasters led to the endorsement of ten principles of the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World.⁹
- ii. 1999 – Adoption of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction¹⁰ and establishment of interagency secretariat (later to become the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction) to lead the efforts of the UN system in this area.
- iii. 2005 - The Second World Conference on Disaster Reduction marked a shift in emphasis from ‘natural disasters’ to ‘disaster risk reduction’ and resulted in the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005–2015);¹¹ the overarching goal of which was to build the resilience of nations and communities to disasters.¹²
- iv. 2015 - The Third World Conference on Disaster Risk resulted in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030.¹³ It aimed at the reduction of disaster risk and losses at all levels and adopted a systemic view of the underlying factors related to risk management and the impact of disasters. Among the four identified priorities, for action following the conference, was i) understanding disaster risk; ii) strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk; iii) investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience; and iv) enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery.¹⁴
- v. 2015 - the 2030 Agenda was adopted by the General Assembly. Resilience was identified as a multidimensional challenge and a cross-cutting issue that will impact progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).¹⁵ The main resilience target is Target 1.5 of Goal 1 to end poverty: “By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters.” Also Target 13.1 specifically features resilience: “Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries.” Resilience also underpins several other goals and targets pertaining to hunger, infrastructure and urbanization.
- vi. 2016 - The World Humanitarian Summit (WHS)¹⁶ raised the importance of shrinking humanitarian needs over the long-term to contribute to the SDGs and affirmed the need to address the root causes of crisis, including through political diplomacy, and emphasized the integration of humanitarian, development, and peace-building efforts. Within the paradigm of addressing the disaster cycle from prevention to post recovery and “Building Back Better”, the organisations of the UN system were called on to integrate risk assessment into the design and planning of their work, thus strengthening long-term resilience through normative and operational activities.
- vii. 2019 – The Overseas Development Institute (ODI), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) Report on risk informed development pointed to human systems being more connected than ever before, with unprecedented impacts upon and interactions with the natural world.¹⁷ The report emphasised that, “Risk-informed development allows for development to become a vehicle to reduce risk, avoid creating risks and build resilience. Only resilient development can become sustainable development; sustainable development initiatives will fail unless they are risk informed. Risk, resilience and sustainability knowledge and actions need to go hand-in-hand”.¹⁸

⁹ UN. 1994. World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction. (A/CONF.172/9).

¹⁰ UN. 2002. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. (A/Res/56/195).

¹¹ Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

¹² The IEWP brings together various organizations, including United Nations organizations and the German Disaster Reduction Committee. It aims to improve resilience to all types of natural hazards through wider information flow, it emphasize the importance of community education about disaster preparedness.

¹³ UNDRR. 2015. *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030*.

¹⁴ Ibid. Page 20.

¹⁵ UN. 2018. High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. 2018 HLPF Thematic Review: Transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies – Building resilience.

¹⁶ See WHS thematic page accessible at: <https://agendaforhumanity.org/summit.html>

¹⁷ Ibid. ODI, UNDP. SDC. 2019. *Risk-informed development - From crisis to resilience*.

¹⁸ Ibid. Page10.

- viii. 2021 - The United Nations Food Systems Summit aimed to transform the way the world produces, consumes, manages and thinks about food. WFP is anchor agency for Action track 5: Build resilience to vulnerabilities, shocks, and stress (AT5), which aims to ensure that food systems which are affected by conflict, climate, environmental, natural, health and economic shocks and stresses, can anticipate, maintain functionality, and recover. AT5 focuses on integrated and cross-cutting systems and nexus approaches to reduce vulnerability to compounded risks, structural fragility and systemic causes, on risk reduction, and on multi-risk and crisis management across and within food systems.¹⁹

Internal

8. The WFP Strategic Plan (2014–2017) affirmed WFP’s commitment to support the response to shocks in ways that better link relief and development. Resilience building was articulated in interventions supporting livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies in SO2 (support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies).²⁰ SO3 (reduce risk and enable people, communities and countries to meet their own food and nutrition needs) also emphasised a shift from managing disasters to managing risks by developing and integrating innovative risk management tools, such as weather index insurance for assets into traditional management and safety nets systems. The strategic plan also included expected results related to stability, resilience and, ultimately, self-reliance.

9. The WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021) further positioned the organization in the global resilience agenda by anchoring its actions across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus. The plan states that “WFP works to strengthen the resilience of affected people in protracted crises by applying a development lens in its humanitarian response.”²¹ Under SO1 (end hunger by protecting access to food), WFP foresaw a role in supporting countries in strengthening their disaster risk reduction, prevention, preparedness and response capacities to ensure access to sufficient, nutritious and safe food for all people. Under SO3 (achieve food security – focusing on the most vulnerable people and communities), “WFP will support partners to promote livelihood and resilience building linked to food security and nutrition, climate change adaptation, risk management, and strengthened sustainability and resilience of food systems”.²² The 2020 mid-term review (MTR) of the CRF highlighted that while indicators used in emergency and protracted contexts were considered satisfactory, “there is a need to develop a framework that better tracks and reports on results in the development context including resilience”.²³

10. WFP’s Strategic Plan (2022-2025) commits WFP to pursue integrated and sequenced humanitarian and development programming and to layer activities that “meet people’s urgent food security, nutrition and essential needs, while strengthening their long-term resilience to shocks and stressors and pursuing social cohesion and contributions to peace”.²⁴ The Plan makes specific reference to shocks, stressors and underlying vulnerabilities and a recognition that multisectoral, integrated programmes build capacities and address vulnerabilities at multiple levels: individual, household, community, institution and systems.

11. Risk-informed programming is explicitly acknowledged in the new Strategic Plan. There is reference to risk-based decision making and programming being premised on “identifying the multiple concurrent threats and complex risks (e.g. conflict, climate-induced disasters and economic crisis) relevant to the achievement of WFP’s results, as well as the risks created by WFP’s operations”.²⁵

12. In 2011, WFP’s Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRR/M) marked a shift towards implementation of DRR and actions that aim to achieve reduced risk. It emphasizes the WFP approach to bridge emergency response, recovery and development and identifies one of WFP’s comparative advantages as building resilience and protecting the most vulnerable, including through food assistance programmes, social protection and productive safety nets, and innovative risk finance, transfer and insurance for food

¹⁹ WFP. 2021. *Update on WFP’s engagement in the 2021 United nations food systems summit* – informal consultation.

²⁰ WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced resilience*. Page 11.

²¹ Ibid.

²² WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1/Rev.2*, Page 22.

²³ WFP. 2020. *Mid-Term Review of the Revised Corporate Results Framework*.

²⁴ WFP/EB.2/2021/4-A/1/Rev.2, Page 18.

²⁵ Ibid. Page 19.

security.²⁶ This policy laid the foundation for present efforts aimed at building resilience and capacity through managing and reducing disaster risk connected with climate change.²⁷

13. Alongside the 2011 DRR/M policy, WFP started to develop a Climate Change Policy given the strong interlinkages between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation (CCA). The WFP policy on DRR/M went ahead and was approved by the Executive Board in 2011; however, the Climate Change Policy²⁸ was only finalized and presented to the EB in 2017.

14. In April 2015, FAO, IFAD and WFP finalized the first joint framework - Strengthening resilience for food security and nutrition: A Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership among the RBA, which defined “the common focus of RBA work is to strengthen the resilience of rural poor, vulnerable and food insecure people’s livelihoods and production systems. The emphasis is on situations where capacities of supporting structures and institutions – notably government systems, national and local institutions and farmers’ organisations – are not in a position to offset or buffer the impacts of shocks and stressors.”²⁹

15. **WFP’s Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition** was approved in 2015. While many of WFP’s operations included elements of resilience building, a “fundamental shift that is being made is in how programming is designed, implemented and managed”.³⁰ A resilience-building approach should start when the programmes are conceived, with resilience at the centre. “Enhancing capacities to absorb, adapt and transform in the face of shocks and stressors requires a significant level of collaboration over a prolonged period.”³¹ WFP also committed to supporting resilience-building by aligning its activities with the plan and actions of governments and partners.

16. The Resilience policy provides the following definitions for the concept each of them addresses:

Box 1: Key Definitions

- **Resilience:** “the capacity to ensure that shocks and stressors do not have long-lasting adverse development consequences”. Resilience is framed as a set of capacities required before, during, and after the onset of shocks and stressors. These are abilities to:
 - i. **Absorb:** resist a shock or the eroding effects of a stressor by reducing risk and buffering its impact, which leads to endurance and continuity of livelihoods and systems;
 - ii. **Adapt:** respond to change by making proactive and informed choices, leading to incremental improvements in managing risks; and
 - iii. **Transform:** change the set of available choices through empowerment, improved governance, and an enabling environment, leading to positive changes in systems, structures, and livelihoods.³²
- **Shocks** are short-term events or deviations, such as drought or an earthquake. When combined with pre-existing vulnerabilities, a shock can lead to crises with substantial negative effects on people’s state of wellbeing, level of assets, livelihoods, safety or ability to withstand future shocks.³³
- **Stressors** can be seen as long-term trends or pressures that undermine the stability of a system and increase vulnerability within it.³⁴ Stressors can also be seen as threatening conditions that have a slower onset.³⁵ They include conditions such as low water quality, poor sanitation, environmental degradation, and challenging household structures (e.g. high dependency ratios).

²⁶ WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*. Page 11.

²⁷ WFP/EB.2/2011/4-A.

²⁸ “WFP/EB.1/2017/4-A/Rev.1*.”

²⁹ FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2015. *Strengthening Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition: A Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership among the Rome-based Agencies*. Page 1.

³⁰ WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C, Page 2

³¹ Ibid.

³² WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C, Page 5

³³ WFP. 2021. *Resilience Toolkit*. (Testing Version July 2021). Page 6.

³⁴ Zselezky and Yosef. 2014. *Are Shocks becoming more frequent or intense? Resilience for Food and Nutrition Security*. Fan, Pandya-Lorch and Yosef. Washington, IFPRI.

³⁵ Conostas, d’Errico and Pietrelli. 2020. *Core Indicators for Resilience Analysis: Toward an Integrated Framework to Support Harmonized Metrics*. FAO, Rome. Page 10. (as cited in WFP. 2021. Resilience toolkit)

17. The WFP Emergency Preparedness Policy (2017) outlines actions related to anticipating, preparing for and taking pre-emptive action prior to an event and planning early emergency response. It also notes that, "WFP's disaster risk reduction policy, climate change policy and resilience policy position emergency preparedness in a broader approach to meeting immediate food security and nutrition needs while strengthening the ability of food-insecure people and countries to manage future risks and build resilience, including in the face of climate change."³⁶

18. The WFP Gender Policy 2015-2020 stressed that risks and crises have different impacts on the food security and nutrition of women, men, girls and boys. Programme design and implementation should include considerations of: gender equality, women's empowerment, how risks affect women, and what opportunities exist for enhancing their resilience. In the draft WFP Gender Policy 2022 – 2026, resilience and climate-resilience are mentioned as enablers to reach equitable access to and control over the means to achieve food and nutrition security and, to enhance economic empowerment of women and girls.³⁷

2. Reasons for the evaluation

2.1. RATIONALE

19. A formative, strategic evaluation of WFP's support for enhanced resilience was conducted in 2018 and took a 'theory of delivery' approach to assess WFP's organisational readiness to deliver on its commitments related to contributing to enhanced resilience. It did not assess the relevance or results from the Resilience Policy and, as such, the requirement for a policy evaluation remain.

20. Elements of the Resilience Policy are at the forefront of current discussions about WFP's future direction. This evaluation aims to provide evidence to inform the decisions on future policy direction and effective policy implementation.

21. Based on consultations with stakeholders, the evidence generated through this evaluation is expected to be useful to:

- Inform WFP thinking and policy approaches to its engagement in resilience moving forward, including assessing the continued relevance of the Resilience Policy in light of more recent concepts such as risk-informed and integrated programming.
- Improve the understanding of how the resilience policy can facilitate integrated and sequenced humanitarian and development programming.
- Improve the understanding of recent efforts to promote integrated and layered interventions to help address vulnerabilities across different programming areas (e.g. social protection, value chains, climate change etc.).

2.2. OBJECTIVES

22. Evaluations serve the dual objectives of accountability and learning.

23. **Accountability** - The evaluation will assess the quality of the policies and the results achieved. The associated guidance and activities rolled out to implement them will also be considered. A management response to the evaluation recommendations will be prepared and the actions taken in response will be tracked over time.

24. **Learning** - The evaluation will identify the reasons why expected changes have occurred or not, draw lessons and, as feasible, derive good practices and learning around further implementation and eventual development of new policies and/or strategies. The evaluation will be retrospective to document actions since the policy were approved. It will also consider the recent context of the WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021 as well as the current through the Strategic Plan 2022-2025.

³⁶ WFP. 2017. *Emergency Preparedness Policy* (WFP/EB.2/2017/4-BRev.1*)

³⁷ WFP. 2021. *WFP Gender Policy (2022–2026)*. Second informal consultation, October 2021.

25. An assessment of the policy from a GEWE and inclusion perspective more broadly will also be undertaken.

2.3. STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

26. A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of WFP have interests in the results of the evaluation and some of these will be asked to play a more active role in the evaluation process. In particular, representatives from some of the key internal units/Divisions will be invited to become members of the Internal Reference Group (IRG).³⁸

27. As policy owner, the WFP entity with major stakes in the evaluation is the Resilience & Food System Service (PROR) and within that the Livelihoods, Asset Creation and Resilience Unit (PROR-L) in the Programme Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO), part of the Programme and Policy Development Department (PD).

28. Other Units have a role in the policy discussion and support implementation: the SAMS & Food Systems Unit (PROR-F), the Climate & Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes Unit (PROC), the Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service (PROT). Specifically: (i) PROR-F, for the work on building resilient food systems and on Smallholder Agricultural Market Support (SAMS), including in the field of climate-resilience; (ii) PROC, for the role that disaster risk management and climate change adaptation have in resilience-building. (iii) PROT, for the work in expanding country capacity on resilience of food systems and for working with national and local government institutions to achieve capacity to face future shocks.

29. The Gender Office (GEN) has a particular stake given the importance of mainstreaming gender in resilience programming areas. The Nutrition and School-based Programmes Divisions also have programmatic links to resilience. The Research, Assessment & Monitoring Division (RAM), the Emergency and Transitions Unit (PROP), the Social Protection Unit (PROS) also engage in cross-cutting policy areas of relevance to the policy.

30. The Strategic Partnerships Division (STR) have a specific stake given RBA's role in resilience approaches.

31. WFP senior management, including the members of the Oversight and Policy Committee, and the members of the policy cycle task force have a stake, given their role in deciding and coordinating WFP's policy development and strategic direction. Regional Bureaux and Country Offices have an interest in the evaluation given their primary role in advancing policy-related objectives. The Executive Board given its role in policy approval, and the relevance for this evaluation to consider the EB members' perceptions and concerns about WFP engagement in this specific resilience area.

32. Other potential stakeholders include humanitarian and development actors, academics, consortia and networks – for example, the Rome-based Agencies, the World Bank and regional development banks, donor countries (e.g., Canada, Germany) and/or their aid/development agencies, cooperating partners (national/international NGOs), national governments, regional entities, universities and research institutions. Furthermore, host governments with their relevant Ministries in countries where WFP operates; non-State actors (as relevant depending on the context); local organisations working on resilience issues; local community members/leaders where resilience initiatives are being implemented, as well as beneficiaries of these initiatives, are key stakeholders.

33. WFP is committed to ensuring gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE), equity and inclusion in the evaluation process, with participation and consultation in the evaluation of women, men, boys and girls from different groups.

34. The above overview is not meant to be exhaustive. A full stakeholders' analysis will be part of the evaluation inception stage.

³⁸ Details on the expected role of IRG members are included in the ToR section 5.3 on Roles and Responsibilities and in Annex II.

3. Subject of the evaluation

3.1. WFP'S POLICY ON BUILDING RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION

35. WFP's Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition articulates WFP's resilience-building role as centred around food security and nutrition. Resilience is not an end objective, but a means to achieving and sustaining food security and nutrition in the face of shocks and stressors.³⁹ WFP uses the definition of resilience formulated by the multi-agency Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group of the Food Security Information Network (FSIN), which, as stated in Box 1, is "the capacity to ensure that shocks and stressors do not have long-lasting adverse development consequences".⁴⁰

36. The Policy intended to guide a resilience-building approach to programming by: i) providing coherence for WFP's actions to reduce vulnerability; ii) aligning WFP with global policy on resilience; and, iii) ensuring that WFP's activities complement the resilience-building programmes of other actors. It built on the 2011 DRR/M Policy and intended to guide WFP's approach to programming and partnerships.

37. The policy indicates that WFP's dual humanitarian and development mandate offers comparative advantages in enhancing resilience⁴¹ across contexts and sectors to address increasingly complex risks and their impacts on vulnerable people.⁴² WFP can apply development tools and perspectives to its humanitarian responses, providing communities with early recovery and development-enabling interventions that help build resilience and contribute to productive assets. WFP can also strengthen the resilience of affected people in protracted crises by applying a development lens in its humanitarian response.⁴³ Similarly, WFP can support governments to strengthen capacities to manage disaster risk, analysis and social protection systems.

38. The Resilience Policy calls for a 'fundamental shift' in how programmes are designed, implemented and managed to mitigate the damaging effects of shocks and stressors before, during and after crises, thereby minimizing human suffering and economic loss. It states that resilience interventions should be multi-level (i.e. individual, household, community, government) and system-based (i.e. relying on national disaster management systems), multi-sector, multi-stakeholder and context specific. Resilience approaches are to be systematically applied to strategy and programme formulation, with WFP CSPs aiming at greater coherence in programme planning.

39. The policy calls for prioritising: (i) gender equality and women's empowerment; (ii) disaster risk reduction as a prerequisite for sustainable development; (iii) the prevention of undernutrition to promote resilience; (iv) support to social protection and safety nets; (v) climate resilience; and (vi) the creation of productive assets and strengthening of livelihoods, especially those related to productive safety nets. The policy also calls for innovative practices to be mainstreamed into WFP's portfolio and to be realistic, responsive and flexible in intervention.

40. As resilience cannot be achieved by a single actor, the policy calls for partnerships with national governments, regional and sub-regional partners, civil society, UN agencies, particularly the RBAs, the private sector and research institutions.

Overview of WFP activities for policy implementation

41. The WFP resilience agenda has been integrated into a large portfolio of policies, strategies and guidelines showing that the organisation's imperative is not simply the work of one policy or set of guidelines

³⁹ WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C.

⁴⁰ See <https://www.fsinplatform.org/resilience-measurement>

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C. Page 6.

⁴³ Ibid.

alone (See Annex VIII for a description of how resilience is integrated in selected policies).⁴⁴ However, the strategic evaluation on resilience noted that, “WFP’s commitment to enhancing resilience is integrated into policies and guidelines but a unifying, agency wide conceptualization of resilience is lacking”.⁴⁵

42. The strategic evaluation noted that resilience enhancement was often perceived as the food assistance for assets initiative and offered examples of how a broader range of WFP activities can build resilience-related capacities (Figure 1). However, the evaluation also observed that the range of WFP interventions were not well suited to the (geographic) mobility or migration of food-insecure people. While there are conceptual synergies between WFP activities of food assistance for assets, school feeding, nutrition and general distribution, it has been a struggle to implement them as an integrated programme.⁴⁶

Figure 1: Examples of WFP interventions mapped according to resilience-related capacities

Transformative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combination of programmes for smallholder farmers when they result in livelihoods and markets that provide reliable incomes that are sufficient to prevent negative impacts from a shock (Purchase for Progress, R4 Rural Resilience Initiative, home-grown school feeding, Farm to Market Alliance). • Gender approaches when they help to alter the social conditions that lead to women experiencing greater negative impacts during the preparation for, response to or recovery from shocks and when women’s ability to anticipate, absorb and adapt is utilized without burdening them. • A combination of capacity building approaches when they lead to the development of a reliable government system that covers shock eventualities and livelihood needs (WFP’s capacity building for disaster risk reduction; shock-responsive social protection; climate adaptation; nutrition; education and food systems assessment) • Asset building when the threat to a community is completely prevented (food assistance for assets)
Anticipatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saving groups and credit services (R4 Rural Resilience Initiative) when they allow groups to increase their financial reserves and utilize them before a shock occurs. • Local-level weather monitoring services (R4 Rural Resilience Initiative) when they provide communities with timely and usable information for foreseeing anticipated weather patterns in their area and when early action is taken to minimize losses and damage caused by climate hazards (forecast-based financing). • Capacity building support when it increases the ability of national or regional governments to predict shocks before they occur, identify particularly vulnerable groups and mobilize responses.
Absorptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lean season food and cash-based support when it smooths consumption patterns and reduces the use of negative coping strategies (food assistance for assets). • Insurance mechanisms when they allow farmers to maintain food consumption during a drought and replenish assets used or destroyed (R4 Rural Resilience Initiative, African Risk Capacity). • Asset building when it reduces the impact of a shock on a community (food assistance for assets). • Nutrition programmes when they prevent serious nutrient loss during a shock or build individuals’ long-term physical and mental health, enabling them to absorb and deal with shocks (Fill the Nutrient Gap) • School feeding when it smooths consumption for children during a shock and relieves pressure on household food supply.
Adaptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset building when it alters the nature of a shock, reducing or avoiding its impact (food assistance for assets). • Programmes for smallholder farmers when they result in the diversification of crops (Purchase for Progress; conservation agriculture through the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative). • Programmes for smallholder farmers when they result in the diversification of buyers (Purchase for Progress, Farm to Market Alliance). • Training when it equips people with new skills that can be used to diversify incomes (food assistance for training).

Source: WFP (2019). *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*. Page 35.

43. The 2020 internal WFP discussion paper⁴⁷ commissioned by PRO-R, which is based on twelve case studies⁴⁸, confirmed that a wide range of programme activities are deployed and combined by country offices in efforts to build resilience capacities. It was found that WFP works most frequently to build resilience to natural or climate related shocks and less frequently, to economic or market shocks and stressors, demographic stressors, conflict and displacements.⁴⁹ WFP has primarily focused on building absorptive and adaptive resilience capacities through transfers, school meals or enhancing protective assets. Recently, WFP activities have sought to build anticipatory and transformative capacities; for example, weather-index

⁴⁴ WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*. Volume II Annexes.

⁴⁵ Ibid, Page iii.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ WFP. 2020. *Approaches to and Principles of WFP’s Resilience Building Programmes – Examples from the field*. Page 17.

⁴⁸ Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Guatemala, Kenya, the Kyrgyz Republic, Mali, Niger, the Philippines, Somalia, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

insurance, weather information, savings groups and contingency planning support target groups to predict shocks and reduce their impacts.⁵⁰

44. The Resilience Policy calls on Member States to support the integration of development and humanitarian financing mechanisms to support resilience-building. In the period 2017 – 2021,⁵¹ the needs-based plan (NBP) budget for the resilience building focus area was USD 8.54 billion (20 percent of total NBP) In contrast, the NBP budget for crisis response focus area was 32.6 billion in 2017 – 2021.⁵² The Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced resilience⁵³ found that focus-area tagging is relevant for funding alignment, but while there is clear targeting of the crisis response tag, resilience building and root causes tags are more widely distributed across strategic results and activities.⁵⁴

45. Since 2018, WFP has embarked on scaling up an Integrated Resilience Programme in G5 Sahel countries (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania and Niger). This initiative is done in partnership with communities, governments and a number of UN organisations, such as FAO, IFAD, UNWOMEN, IOM, UNICEF, UNCDF, UNDP and the World Bank, as well as GIZ the G5 Sahel Permanent secretariat, universities in the Sahel and NGOs⁵⁵. WFP promotes a package of activities in the same communities over a period of 5 years addressing the various stresses they face – combining food assistance for assets (FFA), school feeding, nutrition, capacity strengthening and seasonal support. Over 2 million beneficiaries in 800 communities are planned to benefit from the integrated package of activities.⁵⁶

46. Related to the above Sahel initiative and with the support from the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Germany and wider donor community, WFP has launched the Resilience in a Changing Climate Impact Evaluation Window in partnership with the World Bank's Development Impact Evaluation unit (DIME) in 2019. The priority questions under this window seek to generate evidence broadly on how integrated programming, which brings together multiple activities aimed at improving different outcomes, contributes to resilience; how various combinations of activities strengthen resilience and how programming decisions on targeting or sequencing of activities affect resilience. In 2020, impact evaluations under the climate and resilience impact evaluation window were initiated in Mali, Niger, DRC, and South Sudan.

47. The Resilience Building Blocks project, co-funded by BMZ, was initiated in 2020 in response to the SE 2019 with the overall aim to establish a coherent framework to advance a resilience-enhancing agenda from concept to integrated programming and measurable results. The purpose of the project is to: i) develop an internal common vision of WFP's contribution to enhance resilience capacities, ii) develop a consistent approach and design to integrated resilience programmes and monitor its contribution to resilience capacities of households, communities, governments and systems in 2 Generation-CSP, and iii) scale up the resilience approach at regional and country levels. A resilience tool kit and accompanying Theory of Change (TOC) have been developed, as well as a resilience measurement framework. In 2021, the Resilience Toolkit has been piloted and tested in six countries. This will be expanded to a further six countries in 2022. In addition, a number of different papers and studies have been produced in response to the strategic evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience.

48. Several WFP policy and strategic evaluations, Country Strategic Plan Evaluations (CSPEs), evaluation synthesis, and decentralised evaluations explore, more or less prominently, elements relating to WFP's work on resilience-building. In addition to the strategic evaluation, the Joint evaluation of collaboration among the United Nations Rome RBAs found that the perceptions of the resilience theme among RBAs were more about a shared commitment to address an important issue than about the need to reduce overlap or competition.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ As of 17 September 2021.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*.

⁵⁴ Ibid. Page 25.

⁵⁵ WFP. 2021. *Scaling-up Resilience in the Sahel: A Story of People, Partnerships and Practice*. Page 5.

⁵⁶ WFP. 2021. *Scaling-up Resilience in the Sahel: A Story of People, Partnerships and Practice*.

The evaluation also pointed out that the resilience theme may require repositioning if food systems are adopted as the core emphasis of the RBAs' efforts outside the humanitarian sphere.⁵⁷

49. The WFP & Oxfam Impact Evaluation of the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative in Senegal concluded that the R4 program had demonstrated strong results in reducing the adverse impact of shocks on the food security of participant households and recommended to fully integrate the program's various components in order to leverage the respective strengths of each component toward increasing resilience before, during, and after shocks.⁵⁸

50. Evidence from other evaluations can be found in Annex VII.

3.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

51. The evaluation covers the 2015 Policy on Resilience primarily focusing on addressing the quality of the policy and its implementation mechanisms, including guidance, tools, technical capacity, resourcing, and policy results and contexts in which it occurred. The evaluation will also assess results achieved through the policies' implementation from 2015- October 2022 with particular emphasis on the period 2017-2022.

52. The evaluation will build on the Strategic Evaluation on Resilience (2019) and where appropriate use it as a baseline for further analysis so as to not repeat analysis already undertaken.

53. An analysis of the programmatic areas cited in the policy and the related sub-activity categories shows that policy-related activities fall within the following main categories: analysis, assessment and monitoring; climate adaptation and risk management; institutional capacity strengthening; capacity development for emergency preparedness; emergency response; school feeding; food assistance for assets; food assets for training; smallholder agriculture market support activities; asset creation and livelihood support. Recent efforts to promote an integrated resilience approach combine interventions across WFP's activity categories to build resilience capacities and address vulnerabilities at individual, household, community, institution and/or systems levels (e.g. through nutrition; school based programmes and enabling environment systems). The inception report will further analyse and validate these sub activity areas and delineate the breadth and depth with which these activities can be covered for the purpose of this evaluation (see annex IX).

4. Evaluation approach, methodology and ethical considerations

4.1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA

54. The evaluation will address three high-level questions, which are standard for all WFP policy evaluations. In addition, sub-questions are presented below which will be further refined in the evaluation matrix that will be developed during inception phase.

Evaluation questions

⁵⁷ WFP. 2021. *Joint evaluation of collaboration among the United Nations Rome-Based Agencies*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2020/036). Final report to be presented to EB.2 2021.

⁵⁸ WFP & Oxfam. 2016. *Impact Evaluation of the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative in Senegal*.

1. How good is the Resilience Policy?⁵⁹
1.1 To what extent does the Resilience policy meet the criteria for policy quality in WFP?
1.2 To what extent is the policy coherent with: i) WFP Strategic Plans and other relevant WFP corporate policies or normative frameworks; ii) intergovernment-and UN System wide changes; and, iii) WFP's position and approaches within the nexus?
2. What are the results of the Resilience policy?
2.1 To what extent has the resilience policy contributed to strengthening resilience to shocks at various levels through activities such as but not limited to: analysis, assessment and monitoring; climate adaptation and risk management; institutional capacity strengthening; capacity development for emergency preparedness; school feeding; food assistance for assets; food assets for training; and, asset creation and livelihood support?
3. What has enabled or hindered results achievement from the Resilience policy?
3.1 To what extent did the policy receive support from, and prioritization by, senior management and have clear corporate responsibilities and assigned accountabilities?
3.2 To what extent was the policy adequately disseminated resulting in sufficient staff awareness and ownership?
3.3 To what extent were there adequate financial resources to implement the policy?
3.4 To what extent were robust results frameworks, monitoring and reporting systems including appropriate indicators to monitor progress, in place?
3.5 To what extent was guidance to implement the policy developed and used?
3.6 To what extent were appropriate and sufficient human resource capacities and competencies in WFP at HQ, RB, and CO levels in place?
3.7 What external factors and drivers of change (e.g. national leadership, partnerships with national, regional and global stakeholders working) to promote resilience were in place?

4.2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

55. The evaluation will follow the OEV's Evaluation Quality Assurance System (EQAS). OEV welcomes the use of diverse, participatory, and innovative evaluation methods. The evaluation team is expected to take a rigorous methodological approach to maximise the quality, credibility and use of the evaluation. The methodology will systematically address the evaluation questions and sub-questions in a way that meets the dual purpose of accountability and learning.

56. The methodology should demonstrate attention to impartiality and reduction of bias by relying on different primary and secondary data sources that are systematically triangulated (documents from different sources; a range of stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries; direct observation in different locations, etc.) and mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative, participatory etc.). The methodology will consider any challenges to data availability, validity, or reliability, as well as budget and timing constraints. The evaluation questions, lines of inquiry, indicators, data sources and data collection methods will be brought together in an evaluation matrix, which will form the basis of the sampling approach and data collection and analysis instruments (desk review, interview guides, survey questionnaires etc.).

57. The evaluation team is required to ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.

58. The methodology should be sensitive in terms of GEWE, equity and inclusion, indicating what data collection methods are employed to ensure the inclusion of women and marginalized groups. The

⁵⁹ Annex X provides an overview of criteria for assessing the quality of the policy based on a recent synthesis of evidence and lessons from Policy Evaluations (2011-2019) and OEV document on Top 10 lessons for policy quality.

methodology should ensure that primary data collected is disaggregated by sex and age; an explanation should be provided if this is not possible. Data collection and analysis should ensure that perspectives and voices of diverse groups (men and women, boys, girls, the elderly, and people living with disabilities) are heard and taken into account. The evaluation findings and conclusions will highlight differences in performance and results for different programme participants and target groups.

Design elements

59. The main design elements featured in the evaluation could include:

- **The development of a Theory of Change** for WFP engagement in resilience.
- **A review of relevant academic literature** on resilience.
- **Mapping of all CSPs and identification of resilience activities** as defined in Annex IX.
- **Analysis of WFP administrative and monitoring data** such as expenditures, timelines, performance indicators at corporate and country level and human resource statistics.
- **Build on the analysis carried out as part of the Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience**
- **Review and synthesis** of evaluations, audits and lessons learned documents from 2015-2021.
- **Tools** and approaches used by other international organizations will be examined alongside those from WFP to gather lessons and enhance learning. The policy positions, definitions, and directives of donors on Resilience work will also be examined.
- **Gender and diversity-balanced consultations** with national governments, UN agencies, donors, NGO partners, WFP staff and outside experts will be conducted to obtain a range of views on WFP's work to strengthen resilience work. Other quantitative and qualitative evaluation tools/methods may be used, such as surveys and/or participatory data gathering methods.
- **Key Informant interviews** at HQ, regional and country levels as well as with global and regional partners. The sampling technique to impartially select stakeholders to be interviewed should be specified in the inception report.
- **Country studies**, including in-person missions (if feasible) and desk reviews, will enable a range of data collection to take place in a range of countries that represent the wide spectrum of activities being carried out and support by WFP in resilience. It is anticipated that there would be 2 inception missions, 6 data collection missions and 6 desk reviews. Country studies will be selected using various information and data sources to demonstrate impartiality, minimize bias and optimize a cross-section of information sources. An initial set of criteria has been defined to inform the selection of WFP offices to be visited. These include: population, score on the human development index, size of CO, income level, planned budgets for resilience in new CSPs, presence of specific programmes (e.g. FFA, SAMS, R4 activities), use of specific risk analysis approach (Three-Pronged Approach), existing or active or recently de-activated L2/L3 emergencies, countries visited by the Resilience study, indicators related to resilience and the presence of large, multi-agency programmes on resilience that WFP is directly involved in (e.g. the Sahel Resilience Initiative) (see Annex VI). As part of the inception stage this matrix will be further refined in order to establish a list of countries for the country studies.

60. In order to ensure the impartiality and credibility of the evaluation, findings will be systematically triangulated across different data sources and data collection methods. In line with the mixed methods approach of the evaluation, triangulation will analyse and interpret qualitative and quantitative data.

4.3. EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

Evaluability is the extent to which an activity or a programme can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. It necessitates that a policy, intervention or operation provides: (a) a clear description of the situation before or at its start that can be used as reference point to determine or measure change; (b) a clear statement of intended outcomes, i.e. the desired changes that should be

observable once implementation is under way or completed; (c) a set of clearly defined and appropriate indicators with which to measure changes; and (d) a defined timeframe by which outcomes should be occurring

61. WFP does not currently use a single analytical framework for monitoring and evaluation on resilience at the corporate level. The organisation does, however, use indicators and methodologies to capture resilience as part of the monitoring of its Country Strategic Plans (CSPs), as well as to support the monitoring and evaluation of specific programmes or operations. CSP logframes draw on indicators from WFP's CRF and the Programme Indicator Compendium. Some of the existing outcome indicators mentioned in CSPs already capture elements of resilience and factors contributing to resilience. However, which indicators are used, and how they are selected to measure resilience capacities or outcomes, is so far not consistent across WFP. The Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience (2019) found that overall corporate reporting on resilience remains weak: while the CRF includes some areas relevant to the measurement of resilience, it is limited by discrepancies among the methodologies used for calculating indicators and a tendency to equate outputs with outcomes.⁶⁰⁶¹

62. A recent ODI study⁶² illustrated that there are a number of established indicators that are already used by WFP across countries and considered to reflect – at least in part – different resilience capacities or outcomes (e.g., established food security indicators). Nonetheless, some gaps remain in WFP's existing standard indicators; what is currently in the CRF is not sufficient to measure resilience capacities and outcomes comprehensively, as part of country offices' strategic planning and monitoring.⁶³

63. Annex V provides an overview over time of the evolution of resilience indicators across WFP's two strategic plan result frameworks. It shows that the number of indicators has gone up from 4 in 2014-2017 to approximately 12 in 2017-2021. Indicators have been evolving across the two results frameworks, with the CRF keeping some of the previous SRF indicators, and introducing new resilience-related measurements. Annex V also shows that reporting has generally improved in terms of number of operations and later countries reporting on and resilience, passing from a maximum of 22 operation reporting on resilience indicators in 2014, to 58 countries in 2020.

64. Reporting across the two results frameworks has consistently been done for the Food Consumption Score and the Coping strategy index. Trend analysis for these indicators should be possible for the period covered by the evaluation. Further details on evaluability can be found in Annex V.

65. During the inception phase, the evaluation team will be expected to perform an in-depth evaluability assessment and critically assess data availability, quality and gaps to inform its choice of evaluation methods. This will include an analysis of the results framework and related indicators to validate the pre-assessment made by OEV.

4.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

66. Evaluations must conform to WFP and [UNEG ethical standards and norms](#). Accordingly, the evaluation firm is responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation cycle. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results do no harm to participants or their communities.

⁶⁰ WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*

⁶¹ In response to the Strategic Evaluation, WFP is modifying current and adding new indicators for resilience building. A pilot resilience measurement framework has been launched, which complements the existing indicators in the CRF. A decision will be taken at inception stage on which indicators to consider for the policy evaluation.

⁶² ODI. 2021. *Guiding resilience measurement in WFP's monitoring and evaluation*.

⁶³ ODI. 2021. *Guiding resilience measurement in WFP's monitoring and evaluation*.

67. The team and evaluation manager will not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the WFP Policy Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition nor have any other potential or perceived conflicts of interest. All members of the evaluation team will abide by the 2020 UNEG Ethical Guidelines and the and the [2014 Guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#).

68. In addition to signing a pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation, the evaluation team will also commit to signing a confidentiality, Internet and Data Security Statement. In order to present the evaluation in the EB.1/2023 session, the following timetable will be used. Annex I presents a more detailed timeline.

4.5. QUALITY ASSURANCE

69. WFP’s evaluation quality assurance system sets out processes with steps for quality assurance and templates for evaluation products based on standardized checklists. The quality assurance will be systematically applied during this evaluation and relevant documents will be provided to the evaluation team. This quality assurance process does not interfere with the views or independence of the evaluation team but ensures that the report provides credible evidence and analysis in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.

70. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the data collection, synthesis, analysis and reporting phases.

71. OEV expects that all deliverables from the evaluation team are subject to a thorough quality assurance review by the evaluation company in line with WFP’s evaluation quality assurance system prior to submission of the deliverables to OEV.

72. All final evaluation reports will be subjected to a post hoc quality assessment by an independent entity through a process that is managed by OEV. The overall rating category of the reports will be made public alongside the evaluation reports.

5. Organization of the evaluation

5.1. PHASES AND DELIVERABLES

73. All final evaluation reports will be subjected to a post hoc quality assessment by an independent entity through a process that is managed by OEV. The overall rating category of the reports will be made public alongside the evaluation reports. In order to present the evaluation in the June 2023 EB session, the following timetable will be used. Annex I presents a more detailed timeline.

Table 1: Summary timeline – key evaluation milestones

Main phases	Timeline	Tasks and deliverables
1.Preparation	Nov 2021 - Jan 2022	Final TOR Evaluation Team and/or firm selection & contract Document review Briefing at HQ
2. Inception	Jan-June 2022	Stakeholder interviews Inception Mission(s) Inception report
3. Data collection	June-October 2022	Data collection missions and exit debriefings Primary & secondary data collection

4. Reporting	Oct 2022 –Mar 2023	Report drafting and comments process Stakeholder workshop Final evaluation report Summary evaluation report
5. Dissemination	Apr – Jun 2023	SER Editing / Evaluation Report Formatting Management Response and Executive Board Preparation

5.2. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

74. The team leader position requires a minimum of 15 years' experience in evaluation, with extensive experience in complex global, policy evaluations. Familiarity with resilience concepts in both humanitarian and development contexts is required, as is experience with evaluations in the UN system.

75. The team leader must also have demonstrated experience in leading large teams, excellent planning, negotiation, analytical and communication skills (written and verbal) and demonstrated skills in mixed qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques.

76. The primary responsibilities of the team leader will be: a) setting out the methodology and approach in the inception report; b) guiding and managing the team during the inception and evaluation phases; c) overseeing the preparation of draft outputs by other members of the team; d) consolidating team members' inputs to the evaluation products (inception and evaluation reports); e) representing the evaluation team in meetings with the EM/RA and other key stakeholders; f) delivering the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports and evaluation tools in line with agreed CEQAS standards and agreed timelines; g) presenting evidence at the data collection debriefing and stakeholder workshop; and h) taking on responsibility for overall team functioning and client relations.

77. The evaluation team should have strong capacity in conducting global evaluations that incorporate country-level studies. The team will be multi-disciplinary including extensive knowledge, skill and expertise in evaluating resilience related interventions, as well as in the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data and information.

78. The evaluation team should be comprised of 4-6 people and must include at least one resilience expert. Between the team members, there should be experience in the following technical areas related to Resilience: emergency preparedness and contingency planning; early warning and early action; community resilience-building, FFA, livelihoods and disaster risk reduction programmes; climate change adaptation; conflict analysis; recovery and rehabilitation, food security; gender equality and social inclusion; social protection; and, institutional capacity development. Across the team there must be a strong understanding and experience of the multilateral development system and of humanitarian principles and institutional architecture.

79. The team itself should comprise a balance of men and women of mixed cultural backgrounds. When conducting country studies, core team members could be complemented by national expertise.

80. The team leader should be able to communicate clearly both verbally and in writing in English. The team should also have additional language capacities (minimum French and Spanish).

5.3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

81. The evaluation manager (EM), Catrina Perch, is responsible for drafting the TOR; selecting and contracting the evaluation team; preparing and managing the budget; setting up the reference group; organizing the team briefing and the stakeholder's workshop; participating in the inception mission and supporting the preparation of the field mission; conducting the first-level quality assurance of the evaluation products (inception report and evaluation report) and soliciting WFP stakeholders' feedback on draft products. The evaluation manager will be responsible for writing the summary evaluation report (SER). The EM will be the main interlocutor between the team, represented by the team leader, the long-term agreement

firm focal point, and WFP counterparts to ensure a smooth implementation process. Deborah McWhinney, Senior Evaluation Officer in OEV, will conduct the second-level quality assurance. The OEV Research Analyst, Arianna Spacca will provide research support throughout the evaluation.

82. An internal reference group (IRG) will be formed and asked to review and comment on draft evaluation reports, provide feedback during evaluation briefings and be available for interviews with the evaluation team.

83. The Deputy Director, Anne-Claire Luzot, will approve the final evaluation products and present the SER to the WFP Executive Board for consideration.

5.4. SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

84. As an 'independent supplier' of evaluation services to WFP, the contracted firm will be responsible for ensuring the security of the evaluation team, and adequate arrangements for evacuation for medical or insecurity reasons. However, to avoid any security incidents, the evaluation manager will ensure that the WFP CO registers the team members with the Security Officer on arrival in country and arranges a security briefing for them to gain an understanding of the security situation on the ground. The evaluation team must observe applicable United Nations Department of Safety and Security rules including taking security training (BSAFE & SSAFE) and attending in-country briefings.

5.5. COMMUNICATION

85. All policy evaluation products will be produced in English. As part of the international standards for evaluation, WFP requires that all evaluations are made publicly available. Should translators be required for fieldwork, the evaluation firm will make arrangements and include the cost in the budget proposal.

86. The communication and learning plan (Annex III) provides the framework for the related activities identified to promote, disseminate and encourage the use of evidence from this evaluation.

5.6. BUDGET

87. The evaluation will be financed from OEV's Programme Support and Administrative budget. The offer will include a detailed budget for the evaluation, including consultant fees and travel costs and other costs as relevant.

Annex I. Timeline

Key action		By Whom	Key dates
Phase-1 – Preparation			Aug – Dec. 2021
	DDoE clears TORs and sends to stakeholders for comments	DDoE	Nov 3 - 17 Nov
	Draft ToR shared with LTAs to start preparing their proposals	EM	Nov 3, 2021 (due Nov 25)
	Revise TORs following stakeholder comments	EM/QA2	Nov 17-19, 2021
	ToR approval	DDoE	Nov 23, 2021
	Final TOR shared with stakeholders and posted	EM/QA2	Nov 24, 2021
	Team selection & Decision Memo submitted	EM/QA2	Nov 29, 2021
	PO finalization	Procurement	Dec 30, 2021
Phase-2 – Inception			Jan. 2022 – Jul 2022
	Team preparation prior to HQ briefing (reading docs)	ET	Jan 20 – 30, 2022
	HQ briefing – remote	EM & Team	Jan 31- Feb 4, 2022
	Inception phase interviews and missions	EM & Team	Feb 21- Feb 28, 2022
IR D0	Submission Draft Inception Report (IR) to OEV	TL	Mar 21, 2022
	EM quality assurance and feedback on IR D0	EM	Mar 21 – 25, 2022
	ET revision	ET	Mar 28 - Apr 1, 2022
	EM review on revised IR D0	EM	Apr 4-5, 2022
	QA2 quality assurance and feedback on revised IR D0	QA2	Apr 6-7, 2022
	ET revision	ET	Apr 8-11, 2022
IR D1	Submission D1 to OEV (after LTA firm Quality Assurance review)	TL	Apr 11, 2022
	EM and QA2 quality assurance on IR D1	EM/QA2	Apr 12-13, 2022
	DDoE quality assurance and feedback on IR D1	DDoE	Apr 14-20, 2022
	Submit revised IR, addressing DDoE' comments	TL	Apr 20-22, 2022
	EM and QA2 quality assurance on revised IR D1	EM/QA2	Apr 25-27, 2022
	Submit revised draft IR (D2)	ET	Apr 28-29, 2022
	Review IR D2	DDoE	May 1-6, 2022
IR D2	Share D2 IR with IRG for comment	EM	May 9, 2022 (deadline May 20)
	Consolidate and share comments received	EM/RA	May 23, 2022
IR D3	Submission of revised IR (D3) to OEV	TL	May 26, 2022
	EM and QA2 quality assurance on IR D3	EM/ QA2	May 30-31, 2022
	Seek clearance of final IR (D3)	DDoE	May 31 - 5, 2022
	Circulates final IR to stakeholders; post a copy on intranet.	EM	Jun 6, 2022
Phase-3 - Evaluation data collection phase			Jun –Sept 2022
	Data collection, including missions/case studies & desk review.	ET	Jun 7 – Sept 30 2022
	Overall debriefing with HQ, RB and COs (ppt) – online session	TL	Sept 30, 2022
Phase-4 – Reporting			Oct 2022 – Feb 2023
ER Draft 0	Submission of draft Evaluation Report to OEV	TL	Oct 28, 2022
	EM quality assurance and feedback on ER D0	EM	Oct 31-Nov 4, 2022
	Evaluation Team revisions	ET	Nov 7-11, 2022
	QA2 quality assurance and feedback on revised ER D0	QA2	Nov 14-16, 2022
	ET revision	ET	Nov 17-18, 2022
ER Draft 1	Submission of D1 ER	TL	Nov 21, 2022
	EM and QA2 quality assurance on ER D1	EM/QA2	Nov 21-23, 2022
	DDoE quality assurance and feedback on ER D1	DDoE	Nov 24-28, 2022
	Submit revised ER, addressing DDoE' comments	TL	Nov 29 - Dec 1, 2022
	EM and QA2 quality assurance on revises ER D1	EM/QA2	Dec 2-5, 2022

	Clearance to circulate revised ER for IRG comments	DDoE	Dec 6-7, 2022
	Stakeholder comments on the draft ER	IRG	Dec 8 – Dec 21, 2022
	Consolidate and share comments with TL	EM	Jan 3, 2023
	Stakeholder workshop		Jan 12-13, 2023
ER Draft 2	Submits revised draft (D2) ER	TL	Jan 24, 2023
	EM quality assurance on ER D2	EM	Jan 25, 2023
	QA2 quality assurance on ER D2	QA2	Jan 26, 2023
	Begin SER preparation	EM	Jan 27, 2023
	DDoE quality assurance on ER D2	DDoE	Jan 30 - Feb 3, 2023
ER Draft 3	Submit final draft ER (D3)	TL	Feb 7, 2023
	Submit final draft (D3) ER for approval to send to editing	EM	Feb 7, 2023
SER D0	D0 SER to QA2	EM	Feb 2, 2023
	QA2 review D0 SER	QA2	Feb 3-6, 2023
	Submit revised D0 SER	EM	Feb 7, 2023
	Review revised D0 SER	DDoE	Feb 8– 15, 2023
SER D1	Submit D1 SER following DDoE comments	EM	Feb 16, 2023
	QA2 review D1 SER	QA2	Feb 17-20, 2023
	D1 SER to DDoE for clearance to share with OPC	DDoE	Feb 21-28, 2023
	OPC comment window	OPC	Mar 1 – 15, 2023
SER D2	Submit final draft SER (D2) following OPC comments	EM/QA2	Mar 16 -17, 2023
FINAL ER	Final review ER + SER	DDoE	Mar 20-24, 2023
	Clarify last points as needed DDOE +EM +QA2		Mar 27-29, 2023
	Submission of SER to EB Secretariat	EM	Mar 30, 2023
	Submission of approved ER for editing		Mar 30, 2023
Phase 5 Executive Board (EB) and follow-up			
	Submit SER/rec to CPP for MR + SER for editing and translation	EM	
	Formatting and posting approved ER	EM/Comms	
	Dissemination, OEV websites posting, EB Round Table Etc.	EM	
	Presentation of Summary Evaluation Report to the EB	DDoE	June 2023
	Presentation of management response to the EB	CPP	June 2023

Annex II. Role and composition of internal reference group

Terms of Reference for Policy Evaluations

Internal Reference Group (IRG)

1. Background

The Internal Reference Group (IRG) is an advisory group providing advice and feedback to the Evaluation Manager and the evaluation team at key moments during the evaluation process. It is established during the preparatory stage of the evaluation and is mandatory for all PEs.

2. Purpose and Guiding Principles of the IRG

The overall purpose of the IRG is to contribute to the credibility, utility and impartiality of the evaluation. For this purpose, its composition and role are guided by the following principles:

- *Transparency*: Keeping relevant stakeholders engaged and informed during key steps ensures transparency throughout the evaluation process.
- *Ownership and Use*: Stakeholders' participation enhances ownership of the evaluation process and products, which in turn may impact on its use.
- *Accuracy*: feedback from stakeholders at key steps of the preparatory, data collection and reporting phases contributes to accuracy of the facts and figures reported in the evaluation and of its analysis.

3. Roles

Members are expected to review and comment on evaluation deliverables and share relevant insights at key consultation points of the evaluation process.

The IRGs main role is as follows:

- Participate in face-to-face or virtual briefings with the evaluation team during the inception phase and/or evaluation data collection phase.
- Suggest key references, relevant contacts, and data sources in their area of responsibility.
- Review and consolidate comments from their respective units/Divisions/offices on:
 - o draft TORs with particular attention to the scope, data availability and quality, sub-questions, criteria for country selection and long list of countries
 - o draft inception report and related annexes with a particular focus on the scope, data collection methods, selection criteria for country missions
 - o draft evaluation report and related annexes, with a particular focus on: a) factual errors and/or omissions that could invalidate the findings and change the conclusions; b) issues of political sensitivity that need to be refined in the way they are addressed or in the language used; c) recommendations.
- Participate in the HQ debriefing to discuss preliminary findings
- Participate in the stakeholder workshops to validate findings and discuss recommendations.
- Provide guidance on suggested communications products to disseminate learning from the evaluation.

4. Membership

The IRG is composed of selected WFP stakeholders from HQ Divisions, Regional Bureaux and, eventually, country offices that have participated in the evaluation. IRG members should be nominated by their respective Directors and have sufficient seniority and technical capacity to both provide and consolidate comments on draft deliverables based on their areas of focus and the relationship to the subject of the evaluation. The IRG should not exceed 15 members, including one representative from each of the 6 RBs.

HQ units/divisions may appoint an evaluation focal point that would be a standing member of all IRGs for Pes.

5. Approach for engaging the IRG

The Evaluation Manager will include the key internal stakeholders in the TORs for the evaluation. This will form the first list of key Divisions/Units with whom the evaluation will engage. The EM will draft an email for the Director or the Deputy Director of Evaluation to send to identified Directors to ask that they nominate an IRG representative at the same time that they are provided with the draft TORs for their comments. The Regional Evaluation Officers should be copied on all communications.

By the time that the TORs have been approved, the IRG should be formed. Its members will remain the main points of contact throughout the evaluation.

Proposed members of the Internal Reference Group

Table 2 presents the proposed membership of the evaluation Internal Reference Group. Expected roles, and type of engagement of IRG members are outlined in the IRG Terms of Reference above.

The following units will be asked to identify members for the IRG.

Table 2: Proposed Internal Reference Group for the Policy Evaluation of Resilience

Internal Reference Group for the Evaluation of the Resilience Policy	
Department / Division / Office	Name / function
Policy owner	
PROR and PROR-L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volli CARUCCI, Director Resilience and Food Systems - Delphine DECHAUX, Chief, Livelihoods, Asset Creation & Resilience Unit - Mercy MKHUMBA, Consultant PROR-L
Other Units / Teams in HQ	
SAMS & Food Systems Unit (PRO-F)	- Gianluca Ferrera, Senior Programme & Policy Advisor
Climate & Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes Unit (PROC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gernot LAGANDA, Chief, Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes - Vera Mayer, Programme Officer PROC
Social Protection Unit (PROS)	- Ana Solorzano, social protection and resilience/climate advisor
Emergency and Transitions Unit (PROP)	- Samir Wanmali, Deputy Director, Policy and Programme Division, PROP Emergencies & Transition Service
Gender (GEN)	- Zuzana KAZDOVA, Programme Policy Officer (Gender) , GEN
RAM	- Eric BRANCKAERT, Chief Assessment and Field Monitoring - RAM
Analysis and Early Warning Unit (AEW)	- Joachim GRODER, Head of Unit (Analysis and Early Warning Unit)
Strategic Partnerships Division (STR)	- Neal Pronesti (Strategic Partnerships Division, formerly working in RBA)
Nutrition Division (NUT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Domitille Kauffmann, Nutrition and Resilience Officer - Stien Gijssels, Chief Knowledge Management and Digital Innovation
Innovation and Knowledge Management Division (INK)	- Caroline Legros, Deputy Director Innovation and Knowledge Management Division (INK)
Regional Bureaux	
RBB	- Samuel Clendon, Programme Policy Officer, RBB
RBC	- Oscar Ekdahl, Programme Policy Officer - Climate Change and DRM, RBC
RBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Federico Doehnert, Programme Policy Officer RBD - Sebastian Muller, Programme Policy Officer RBD
RBJ	- Giovanni La Costa, Resilience And Market Access Regional Advisor, RBJ
RBN	- Sibi Lawson-Marriott, Climate Adaptation And Resilience Advisor, RBN (proposed, TBC)
RBP	- Raphael Leao, Programme Policy Officer, RBP

Annex III. Communication and knowledge management plan

Phase	What Product/Event	Which Target audience	How & Where Channels	Who Creator lead	When Publication deadline
Preparation (Aug - Dec 2021)	Summary TOR and TOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IRG – WFP staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consultations and meetings – Email – WFPgo; WFP.org 	EM	Nov 2021
Inception (Jan - Jul 2022)	Inception report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IRG – WFP staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Email – WFPgo 	ET	Jun 2022
Reporting (Oct 2022 - Feb 2023)	Country missions debrief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CO management and staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – PPT, meeting support 	EM/ET	Jun - Sept 2022
	Data collection debrief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IRG – Representatives of RBs and COs consulted during data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – PPT 	ET	Sept 2022
	Stakeholder workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – IRG members – WFP Technical Staff – Representatives of RBs and COs consulted during data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – PPT – Workshop, meeting support 	EM/ET	Jan 2023
	Presentation of key findings, conclusions and recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – OPC members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Meeting of the Oversight and Policy Committee 	Doe/DDoE	Mar 2023
Dissemination	Summary evaluation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – WFP EB/Governance/Management – IRG members – WFP country/regional office/local stakeholders – Donors/Countries – Partners/Civil society /Peers/Networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Executive Board website (for SERs and MRs) – WFPgo 	EM/EB	Mar 2023
	Evaluation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – WFP EB/Governance/Management – IRG members – WFP country/regional office/local stakeholders – Donors/Countries – Partners/Civil society /Peers/Networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Email – Web and social media – Evaluation Network platforms – Newsflash 	EM	Mar 2023
	Management response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – WFP EB/Governance/ Management – WFP country/regional office/local stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – WFP.org, WFPgo – KM channels 	EB	April/May 2023

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP Technical Staff/Programmers /Practitioners - Donors/Countries - Partners/Civil society /Peers/Networks 			
	ED Memorandum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ED/WFP management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Email 	EM	April/May 2023
	Talking Points/Key messages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP EB/Governance/ Senior Management - WFP Technical and Programme colleagues - Donors/Countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation 	EM	April/May 2023
	PowerPoint presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP EB/Governance/Management - IRG members - WFP Technical and Programme colleagues - Donors/Countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation 	EM	April/May 2023
	Report communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversight and Policy Committee (OPC) - Division Directors, Country Offices and evaluation specific stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Email 	EM	April/May 2023
	Newsflash	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP EB/Governance/ Senior Management - WFP country/regional office/local stakeholders - IRG members - WFP Technical and Programme colleagues - Donors/Countries - Partners/Civil society /Peers/Networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Email 	CM	April/May 2023
	Business cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation community - Partners/Civil society /Peers/Networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cards 	CM	April/May 2023
	Brief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP EB/Governance/ Senior Management - WFP country/regional office/local stakeholders - IRG members - WFP Technical and Programme staff - Donors/Countries - Partners/Civil society /Peers/Networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Web and social media, - KM channels - Evaluation Networks 	EM	April/May 2023

Annex IV. Preliminary stakeholder analysis

Internal stakeholders	Interest in the evaluation	Participation in the evaluation
Programme and Policy Development Department:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resilience & Food Systems Service (PROR) - Livelihoods, Asset Creation & Resilience Unit (PROR-L) 	<p>Primary stakeholders, policy owners of the WFP Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition (2015).</p> <p>PROR and PROR-L have a direct stake in the evaluation and will be one of the primary users of its results. Such primary role is linked to the Service and Unit's role in drafting policy and strategies and supporting the rollout of normative and programming guidance in the resilience-related area.</p>	<p>Representants from PROR and PROR-L will be included in the IRG. They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission, they will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop. They will be requested to provide information necessary to the evaluation and facilitate access to relevant documentation and contacts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SAMS & Food Systems Unit (PROR-F) 	<p>PROR-F has a role in the policy discussion and support to implementation, for the work on building resilient food systems and on Smallholder Agricultural Market Support (SAMS), including in the field of climate-resilience.</p>	<p>Representants from PROR-F will be included in the IRG. They will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate & Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes Unit (PROC) 	<p>PROC has a role in the policy discussion and support to implementation, for the role that disaster risk management and climate change adaptation have in resilience-building.</p>	<p>Representants from PROC will be included in the IRG. They will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service (PROT) 	<p>PROT has a role in the policy discussion and support to implementation, for the work in expanding country capacity on resilience of food systems and for working with national and local government institutions to achieve capacity to face future shocks.</p>	<p>Representants from PROT will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis and Early Warning Unit (AEW) - Preparedness Unit (EPU) (under the Emergency Operations Division (EME)) 	<p>AEW has a role in the resilience policy for providing early warning analysis that PROC and PROR plans and acts upon.</p>	<p>Representants from AEW will be included in the IRG. They will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gender Office (GEN) - Nutrition Division (NUT) - School-Based Programmes (SBP) 	<p>As stated in the WFP Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition the gender, nutrition and school feeding are cross-cutting policies that contribute to WFP's resilience-building approach. For this reason, these Divisions has a direct stake in the evaluation.</p>	<p>Representants from GEN, NUT and SBP will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.</p> <p>Representants from GEN will be included in the IRG. They will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research, Assessment & Monitoring Division (RAM) - Emergency and Transitions Unit (PROP) - Social Protection Unit (PROS) 	<p>These Divisions and Units have a role in cross-cutting policy areas relevant to resilience and DRR.</p>	<p>Representants from RAM, PROP and PROS will be included in the IRG. They will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic Partnerships Division (STR) 	<p>This Unit has a role in supporting the policy implementation. The Division will have a specific stake, for RBA's role in resilience approaches and work on methodology for the measurement of resilience.</p>	<p>They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.</p> <p>A representant from STR will be included in the IRG. They will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop.</p>
<p>WFP senior management, including the Oversight and Policy Committee and the Policy Cycle Task Force</p>	<p>Interest given its role in deciding on the organization's policies and strategic directions.</p>	<p>They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission. They will have an opportunity to review and comment on the evaluation deliverables.</p>
<p>The Executive Board</p>	<p>Accountability role, but also interest given its role in policy consideration and approval.</p>	<p>Presentation of the evaluation results at the June 2023 session to inform Board members.</p>
<p>Regional Bureaux and Country Offices</p>	<p>Interest given their primary role in advancing policy-related objectives.</p>	<p>Representants from the six regional bureaux and from the countries selected as case studies will be included in the IRG.</p> <p>They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission, they will provide comments on evaluation deliverables and will participate to the HQ debriefing and stakeholder workshop. They will be requested to provide information necessary to the evaluation and facilitate access to relevant documentation and contacts.</p>

External stakeholders		
Country-level stakeholders		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Host governments with their relevant Ministries in countries where WFP operates; - Local community members/leaders where resilience initiatives are being implemented - Beneficiaries of resilience initiatives. 	As the ultimate recipients of policy-related objectives, host governments, local communities and beneficiaries have a stake in WFP determining whether the policy evaluated is relevant, effective and sustainable.	Host governments, will be interviewed and consulted during the field missions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-State actors <i>To be further developed at inception</i> 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local organisations <i>To be further developed at inception</i> 		
Global stakeholders		
Humanitarian and development actors		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rome-based United Nations agencies (FAO and IFAD) - United Nations Sustainable Development Group (UNSDG) - United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) - Inter-Agency Standing Committee - World Bank 	Primary audience of the evaluation. The evaluation is expected to help enhance and improve collaboration with WFP.	They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement⁶⁴ 	Primary audience of the evaluation. The evaluation is expected to help enhance and improve collaboration with WFP.	They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.
National and regional institutions		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - African Union - Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) - Central American Integration System (SICA) - Southern African Development Community (SADC) 	Primary audience of the evaluation. The evaluation is expected to help enhance and improve collaboration with WFP.	They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.
Leading institutions and research centres		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overseas Development Institute - International Development Research Center - International Institute for Climate and Society of Columbia University 	Primary audience of the evaluation. The evaluation is expected to help enhance and improve collaboration with WFP.	They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.

⁶⁴ The UN Nutrition Initiative serves as the UN Network for the SUN Movement. In this capacity, it contributes to advance the aims of the SUN Movement and support SUN processes at global, regional and country levels.

-		
Key donors - Canada, (Germany) and/or their aid/development agencies	Key donors will have a specific interest in the evaluation from both an accountability and learning perspective.	They will be key informants and interviewed during the inception and main mission.

Annex V. Preliminary evaluability assessment

Resilience corporate indicators

The overall strategic direction of WFP is guided by its Strategic Plans. The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 was complemented by two results frameworks: the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and the Management Results Framework (MRF). The SRF was the performance measurement tool for project design, monitoring and reporting while the MRF articulated WFP's internal management approach to planning, measuring and reviewing organizational performance. In the 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework, the resilience-related Strategic Objectives were SO2⁶⁵ and SO3.⁶⁶ Outcome indicators included: Household Food Consumption Score, Community Asset Score (CAS), Daily average dietary diversity (DD), and Coping Strategy Index (CSI). More details on the evolution of performance indicators is available in Table 3: 2014–2021 changes in outcome and cross-cutting indicators related to resilience below.

In OEV's 2016 Evaluability Assessment of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017, the resilience indicators were found to be "difficult to use to capture changes in resilience" and issues around the relevance and meaningfulness of these measures were raised. Difficulties on reporting resilience indicators were confirmed in the 2016 Annual Performance Report, especially for the CAS.

The Strategic Plan (2017–2021) is aligned with the 2030 Agenda, and the review of WFP's financial framework presented an opportunity for better integration of strategic results and management performance into a Corporate Results Framework (CRF) (2017-2021). The CRF includes resilience-related Strategic Objectives under SO1,⁶⁷ Strategic Result 1,⁶⁸ SO3,⁶⁹ Strategic Results 3⁷⁰ and 4⁷¹, and SO 5⁷², Strategic Result 7.⁷³ The CRF does not have a resilience-specific SO, however, resilience building is one of the Focus areas around which strategic outcomes formulated at country level are framed.

The CRF dropped two outcome indicators related to resilience (the CAS and the DD), and introduced ten new resilience-related measurements: (i) Food expenditure share; (ii) Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihoods asset base; (iii) Food Price Index; (iv) Zero Hunger Capacity Scorecard; (v) Percentage of male/female smallholder farmers selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems; (vi) Rate of post-harvest losses; (vii) Value and volume of pro-smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems; (viii) Percentage of WFP food procured from pro-smallholder farmer aggregation systems, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer and type of

⁶⁵ Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies.

⁶⁶ Reduce risk and enable people, communities and countries to meet their own food and nutrition needs.

⁶⁷ End hunger by protecting access to food.

⁶⁸ Everyone has access to food.

⁶⁹ Achieve Food Security.

⁷⁰ Smallholders have improved food security and nutrition through improved productivity and incomes.

⁷¹ Food Systems are sustainable.

⁷² Partner for SDG results.

⁷³ Developing countries access a range of financial resources for development investment.

programmes; (ix) Percentage reduction of Supply Chain costs in areas supported by WFP (x) Effectiveness of resilience-enhancing and risk management financial instruments.

In 2018, a revised version of the CRF was published. Under this framework, the CRF dropped four outcome indicators related to resilience: (i) Food Price Index; (ii) Zero Hunger Capacity Scorecard and (iii) Percentage reduction of Supply Chain costs in areas supported by WFP (iv) Effectiveness of resilience-enhancing and risk management financial instruments.

In 2018, WFP commissioned the Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience (2019), which found that “The WFP corporate monitoring framework includes some areas that are relevant to the measurement of resilience but is limited by differences among the methodologies used for measuring indicators and a tendency to equate outputs with outcomes.”, concluding that “WFP corporate reporting on resilience remains weak because core programmes are not yet integrated in ways that create a coherent resilience “outcome” and the monitoring indicators used are designed to track the outputs of separate interventions”.⁷⁴

In 2020, WFP commissioned a mid-term review (MTR) of the CRF, expected to inform midway correction and contribute to the formulation of the next Corporate Results Framework. The review focused on the effectiveness of the CRF in supporting the design, monitoring and reporting of the Country Strategic Plan. The review highlighted that while indicators used in emergency and protracted context were considered satisfactory, “there is a need to develop a framework that better tracks and reports on results in the development context including resilience”.⁷⁵ The mid-term review also highlighted few issues with the use of activity categories. Two issues are of particular relevance when measuring resilience results: (i) activities’ lack of definition, leading similar interventions to be categorized under different activities (i.e. a similar intervention could be categorized as asset creation and livelihood support or climate adaptation and risk management); (ii) activity-bundling, leading to complications in results-based management and reporting.⁷⁶

The 2021 ODI study⁷⁷ highlights that some gaps remain in WFP’s existing standard indicators and what is currently in the CRF is not sufficient to measure resilience capacities and outcomes comprehensively. PROR has been working on a pilot resilience measurement framework, which complement the existing indicators in the CRF include (see Table 6). A decision will be taken at inception stage on which indicators to consider for the policy evaluation.

The WFP Strategic Plan (2022 – 2025) renews the global commitment to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with Outcome 2⁷⁸ and 3⁷⁹ focusing on resilience.

The below tables provide an overview of the resilience corporate outcome indicators as per the 2014-2017, 2017-2021 Results Frameworks and Resilience Measurement Framework.

⁷⁴ WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*.

⁷⁵ WFP. 2020. *Mid-Term Review of the Revised Corporate Results Framework*.

⁷⁶ WFP. 2020. *Mid-Term Review of the Revised Corporate Results Framework*. Page 15.

⁷⁷ ODI. 2021. *Guiding resilience measurement in WFP’s monitoring and evaluation*.

⁷⁸ People have better nutrition, health and education outcomes.

⁷⁹ People have improved and sustainable livelihoods.

Table 3: 2014–2021 changes in outcome and cross-cutting indicators related to resilience

Corporate-level indicators	SRF (2014-2017)	CRF (2017-2021)		
		CRF (2017-2021)	2018 Revised CRF	2020 Indicator Compendium of the Revised CRF
Outcome indicators				
Household food consumption score	X		X	
Community asset score	X	-	-	-
Daily average dietary diversity	X	-	-	-
Coping strategy index	X		X	
- <i>CSI Assets</i>	X		X	
- <i>CSI Food</i>	X		X	
Food expenditure share	-		X	
Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced asset base	-		X	
Food Price Index	-	X		-
Zero Hunger Capacity Scorecard	-	X		-
Percentage of male/female smallholder farmers selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems	-		X	
Rate of post-harvest losses	-		X	
Value and volume of pro-smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems	-		X	
Percentage of WFP food procured from pro-smallholder farmer aggregation systems, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer and type of programmes	-		X	
Percentage reduction of Supply Chain costs in areas supported by WFP	-	X		-
Effectiveness of resilience-enhancing and risk management financial instruments	-	X		-

Source: 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework., 2017-2021 revised Corporate Results Framework (November 2018); 2017-2021 Programme Indicator Compendium of the revised CRF (October 2020 update).

Table 4: 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework – reporting against outcome indicators related to resilience

	Corporate-level outcome indicators	Baseline	Target	# of relevant projects				# of operation reporting sufficient data and performance rating ⁸⁰			
				2014	2015	2016	2017	2014	2015	2016	2017
SRF (2014 -2017)	Strategic Objective 2: Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies										
	Strategic Outcome 2.1: Adequate food consumption reached or maintained over assistance period for targeted households										
	2.1.1 Food consumption score, disaggregated by sex of household head (key outcome indicator)	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible; alternatively, the CO can use secondary data to set the baseline.	80% of targeted households have acceptable food consumption	26	34	24	21	17	20	20	16
	2.1.2 Daily average dietary diversity, disaggregated by sex of household head (key outcome indicator)	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible; alternatively, the CO can use secondary data to set the baseline.	80% of targeted households consume an average of at least 4 food groups per day	27	33	24	22	12	19	20	16
	2.1.3 Coping strategy index, disaggregated by sex of household head	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible; alternatively, the CO can use secondary data to set the baseline.	Coping strategy index of 80% of targeted households is reduced or stabilized	12	18	14	13	8	7	11	8
	Strategic Outcome 2.2: Improved access to assets and/or basic services, including community and market infrastructure										
	2.2.1 Community asset score	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible at the start of an intervention.	80% of targeted communities exhibit an increase in CAS over baseline.	25	32	22	19	7	9	14	13
	Strategic Objective 3: Reduce risk and enable people, communities and countries to meet their own food and nutrition needs										
	Strategic Outcome 3.1: Improved access to livelihood assets has contributed to enhanced resilience¹³ and reduced risks from disaster and shocks faced by targeted food-insecure communities and households										
	3.1.1 Community asset score (key outcome indicator)	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible at the start of an intervention.	80% of targeted communities exhibit an increase in CAS over baseline.	35	48	39	30	9	21	21	19
3.1.2 Food consumption score, disaggregated by sex of household head (key outcome indicator)	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible; alternatively, the CO can use secondary data to set the baseline.	80% of targeted households have acceptable food consumption	38	50	41	34	22	32	32	25	
3.1.3 Daily average dietary diversity, disaggregated by sex	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible; alternatively, the	80% targeted households consume average of at least 4 food groups per day	38	48	38	32	18	33	29	24	

⁸⁰ Green: WFP either “achieved” or made “strong” progress towards yearly average outcome targets. Amber: WFP made “some” progress towards yearly average outcome targets. Red: WFP made “little or no” progress towards yearly average outcome targets. Grey: Available data are insufficient to allow the monitoring of organization-wide progress.

	of household head (key outcome indicator)	CO can use secondary data to set the baseline.									
	3.1.4 Coping strategy index, disaggregated by sex of household head (key outcome indicator)	A baseline survey should be conducted as soon as possible; alternatively, the CO can use secondary data to set the baseline.	Coping strategy index of 100% of targeted households is reduced or stabilized	38	48			16	29		
-	<i>CSI Assets</i>					22	23			15	16
-	<i>CSI Food</i>					37	32			28	23

Source: 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework; 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework Indicator Compendium (2015 update); 2015, 2016 and 2017 Annual Performance Reports

Table 5: 2017-2021 Corporate Results Framework – reporting against outcome indicators related to resilience

	Corporate-level indicators	Baseline	End of CSP target	Annual target	Relevant countries				Countries reporting sufficient data and performance rating ⁸¹			
					2017	2018	2019	2020	2017	2018	2019	2020
CRF (2017-2021)	Strategic Objective 1: End hunger by protecting access to food											
	Strategic Result 1: Everyone has access to food											
	Strategic outcome 1.1: Maintained/enhanced individual and household access to adequate food											
	1.1.1 Food Consumption Score, disaggregated by sex of household head	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation	- Reduction in households with poor food consumption - Reduction in households with poor and borderline food consumption	21	62	56	63	11	54	52	58	
	1.1.2 Coping Strategy Index			21	44			10	38			
	- 1.1.2.2 Consumption-based CSI (average)		- Reduction in average rCSI	- Stabilized/ reduction in average rCSI			46	50			43	43
	- 1.1.2.3 Livelihood-based CSI (percentage of households using coping strategies)					20	27			16	24	
	- 1.1.2.4 Livelihood-based CSI (average)					9	-			8	-	
	1.1.3 Food expenditure share		- Decrease in median monthly food expenditure - Proportion of households spending 65% or more decreased.		10	30	31	-	5	24	31	-
	1.1.4 Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced asset base	0	Programmes focusing on: - <u>Community assets</u> : 50% to 70%. - <u>Household assets</u> : To be set at a lower level.	Based on a linear projection towards the CSP-end target.	6	10	17	17	5	8	12	12

⁸¹ Green: WFP either “achieved” or made “strong” progress towards yearly average outcome targets. Amber: WFP made “some” progress towards yearly average outcome targets. Red: WFP made “little or no” progress towards yearly average outcome targets. Grey: Available data are insufficient to allow the monitoring of organization-wide progress.

Strategic outcome 1.2: Stabilized/improved availability and affordability of appropriate foods in markets											
1.2.1 Food Price Index ⁸²	No guidance available			-	-	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
Strategic outcome 1.3 Enhanced social and public-sector capacity to assist populations facing acute, transitory or chronic food insecurity											
1.3.1 Zero Hunger Capacity Scorecard ⁸³	No guidance available			1	3	N/A	N/A	1	1	N/A	N/A
1.3.2 Emergency Preparedness Capacity Index	Baseline for each selected variable to be verified through stakeholder consultations.	An increase by at least 1 from the established baseline in each of the selected variables.	Country specific, based on the initial baseline value	1	5		1	0	1		1
Strategic Objective 3: End hunger by protecting access to food											
Strategic Result 3: Smallholders have improved food security and nutrition through improved productivity and incomes											
Strategic outcome 3.1 Increased smallholder production and sales											
3.1.1 Percentage of male/female smallholder farmers selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems	To be based on the value of the indicator for the year prior to the start of the project.	Increase in the proportion of smallholder members of the aggregation system who actively contribute to collective sales.		5	17	13	11	4	13	13	11
3.1.2 Rate of post-harvest losses	To be established during storage period for each farmer.	Reduction of post-harvest losses by over 90% for participating farmers compared to control group farmers.		2	7	4	8	0	2	3	7
3.1.3 Value and volume of pro-smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems	To be established using the historical of sales conducted by the targeted aggregation systems in the year preceding the start of the programme.	CO specific		4	20	-	1	2	15	-	1
3.1.4 Percentage of WFP food procured from pro-smallholder farmer aggregation systems, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer and type of programmes	To be based on value prior to the start of the CSP. Where WFP has not been purchasing from pro-SHF, baseline is 0.	- Corporate commitment: at least 10% - Country specific	- Gradual increase to reach 10% CSP-end target	4	-	13	7	3	-	13	7
- for programmes implementing asset creation activities											

⁸² This indicator was discontinued and was not included in the 2017-2021 revised Corporate Results Framework (November 2018).

⁸³ Ibid.

3.1.5 Food Consumption Score, disaggregated by sex of household head	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation	- Reduction in households with poor food consumption - Reduction in households with poor and borderline food consumption		2	19	11	8	1	14	8	7
3.1.6 Coping Strategy Index	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation			2	13			1	8		
- 3.1.6.2 Consumption-based CSI (average)		- Reduction in average rCSI	- Stabilized or reduction in average rCSI			11	9			9	9
- 3.1.6.3 Livelihood-based CSI (percentage of households using coping strategies)		- Reduction in proportion of households applying crisis and emergency strategies				6				3	
- 3.1.6.4 Livelihood-based CSI (average)		- Reduction in proportion of households applying emergency strategies.				7	6			6	6
3.1.7 Food expenditure share	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation	- Decrease in median monthly food expenditure - Proportion of households spending 65% or more decreased.		2	19	10	-	1	14	7	-
3.1.8 Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced asset base	0	Programmes focusing on: - <u>Community assets</u> : 50% to 70%. - <u>Household assets</u> : To be set at a lower level.	Based on a linear projection towards the CSP-end target.	2	15	9	8	1	10	8	6
Strategic Result 4: Food systems are sustainable											
Strategic outcome 4.1 Improved household adaptation and resilience to climate and other shocks											
4.1.1 Food Consumption Score, disaggregated by sex of household head	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation	- Reduction in households with poor food consumption - Reduction in households with poor and borderline food consumption		5	15	16	21	2	10	14	20
4.1.2 Coping Strategy Index	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation			5	12			2	10		
- 4.1.2.2 Consumption-based CSI (average)		- Reduction in average rCSI	- Stabilized or reduction in average rCSI			10	18			8	16

- 4.1.2.3 Livelihood-based CSI (percentage of households using coping strategies)		- Reduction in proportion of households applying crisis and emergency strategies			8	11				7	11
- 4.1.2.4 Livelihood-based CSI (average)		- Reduction in proportion of households applying emergency strategies.			7					5	
4.1.3 Food expenditure share	To be established within 3 months before/ after starting activity implementation	- Decrease in median monthly food expenditure - Proportion of households spending 65% or more decreased.		3	5	11	-	2	4	8	-
4.1.4 Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihoods asset base	0	Programmes focusing on: - <u>Community assets</u> : 50% to 70%. - <u>Household assets</u> : To be set at a lower level.	Based on a linear projection towards the CSP-end target.	5	9	17	17	3	8	12	13
Strategic outcome 4.2 Supported inclusive commercial food system functions and services											
4.2.1 Percentage reduction of Supply Chain costs in areas supported by WFP ⁸⁴	No guidance available			-	-	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
Strategic outcome 4.3 Improved availability of food system-strengthening public goods and services											
4.3.1 Zero Hunger Capacity Scorecard ⁸⁵	No guidance available			-	-	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
4.3.2 Emergency Preparedness Capacity Index	Baseline for each selected variable to be set through stakeholder consultations.	An increase by at least 1 from the established baseline in each of the selected variables.	Country specific, based on the initial baseline value	1	-	-	-	0	-	-	-
Strategic Objective 5: Partner for SDG results											
Strategic Result 7: Developing countries access a range of financial resources for development investment											
Strategic outcome 7.1 Increased government access to financial resources (through public, private and public-private partnerships)											

⁸⁴ This indicator was discontinued and was not included in the 2017-2021 revised Corporate Results Framework (November 2018).

⁸⁵ Ibid.

	7.1.1 Effectiveness of resilience-enhancing and risk management financial instruments (as per qualitative review) ⁸⁶	<i>No guidance available</i>	-	-	N/A	N/A	-	-	N/A	N/A
--	---	------------------------------	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	-----	-----

N/A: Not applicable

Source: 2017-2021 revised Corporate Results Framework (November 2018); 2017-2021 Programme Indicator Compendium of the revised CRF (October 2020 update); 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 Annual Performance Reports.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

Table 6: Additional outcome and cross-cutting indicators included in the pilot resilience measurement frameworks

Programme area	Corporate-level indicators
Outcome Indicators	
Food security	Economic capacity to meet essential needs
Nutrition & nutrition-sensitive	Programme coverage for Moderate Acute Malnutrition treatment (Coverage: prevention)
	Programme coverage for Moderate Acute Malnutrition prevention (Coverage: prevention)
	Proportion of target population who participate in an adequate number of distributions (Adherence)
	Proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)
	Moderate Acute Malnutrition treatment performance rate (MAM)
	Minimum Diet Diversity for Women of Reproductive Age (MDD-W)
	Percentage increase in production of high quality and nutrition-dense foods
	Default rate of clients from anti-retroviral therapy, tuberculosis directly observed treatment (TB-DOTS), and prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV (PMTCT) programmes
School feeding	Retention rate/Dropout rate (by grade)
	Enrolment rate
	Attendance rate
	Graduation rate (GPGR)
	SABER School Feeding Index (SABER-SF)
	Percentage of students who by the end of two grades of primary schooling demonstrate ability to read and understand grade level text
Capacity Strengthening	Resources mobilised (USD value) for national food security and nutrition systems as a result of WFP capacity strengthening
	Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes, and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening
	Number of national programmes enhanced as a result of WFP-facilitated South-South and triangular cooperation support
	Emergency Preparedness Capacity Index (EPCI)
	Proportion of targeted sectors and government entities implementing recommendations from national zero hunger strategic reviews
	Number of people assisted by WFP integrated into national social protection systems as a result of WFP capacity strengthening
	Proportion of cash-based transfers channelled through national social protection systems as a result of WFP capacity strengthening
Smallholder agricultural market support	Default rate (as a percentage) of WFP pro-smallholder farmer procurement contracts
Smallholder agricultural market support activities - Nutrition-sensitive	Percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting increased production of nutritious crops
Partnership	Partnership Index (PI)
Services/cluster coordination	User satisfaction rate
Cross-cutting indicators	
	2. Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme

1. Accountability to affected population	3. Proportion of activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented, analysed, and integrated into programme improvements
Protection	4. Proportion of targeted people receiving assistance without safety challenges
	5. Proportion of targeted people who report that WFP programmes are dignified
	6. Proportion of targeted people having unhindered access to WFP programmes
Gender	7. Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food / cash / vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality
	8. Proportion of food assistance decision making entity (committees, boards, teams, etc) members who are women
	9. Type of transfer (food, cash, voucher, no compensation) received by participants in WFP activities, disaggregated by sex and type of activity

Annex VI. Preliminary criteria for country selection

The evaluation will include cases chosen to represent countries with varying degrees of engagement with resilience activities, programmes and initiatives. A list of criteria used to guide the selection of countries to be considered for field missions is included in Table 7. This table combined with the matrix in Table 8, which will be further refined during inception, will be used for selecting countries that could be considered for the evaluation.

Table 7: Criteria to identify long-list of countries to be considered for the evaluation field missions

Proposed criteria / features of interest	Values / brief description and rationale
Geographic and context information	
Geographic balance	Ensure coverage across the six WFP regions. Minimum of two countries per region targeted by different evaluation data collection activities.
Income classification	Ensure diversity across income brackets using the World Bank classification.
WFP general information	
Humanitarian situation classification	Purposeful selection of Level 2 and Level 3 countries
I-/ CSP status and timeline	Timeline information about the last or current I-/ CSP cycle.
I-/ CSP budget and funding level	Budget and funding level information about the last or current I-/ CSP cycle.
OEV and other oversight- specific information	
This criterion considered: 2021-22 ongoing or planned I- / CSP evaluations; 2018-21 relevant ongoing or completed Decentralised Evaluations; 2020-22 inclusion in Strategic, Policy, Impact, or Corporate Emergency Evaluations. Ongoing or completed audit missions were also considered. This analysis was conducted to avoid duplication and burden on country offices and national partners which have recently hosted an evaluation/audit exercise.	
Resilience - specific information	
Programming features: countries and beneficiaries reached	Mapping of programming features under Resilience activities, and number of beneficiaries reached in 2020.
Global/Regional Resilience Initiatives	Mapping of participation in global and regional Resilience initiatives.
Expenditures by Resilience Building focus area in the period 2017 – 2020	This criterion considered: estimate expenditures for Resilience Building focus area in the period 2017 – 2020; estimate of percentage of expenditures on Resilience Building focus area, in the period 2017 – 2020.
IPC analysis	Mapping of number (and %) of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above (millions)

Table 8: Mapping of countries that could be considered for the evaluation

General data					Programming Features							Global/Regional Resilience Initiatives		DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY FOCUS AREA (USD thousand) 2017 - 2020		IPC		
Country	Region	Population (2019)	Human Dev Rank (2019)	L2/L3 (2021)	Food assistance for asset		SAMS		3PA	RBA collaborative activities	R4 activities		Sahel G5 resilience initiative with FAO and IFAD	RBA Resilience Initiative countries	Total exp Resilience building 2017 - 2020	% of expenditure on Resilience Build 2017 - 2020	2020 Number of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above (millions)	2020 % of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above
					Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020							
Afghanistan	RBB	38,041,754	169		Y	271,000	Y		ICA + SLP + CBPP					108,581	28%	1,149,264	36%	
Algeria	RBC	43,053,054	91											-	0%			
Angola	RBJ	31,825,295	148						Y					-	0%	600,000	62%	
Armenia	RBC	2,957,731	81						ICA					-	0%			
Bahamas	RBP													-	0%			
Barbados	RBP									launched in 2021				527,041	100%			
Bangladesh	RBB	163,046,161	133	L2	Y	409,913			SLP + CBPP					27,830	4%	1,200,000	87%	
Benin	RBD	11,801,151	158											-	0%	2,869	0%	
Bhutan	RBB	763,092	129											217	7%			
Bolivia (Plurinational)	RBP	11,513,100	107		Y	19,296	Y		SLP - CBPP					1,612	32%			
Burkina Faso	RBD	20,321,378	182	L3	Y	190,253	Y		ICA, CBPP, SLP starting in Q4/2021	Y, incl. RBA-G5 Action Plan-G5 Sahel Operation (SD3C)	Y	2,500	Y	40,677	20%	1,606,484	8%	
Burundi	RBN	11,530,580	185		Y	11,946	Y		ICA, CBPP					52,972	52%	755,517	6%	
Cambodia	RBB	16,486,542	144		Y									3,520	11%			
Cameroon	RBD	25,876,380	153	L2	Y	41,609			ICA, CBPP	Y				39,181	22%	2,650,432	11%	
Caribbean Community	RBP													3,064	54%			
Central African Rep	RBD	4,745,185	188	L2	Y	199,574			ICA	Y				22,443	8%	1,928,608	41%	
Chad	RBD	15,946,876	187		Y	84,580			ICA (not conducted this year but part of Chad CO (see next table) CBPP	Y, incl. RBA-G5 Action Plan-G5 Sahel Operation (SD3C)	Y			76,299	29%	453,321	3%	
China	RBB	1,397,715,000	85											813	9%			
Colombia	RBP	50,339,443	93	L2	Y	18,685	Y		SLP, ICA					12,215	5%			
Comoros	RBJ													-	0%			
Congo	RBJ	5,380,508	149			26,161	Y		SLP, CBPP					1,573	7%			
Cuba	RBP						Y							421	4%			
Côte d'Ivoire	RBD	25,716,544	162		Y									4,626	20%	229,552	4%	
Democratic Republic of Congo	RBJ	86,790,567	175	L3	Y	18,895	Y			Y			Y	30,367	4%	21,834,710	33%	
Djibouti	RBN	973,560	166		Y	12,570								11,867	41%	154,379	14%	

Note: Bangladesh IPC figures refer to Rohingya refugees and host populations in Ukhiya and Teknaf Upazilas of Cox's Bazar District, and Lebanon IPC figures refer to Syrian Refugees.

General data					Programming Features										Global/Regional Resilience Initiatives		DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY FOCUS AREA (USD thousand) 2017 - 2020		IPC	
Country	Region	Population (2019)	Human Dev Rank (2019)	L2/L3 (2021)	Food assistance for asset		SAMS		3PA	RBA collaborative activities	R4 activities		Sahel/IG5 resilience initiative with FAO and IFAD	RBA Resilience Initiative countries	Total exp Resilience building 2017 - 2020	% of expenditure on Resilience Build 2017 - 2020	2020 Number of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above (millions)	2020 % of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above		
					Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020									
Dominican Republic	RBP	10,738,958	88				Y				feasibility study done			2,380	34%					
DPRK	RBB				Y	118,942								42,865	30%					
Ecuador	RBP	17,373,662	86	L2			Y							2,680	4%					
Egypt	RBC	100,388,073	116		Y (Non-traditional IFFA)	3,329								6,939	5%	50,000	38%			
El Salvador	RBP	6,453,553	124		Y		Y		ICA	discussion with FAO	launched in 2021			10,110	37%	684,118	10%			
Eswatini	RBJ	1,148,130	138		Y		Y		ICA, SLP					5,925	41%	330,316	30%			
Ethiopia	RBN	112,078,730	173	L3	Y		Y		CBPP	Y	Y	67,000		49,598	6%	8,609,537	16%			
Gambia	RBD	2,347,706	172			400								5,919	50%					
Ghana	RBD	30,417,856	138		Y									1,661	10%					
Guatemala	RBP	16,604,026	127		Y		Y		ICA, SLP, CBPP	discussion with FAO discussion with IFAD to extend our insurance activities	launched in 2021			7,300	9%	3,681,608	22%			
Guinea	RBD	12,771,246	178		Y			4,364	ICA, CBPP					13,460	55%	113,641	1%			
Guinea-Bissau	RBD							13,832	CBPP					1,233	7%					
Haiti	RBP	11,263,077	170		Y	29,742	Y		SLP, CBPP		feasibility study done			13,238	15%	3,988,368	41%			
Honduras	RBP	9,746,117	132		Y	15,400	Y		SLP-CBPP	discussion with FAO	feasibility study done			6,985	10%	2,900,000	31%			
India	RBB	1,366,417,754	131											-	0%					
Indonesia	RBB	270,625,568	107											4,080	58%					
Iran (Islamic Repub)	RBC													-	0%					
Iraq	RBC	39,309,783	123	L2	Y	81,747								49,003	19%	700,000	12%			
Jordan	RBC	10,101,694	102	L2	Y	4,776			ICA, Urban SLP (pilots)	EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian crisis				37,067	7%	200,000	25%			
Kenya	RBN	52,573,973	143		Y	388,231	Y		ICA, SLP	Y				76,192	26%	1,809,894	10%			
Kirguzstan	RBB	6,456,900	120		Y	148,149			ICA - SLP					2,560	11%					
Lao People's Demd	RBB	7,169,455	137		Y	29,860								4,208	11%					

General data					Programming Features										Global/Regional Resilience Initiatives		DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY FOCUS AREA (USD thousand) 2017 - 2020		IPC	
Country	Region	Population (2019)	Human Dev Rank (2019)	L2/L3 (2021)	Food assistance for asset		SAMS		3PA	RBA collaborative activities	R4 activities		Sahel G5 resilience initiative with FAO and IFAD	RBA Resilience Initiative countries	Total exp Resilience building 2017 - 2020	% of expenditure on Resilience Build 2017 - 2020	2020 Number of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above (millions)	2020 % of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above		
					Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020									
Lebanon	RBC	6,855,713	92	L2	Y	45,083			CLEAR, CBPP	EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian crisis				52,966	6%	400,000	43%			
Lesotho	REJ	2,125,268	165		Y	11,775	Y		ICA, SLP, CBPP					4,401	14%	374,195	26%			
Liberia	RBD	4,937,374	175		Y	21,920	Y	30,118	ICA, CBPP					8,088	22%	500,000	10%			
Libya	RBC	6,777,452	105	L2										1,068	3%	700,000	9%			
Madagascar	REJ	28,369,307	164	L2	Y	86,531	Y		ICA, CBPP	Y	Y	3,500		14,160	17%	1,062,712	27%			
Malawi	REJ	18,628,747	174		Y	739,684	Y		ICA, SLP, CBPP		Y	67,000		55,638	43%	2,549,703	14%			
Mali	RBD	19,658,031	184	L3	Y	178,805	Y		ICA, CBPP	Y, incl. RBA-G5 Action Plan-G5 Sahel Operation (SD3C)		Y		63,975	25%	757,217	4%			
Mauritania	RBD	4,525,696	157		Y	25,871			ICA, SLP, CBPP	Y, incl. RBA-G5 Action Plan-G5 Sahel Operation (SD3C)		Y		31,994	35%	177,091	4%			
Morocco	RBC														#DIV/0!					
Mozambique	REJ	30,366,036	181	L2	Y	672,467	Y		ICA	Y	Y	2,400		21,305	7%	2,674,922	15%			
Myanmar	RBB	54,045,420	147	L2	Y	102,381								37,628	25%					
Namibia	REJ	2,494,530	130						ICA (maps ready)					512	4%	427,905	18%			
Nepal	RBB	28,608,710	142		Y	1,005								16,569	34%					
Nicaragua	RBP	6,545,502	128		Y		Y		SLP, CBPP	discussion with FAO	Y			14,422	55%	400,000	6%			
Niger	RBD	23,310,715	189	L3	Y	448,280			ICA, SLP, CBPP	Y, incl. RBA-G5 Action Plan-G5 Sahel Operation (SD3C)		Y	Y	121,135	48%	1,635,842	7%			
Nigeria	RBD	200,963,599	161	L3	Y	181,744			ICA (note: validation workshop not held yet), SLP, CBPP	Y				43,335	11%	5,064,173	5%			
Pacific Island Count	RBB													1,852	44%					
Pakistan	RBB	216,565,318	154		Y	272,225			ICA + SLP + CBPP					4,143	3%	1,175,287	23%			
Papua New Guinea	RBB													163	74%					
Palestine	RBC	4,569,087	115		Y									1,745	1%	2,000,000	38%			
Peru	RBP	32,510,453	79	L2										1,278	8%					
Philippines	RBB	108,116,615	107		Y	27,507			ICA + SLP					8,208	45%					
Rwanda	RBN	12,626,950	160		Y		Y							10,618	20%					

General data					Programming Features										Global/Regional Resilience Initiatives		DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY FOCUS AREA (USD thousand) 2017 - 2020		IPC	
Country	Region	Population (2019)	Human Dev Rank (2019)	L2/L3 (2021)	Food assistance for asset		SAMS		3PA	RBA collaborative activities	R4 activities		Sahel G5 resilience initiative with FAO and IFAD	RBA Resilience Initiative countries	Total exp Resilience building 2017 - 2020	% of expenditure on Resilience Build 2017 - 2020	2020 Number of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above (millions)	2020 % of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above		
					Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020	Countries	Countries	Beneficiaries 2020									
Sao Tome and Pr...	RBD	215,056	135																	
Senegal	RBD	16,296,364	168		Y	151,965			ICA, CBPP	RBA-G5 Action Plan-G5 Sahel Operation (SD3C)	Y	45,000	Y		19,739	88%	436,650	3%		
Sierra Leone	RBD	7,813,215	182		Y	16,351	Y		ICA, SLP, CBPP					12,000	54%	1,011,120	12%			
Somalia	RBN	15,442,905			Y	240,085			ICA, SLP, CBPP	Y			Y	177,232	29%	1,281,000	10%			
South Sudan	RBN	11,062,113	185	L3	Y	597,845	Y		ICA					108,247	7%	6,301,000	53%			
Sri Lanka	RBB	21,803,000	72		Y	3,785			SLP + CBPP					8,392	60%					
Sudan	RBN	42,813,238	170		Y	820,567			ICA					44,746	5%	9,578,685	21%			
Syrian Arab Republi	RBC	17,070,135	151	L3	Y	104,950			SLP, CBPP					107,471	9%	12,400,000	60%			
Tajikistan	RBB	9,321,018	125		Y	27,058			ICA					3,894	15%					
Timor-Leste	RBB	1,293,119	141						ICA + SLP + CBPP					1,800	44%					
Togo	RBD	8,082,366	167						ICA, CBPP					-	0%	0	0%			
Tunisia	RBC	11,694,719	95											-	0%					
Turkey	RBC	83,429,615	54	L2										1,144,276	99%					
Uganda	RBN	44,269,594	159			65,997	Y							17,956	4%	2,602,848	22%			
United Republic of T	RBJ	58,005,463	163		Y		Y		ICA, SLP, CBPP					5,868	4%	985,278	21%			
Yemen	RBC	29,161,922	179	L3	Y	508,041			3PA (Planning phase)	Y (Joint projects with FAO, UNICEF, UNDP, IFAD)				87,209	3%	13,479,500	45%			
Zambia	RBJ	17,861,030	146		Y		Y				Y	7,800		6,631	20%	1,423,026	22%			
Zimbabwe	RBJ	14,645,468	150		Y	112,294	Y		ICA, SLP, CBPP		Y	6,000		35,186	9%	2,605,477	27%			

Annex VII. Evaluative evidence on resilience from recent centralised evaluations

Evaluation	Findings
Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans⁸⁷ (2018)	Finding: The evaluation recognized that the CSP process has often strengthened WFP's alignment with national policies and priorities. However, while it did not find evidence that CSPs have improved WFP's capacity to respond to sudden onset emergencies, the structure of CSPs may strengthen long-term efforts to build resilience and tackle the root causes of vulnerability, and CSPs have strengthened the focus on capacity strengthening, highlighting the human resources challenges that WFP faces.
Synthesis report of WFP's country portfolio evaluations in Africa (2016–2018)⁸⁸ (2019)	Finding: Donor preferences regarding activities, targeting and transfer modalities shaped WFP strategic choices. In at least five countries, differing donor positions on transfer modalities and resilience were challenging to reconcile. WFP used FFA and FFT activities to prevent and reduce food and nutrition insecurity in all eight countries. From 2015 onwards, these activities were undertaken under resilience. There were design weaknesses in four countries, and the sustainability of assets was uncertain in five. However, the gradual implementation of WFP's 2015 Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition promises future improvement. While resilience approaches were relatively new in the eight portfolios, their broad, systemic and medium-term nature makes them relevant across the triple nexus and to preparedness and prevention. They would benefit from being tailored to the circumstances in which they are to be employed and a medium-term approach to partnerships and resourcing.
Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Capacity to Respond to Emergencies⁸⁹ (2020)	Finding: the WFP policy and strategic commitments to maximize WFP's potential contribution to approaches connecting humanitarian, development and peace work were limited by lack of practical guidance and tools and the limited use of programme options . Further constraints included donor perceptions that WFP did not have the right expertise and partners, potential overlap with other organizations' mandates and an organizational focus on outputs that build immediate food security rather than the outcome of long-term community resilience.
Evaluation of the Gender Policy (2015-2020)⁹⁰	Finding: WFP was not yet systematically supporting the equitable participation of women and men across its programmes. While good examples, such as community-based participatory planning and the management and oversight of general food distribution committees exist, equal participation in the design or adjustment of programmes had not yet been actively promoted.

⁸⁷ WFP. 2018. *Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2017/014).

⁸⁸ WFP. 2019. *Synthesis report of WFP's country portfolio evaluations in Africa (2016–2018)*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2019/021)

⁸⁹ WFP. 2020. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Capacity to Respond to Emergencies*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2018/010)

⁹⁰ WFP. 2020. *Evaluation of the Gender Policy (2015-2020)*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2019/015).

<p>Evaluation of Democratic Republic of the Congo Interim Country Strategic Plan 2018-2020⁹¹ (2020)</p>	<p>Finding: WFP provided technical assistance to smallholder farmer organizations through purchase for progress and food assistance for assets and training. Resilience activities were deprioritized compared to emergency assistance, but renewed funding allowed for an increase in activities, partly linked to an expanding home-grown school feeding programme. Gender equality and women empowerment were well integrated in resilience activities and likely to improve women’s socio-economic status, however sick people and people with disabilities tended to be left behind in those activities.</p>
<p>Republic of Zimbabwe An evaluation of WFP Country Strategic Plan 2017-2020 (2021)⁹²</p>	<p>Finding: The Zimbabwe Country Strategic Plan Evaluation concluded that the CSP provided the basis for improved programmatic coherence and integration across the humanitarian-development nexus, consolidating WFP programmes within one strategic document. In Zimbabwe WFP had contributed effectively to the nexus through building synergies between its crisis response and resilience building activities, while other agencies had comparative advantages in addressing root causes of food and nutrition insecurity. It went on to note that WFP possesses a level of comparative advantage in resilience building that in itself is an important contribution to addressing the nexus. The perception of comparative advantage has been reflected in significant funding, albeit at levels far short of what is needed to achieve impact at-scale.</p>
<p>Evaluation of WFP South-South and Triangular Cooperation Policy (2021)⁹³</p>	<p>Finding: The Policy Evaluation: WFP South-South and Triangular Cooperation Policy, pointed out that direct contributions of South-South and Triangular Cooperation emerged primarily in the area of strengthening smallholder farmer resilience and access to markets. Other benefits for community-level actors were largely indirect, through the effects of the implementation of innovative solutions informed by South-South exchange.</p>
<p>School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals: A Strategic Evaluation⁹⁴ (2021)</p>	<p>Finding: The first-generation CSPs have enabled school feeding to be positioned more strategically along the humanitarian-development-peace nexus during planning. CSPs most frequently linked school feeding to efforts to addressing root causes and enhancing resilience.</p>
<p>Joint evaluation of collaboration among the United Nations Rome-Based Agencies⁹⁵ (2021)</p>	<p>Finding: The perceptions of the resilience theme among Rome-Based Agencies (RBA) were more about a shared commitment to address an important issue than about the need to reduce overlap or competition. The evaluation also pointed out that the resilience theme may require repositioning if food systems are adopted as the core emphasis of the RBA efforts outside the humanitarian sphere. The RBAs have made efforts to develop common approaches around resilience, including the 2015 RBA conceptual framework and the RBAs’ Resilience Initiative. The RBAs’ Resilience Initiative builds on the RBAs’ comparative advantages and is grounded in the 2015 RBA conceptual framework and the Committee on World Food Security Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises.</p>

⁹¹ WFP. 2020. *Evaluation of Democratic Republic of the Congo Interim Country Strategic Plan 2018-2020*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2019/001).

⁹² WFP. 2021. *Draft Country Strategic Plan Evaluation Zimbabwe*

⁹³ *Policy Evaluation: WFP South-South and Triangular Cooperation Policy*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2019/027). Final report to be presented to EB.2 2021.

⁹⁴ WFP. 2021. *School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals: A Strategic Evaluation*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2019/019).

⁹⁵ WFP. 2021. *Joint evaluation of collaboration among the United Nations Rome-Based Agencies*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2020/036).

	<p>Gender is a key dimension of the RBAs' Resilience Initiative, with interviews and programme documentation suggesting strong attention to increased engagement of women in decision making, increased representation in groups, and increased enrolment of girls in schools. The RBAs' Resilience Initiative referred to the importance of including and benefiting young people. The recent evaluation of the JP RWEE found that the programme gave some but not sufficient attention to social inclusion.⁹⁶ Gender is also integrated in the design of the SD3C Sahel initiative, although neither the agreement between FAO, WFP (and later IFAD) with the G5 Sahel Secretariat nor the action plan for the initiative specifically mentions gender.⁹⁷ In the RBA-Canadian resilience initiative, several agency design instruments were connected in complementary ways. The layering of these approaches was cost-effective, saved time and resources, and gave continuity to the country projects.</p>
--	--

⁹⁶ FAO, IFAD, UN Women and WFP. 2021. *Global End-term Evaluation of the Joint Programme on Accelerating Progress towards the Economic Empowerment of Rural Women in Ethiopia, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Nepal, Niger and Rwanda from 2014 to 2020*.

⁹⁷ IFAD. 2020. *République du Niger. Programme conjoint Sahel en réponse aux Défis COVID-19, Conflits et Changements climatiques (SD3C) FAO/FIDA/PAM/ G5 Sahel + Sénégal*.

Annex VIII. WFP Policies, Strategies and Guidelines and the Definition of Resilience

1. This annex provides an overview of WFP policies, strategies and related guidelines from the past eight or more years, from the perspective of how these documents define and refer to the concept of resilience and/or the role(s) of WFP in building resilience.
2. The overview demonstrates how the idea of building resilience has been integral to WFP during this period, appearing as it does in most of these documents. It also reveals the ways in which policies, strategies and related guidelines cross-reference the idea of building resilience, showing appreciation that this organizational imperative is not simply the work of one policy or set of guidelines alone.
3. A definition of resilience is used in the Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management: Building Food Security and Resilience (2011). This uses a disaster risk reduction definition of resilience, from UNISDR (see below). Another definition of resilience, as refined and applied in the Rome-based agencies' conceptual framework, Strengthening Resilience for Food and Nutrition Security,⁹⁸ is used in the Policy on Building Resilience for Food and Nutrition Security (2015).
4. However, while this definition is referred to in the 2015 resilience policy, it is not formally adopted or applied as a definition of resilience for WFP. For example, while "resilience building" is one of the three focus areas for developing country strategic plans (CSP), the Policy on Country Strategic Plans (2016) does not use this definition of resilience or provide specific guidance on how to apply the definition to country strategic plan analysis, design and development.
5. The 2015 resilience policy suggests that WFP is conceptually aligning with emerging best practice, in terms of:
 - Adopting a development outcomes-driven understanding of resilience
 - Focusing on a set of capacities required before, during and after the onset of shocks and stressors (the ability to absorb, adapt and transform), that are a means to achieving the sustained desired well-being outcomes in the face of those shocks and stressors
 - Appreciating that resilience interventions need to be: multi-level and systems based; multi-sector and holistic; multi-stakeholder with a need to enhance resilience capacities concurrently and at different scales; and context specific.

However, specific discussion or application of these concepts of resilience is not found in the policies, strategies and guidelines, either just preceding or developed since 2015.

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>Policy on Capacity Development: An Update on Implementation ⁹⁹ (2009)</p> <p>The policy on capacity development outlines a systematic approach to strengthening national institutions and acknowledges WFP contributions to local and national capacities, especially related</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s): Reference to resilience in this policy is limited to reference to the WFP Strategic Plan (2008–2013), and SO2, which included "supporting and enhancing the resilience of communities to shocks by creating safety nets or assets"</p>

⁹⁸ FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2015. Strengthening Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition: A Rome-based Agencies' Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership. Rome.

⁹⁹ "Policy on Capacity Development: An Update on Implementation" (WFP/EB.2/2009/4-B)

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>to disaster risk management and safety nets¹⁰⁰</p>	<p>The policy references the need for investment in policymaking, institutional and individual capacities, where individual level capacities are described as outputs:</p> <p>“Successive cohorts emerge of individual and communities trained in the design and implementation of efficient and effective food assistance programmes and policies, including in gender-disaggregated needs assessment, targeting, food quality and quantity management, market analysis, information management and local tendering”</p> <p>The 2015 evaluation refers in general ways to WFP work in resilience building and includes some short descriptions of WFP projects that enhance community resilience, through community kitchens and local food purchase. The evaluation acknowledges that capacity development is at the very centre of the notion of “resilience”, with its association with the capacity of individuals, groups and society as a whole to cope, adapt and transform in the face of shocks</p> <p>The recommendations do not directly reference resilience building. However, recommendation 2 does highlight the importance of country offices being provided with “relevant, concrete and practical tools and guidance on capacity strengthening”, and that these should be applicable in contexts working along the humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus</p>
<p>Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management: Building Food Security and Resilience¹⁰¹ (2011)</p> <p>The policy emphasizes the WFP approach to disaster risk reduction by bridging emergency response, recovery, and development, in addition to targeted prevention, mitigation, and preparedness activities, including safety nets</p> <p>The policy builds on the WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction (2009), and impact evaluations in eight countries¹⁰²</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Resilience is “the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions”¹⁰³</p> <p>WFP role(s): “For WFP, building resilience is about enhancing and reinforcing the capacities, livelihoods and opportunities of the most vulnerable and food-insecure people, communities and countries in the face of an increasingly risky environment. WFP is contributing to resilience building through interventions that meet immediate food and nutrition security needs while strengthening the ability of food-insecure people and countries to manage future risks and withstand the adverse effects of natural and man-made disasters” (p. 9)</p> <p>The comparative advantages of WFP in food security-related disaster risk reduction are identified as: (i) food security analysis, monitoring and early warning; (ii) emergency preparedness, response and recovery; (iii) building resilience and protecting the most vulnerable; (iv) capacity development with national and regional institutions; and (v) coordination and leadership, in which the contribution of WFP to resilience is building community resilience through: food assistance programmes; social protection and productive safety nets; and innovative risk finance, transfer and insurance for food security</p>
<p>Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy: The Role of Food Assistance in Social Protection¹⁰⁴ (2012)</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p>

¹⁰⁰ The policy updates the 2004 policy ‘Building Country and Regional Capacities’

¹⁰¹ “WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management”. (WFP/EB.2/2011/4-A).

¹⁰² Ethiopia, Ghana, Haiti, Lao People Democratic Republic, Malawi, Nepal, Niger and Pakistan.

¹⁰³ UNISDR Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction. 2009. www.unisdr.org/eng/terminology/UNISDR-Terminology-English.pdf

¹⁰⁴ “Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy: The Role of Food Assistance in Social Protection” (WFP/EB.A/2012/5-A.)

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>This policy clarifies social protection and safety net concepts and their relevance to WFP activities. It outlines the role of WFP in supporting national safety nets in a predictable manner to help address long-term challenges</p> <p>Subsequent guidelines (2014):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFP Safety Nets Guidelines: Module A – Safety Nets and Social Protection Basics and Concepts • WFP Safety Nets Guidelines: Module B – Engagement with Governments and Partners • WFP Safety Nets Guidelines: Module C – Design and Implementation 	<p>Considering the lessons learned from the previous (2004) safety net policy, a set of guiding principles was established, such as including safety nets as an integral component of national disaster risk reduction and preparedness agendas. School feeding programmes also serve to provide social safety nets and promote educational and nutritional outcomes</p> <p>Concept/definition of resilience: The guidelines provide no definition of, or concept for, resilience. However, Module A anticipates that the WFP forthcoming policy on resilience will further elaborate the relationship between safety nets and resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFP is contributing to resilience building through interventions that meet immediate food security and nutrition needs, while strengthening the ability of food-insecure people and countries to manage future risks and withstand the adverse effects of natural and man-made disasters¹⁰⁵ • Safety nets can be an appropriate vehicle to deliver on food security and resilience as intended outcomes. However, safety nets can only be part of the WFP contribution to resilience. Safety net programmes alone may not fully enable households, communities and institutions to recover from the effects of a shock, and they “will likely need a combination of different types of interventions to help with full recovery, and work toward transformation, adaptation and innovation” • WFP provides a number of examples of working with governments and partners on safety nets programmes, and highlights the importance of discussions about graduation and the role of safety nets in increasing resilience, with stakeholders often concerned about the notion of dependency • The WFP community-based participatory planning tool is intended to “put people in charge of resilience building efforts and development” • WFP presents examples of programming initiatives such as FoodSECuRE and R4Rural Resilience as initiatives intended to promote resilience building • WFP discusses “How to design safety nets to build resilience over time” by using the three planning processes: (i) integrated context analysis; (ii) seasonal livelihoods programming; and (iii) community-based participatory planning
<p>Policy on Humanitarian Protection ¹⁰⁶ (2012)</p> <p>The policy, along with WFP Strategy for Accountability to Affected Populations¹⁰⁷ affirms the recognition by WFP of human beings as rights holders and that, as recipients of assistance, they are entitled to accurate, timely and accessible</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mention of resilience in the policy • There is recognition that community and individual coping strategies need to be part of WFP context and risk analysis, and that

¹⁰⁵ In the subsequent (2016) *Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) for Zero Hunger and Resilient Livelihoods: A Programme Guidance Manual*, the reference to man-made disasters is absent.

¹⁰⁶ “Policy on Humanitarian Protection” (WFP/EB.1/2012/5-B/Rev.1).

¹⁰⁷ Issued in January 2017 by the Emergencies and Transitions Unit, Policy and Programme Division.

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
information about the assistance being provided	targeting is critical, as populations excluded from assistance may be pushed into negative coping strategies
<p>WFP’s Role in Peacebuilding in Transition Settings¹⁰⁸ (2013)</p> <p>This policy sets the parameters for WFP engagement in peacebuilding activities as part of the United Nations efforts to transition towards peace in countries emerging from conflicts. The policy also states that WFP should not allow peacebuilding to become its overriding objective in a country, and should maintain humanitarian principles in areas still affected by conflict</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience. Use of the term “building resilience” with reference to the potential role of restoring and strengthening community assets in reconciliation efforts</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <p>WFP Identifies eight key principles that should guide WFP work in transition settings. These are: understanding the context, applying a risk analysis; maintaining a hunger focus; supporting national priorities where possible, but following humanitarian principles where conflict continues; supporting United Nations coherence; at a minimum avoid doing harm; being responsive to a dynamic environment; ensuring inclusivity and equity; and being realistic</p>
<p>Revised School Feeding Policy: Promoting innovation to achieve national ownership¹⁰⁹ (2013)</p> <p>This policy positions school feeding as a social protection intervention at the nexus of education, nutrition, poverty, and agricultural development, and reinforces the dual role of WFP as both an implementer and a provider of technical assistance, aiming to strengthen a country’s capacity and link school feeding to domestic agricultural production¹¹⁰</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience. Use of the term resilience, in relation to impacts, “improved household food security and resilience”</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <p>School feeding is a programme that should be linked to other programmes that assist children at different stages in the life cycle, and “to community development, asset creation and resilience initiatives”</p>
<p>Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition¹¹¹ (2015)</p> <p>This policy guides the WFP work on enabling the most vulnerable people to better absorb, adapt, and transform in the face of shocks and stressors. It acknowledges that many WFP operations already include elements of resilience building and seeks to refocus the way strategies and programmes are conceived. The policy recognizes the need to transcend the humanitarian-development divide and develop long-term country-level resilience programming, based on multi-year funding</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Refers to the leading role of WFP in the multi-agency Resilience Technical Working Group of the Food Security Information Network, which defines resilience as: “the capacity to ensure that shocks and stressors do not have long-lasting adverse development consequences”¹¹³</p> <p>Also references the elements found in other resilience definitions, with emphasis on the set of capacities required before, during and after the onset of shocks and stressors, mediating the ability to absorb, adapt and transform. Whereby such capacities for resilience, are not an end objective of programming, but a means to achieving and sustaining desired well-being outcomes in the face of shocks and stressors</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The executive summary envisages a resilience-building approach: “A resilience building approach to programming helps to mitigate the

¹⁰⁸ “Revised School Feeding Policy: Promoting innovation to achieve national ownership” (WFP/EB.2/2013/4-A/Rev.1).

¹⁰⁹ “Revised School Feeding Policy: Promoting innovation to achieve national ownership” (WFP/EB.2/2013/4-C.).

¹¹⁰ The policy was developed following an evaluation of a previous 2009 policy that highlighted the need to clarify and update the policy, operationalize it more effectively, strengthen its financing and intensify learning (Summary Evaluation Report of WFP School Feeding Policy: WFP/EB.1/2012/6-D).

¹¹¹ “Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition” (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C).

¹¹³ Food Security Information Network. 2013. *Resilience Measurement Principles: Toward an Agenda for Measurement Design*. Rome.

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>The policy notes that, while the elements of resilience building are already included in WFP operations, a fundamental shift will be how programming is designed, implemented and managed</p> <p>The policy is intended to guide WFP adoption of a resilience-building approach to programming and it: "(i) provides coherence for WFP actions to reduce vulnerability; (ii) aligns WFP with global policy on resilience; and (iii) ensures that WFP activities complement the resilience building programmes of other actors"</p> <p>The policy acknowledges that enhancing resilience is particularly challenging in fragile states and conflict situations, and that WFP is guided by its policies on humanitarian principles (2004),¹¹² humanitarian protection (2012) and peacebuilding in transition settings (2013) when working in such contexts</p> <p>The 2015 resilience policy includes the six principles outlined in the common approach for strengthening resilience as adopted by the Rome-based agencies (FAO, IFAD, WFP). These principles all have significant potential implications for capacity development within WFP and with government and other partners.</p>	<p>damaging effects of shocks and stressors before, during and after crises, thereby minimizing human suffering and economic loss"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such an approach starts with the way strategies and programmes are conceived, with resilience at the centre of the programme cycle • For WFP, the target outcomes of resilience interventions relate to food security and nutrition • WFP efforts to support resilience building includes aligning its activities with the plans and actions of governments and partners. Resilience building, enhancing the capacities to absorb, adapt and transform in the face of shocks and stressors, is acknowledged to require significant levels of collaboration over prolonged periods <p>The policy provides over-arching guidance under "programme implications", noting, for example, the need to prioritize gender equality and women's empowerment and to prioritize the prevention of undernutrition to promote resilience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People, communities and governments must lead resilience building for improved food security and nutrition. Efforts to assist vulnerable groups in managing risks and building resilience must be developed through country- and community-led efforts. Government leadership brings a more holistic approach that transcends institutional barriers to partners' collaboration. Capacity development of local authorities and engagement of community leaders increases the likelihood that activities will meet local needs and deliver sustainable gains. All efforts must focus on people and their organizations, and build on their risk management and coping strategies • Assisting vulnerable people to build resilience is beyond the capacity of any single institution. No single activity on its own will effectively build resilience, yet if taken to scale in a cohesive manner can contribute to strengthened resilience. To reach scale, multi-sector and multi-stakeholder partnerships must be integrated and must utilize the comparative advantages of each stakeholder • Planning frameworks should combine immediate relief requirements with long-term development objectives. Building resilience means addressing the immediate causes of vulnerability, food insecurity and malnutrition while building the capacity of people and their governments to manage risks to lives and livelihoods. Development can no longer be divided from humanitarian action. Better risk management and strengthened resilience are as central to development as they are to humanitarian response • Ensuring protection of the most vulnerable is crucial for sustaining development efforts. The poorest, most vulnerable and food-insecure people in the world typically have no access to social protection or safety nets. By providing a safeguard in the event of shocks, safety nets are a vital tool that can sustain livelihoods while assisting those most in need • Effective risk management requires an explicit focus on the decision-making of national governments, as well as integration of enhanced monitoring and analysis. Improved monitoring and early warning provide decision makers with the information they need to manage risks, adjust plans and seize opportunities. Actions to manage risk should begin with vulnerable communities and extend to

¹¹² "WFP Policy on humanitarian principles" (WFP/EB.1/2004/4-C).

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
	<p>local, national and regional levels and be mutually reinforcing. This requires full coordination among the institutions involved in food security and nutrition analysis, and early warning to ensure timely and flexible response to shocks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interventions must be evidence-based and focused on long-term results. Resilience-building initiatives must be evaluated to determine their medium- and long-term impacts on food security and nutrition in the face of recurrent shocks and stressors. Investments in evaluation are required to generate rigorous evidence of effectiveness and value for money over time
<p>The South–South and Triangular Cooperation Policy ¹¹⁴ (2015)</p> <p>The policy outlines WFP work undertaken at the policy, programming, and implementation levels in areas such as social protection, safety nets and school feeding; sustainable agriculture and connecting smallholders to markets through the Purchase for Progress initiative; nutrition; and services for climate change-related resilience building. As a priority, WFP supports regional and sub-regional organizations to facilitate the sharing of expertise, information, and capacities in resilience building, emergency preparedness, disaster risk reduction and nutrition</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referencing WFP mandate, policies and operations that put it at the forefront of efforts to end hunger. This includes an emphasis on ensuring that food systems are sustainable and resilient • Promoting forms of cooperation that support nationally owned efforts, through country capacities (sharing expertise, tools, skills); resources (sharing in-kind of cash contributions through twinning); and innovation (facilitating the identification and testing of potential solutions among countries) • Envisaging WFP supporting such cooperation at the policy, programming and implementation levels in a number of arenas, including school meals, sustainable agriculture etc. and “climate change services for resilience building”
<p>WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021) ¹¹⁵ (2016), developed along with three other key framework documents – i) the Policy on Country Strategic Plans (CSPs); ii) the Financial Framework Review (FFR); and iii) the Corporate Results Framework (CRF)</p> <p>The strategic plan applies an understanding that building resilience is critical to WFP efforts in achieving zero hunger. Efforts must be made to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable households and communities, of affected people in protracted crises, and as part of emergency response and preparedness in the context of recovery</p> <p>The SP locates WFP strategy in relation to global trends and international conferences and agreements. Among these are the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030), which calls for “investment in disaster risk reduction for resilience – including through social-protection systems – and enhanced disaster preparedness for</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience. Although it does reference the 2015 resilience policy. And the idea of resilience building is included throughout the strategic plan document</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “WFP works to strengthen the resilience of affected people in protracted crises by applying a development lens in its humanitarian response” • “WFP’s mandate allows it to apply development tools and perspectives to its humanitarian responses, providing communities with early recovery and development-enabling interventions that help build resilience and contribute to productive opportunities over the long term” • “Country Strategic Plans are context-specific and adaptable, to facilitate appropriate responses to changes in the operating environment; promote links between humanitarian and development assistance; and enable effective resilience-building by ensuring that crisis response supports recovery and long-term development and that development activities reflect an understanding of risk, vulnerability and ways to protect vulnerable people in crisis” • With reference to SO3 “Achieve Food Security”: “WFP will use analytical tools to facilitate a cross-sectoral understanding of disaster risks and of opportunities for enhancing livelihoods, climate resilience and

¹¹⁴ “The South–South and Triangular Cooperation Policy” (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-D)

¹¹⁵ “WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021)” (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1/Rev.2*)

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>effective response and ‘building back better’’. It is also noted that climate change will deepen vulnerability to disasters “especially in resource-scarce environments dominated by high prevalence of food insecurity and malnutrition”, as reflected in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Paris Agreement (2015)</p>	<p>nutrition, in line with government’s provisions. This analytical process will help partners engage in sustained efforts to build resilience for food security and nutrition. Similar tools will also help partners support communities in protracted conflict and displacement situations by guiding efforts to enhance their resilience for food security and nutrition”</p>
<p>WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans¹¹⁶ (2016)</p> <p>The Policy introduces “a unique programmatic framework based on coherent country portfolios”. This is intended to replace existing programme categories</p> <p>The Policy recognizes that the CSPs need to be context-specific and adaptable to change</p> <p>Strategic outcomes are to be formulated at the country level, and framed around focus areas – crisis response, resilience building and root causes, which are aligned with standardized strategic outcome categories included in the Corporate Results Framework</p> <p>The CSPs are intended to “promote links between humanitarian and development assistance and enable effective resilience building”. They are intended to better ensure that WFP crisis response supports recovery and long-term development, “and that its development activities are informed by an understanding of risk and protect vulnerable people from crisis”</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience. However, the three focus areas are described:</p> <p>Crisis response: aims to provide relief and maintain food security and nutrition in relation to a crisis, and may also include recovery efforts to restore livelihoods; targets internally displaced persons, refugees, vulnerable host communities, and malnourished and food-insecure populations affected by a shock – conflict, natural disaster or economic crisis</p> <p>Resilience building: aims to build resilience to future crises and shocks by providing support to people and institutions and enabling communities and institutions to develop their assets and capacities to prepare for, respond to and recover from crises; typically supports people, communities and institutions in areas that are food insecure, poor, hazard prone or vulnerable to climate change</p> <p>Response to root causes: occurs in the context of long-standing and/or unaddressed needs and vulnerabilities, and aims to address the underlying, root causes of vulnerability, including unavailability of food, poverty, and poor access to education and basic social services, etc.; objective is to ensure and protect the food security and nutrition of the most vulnerable people and communities while strengthening institutional capacity to respond to their needs; typically targets people and communities suffering from chronic food insecurity, persistent poverty and limited access to services</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “All aspects of the programme cycle will be examined through a resilience lens to determine how actions can best be integrated with national government strategies and partner-supported programmes” • “As WFP focuses on its core business of saving lives, it will do so in ways that contribute to building resilience and stimulating productive opportunities for food-insecure and marginalized people over the longer term” • Anticipates that the CSP will enable “a multi-sector approach to recovery programming, addressing risk and building resilience for food security and nutrition, which requires wide consultation and long-term collaboration”
<p>Climate Change Policy¹¹⁷ (2017)</p> <p>The policy lays out how WFP supports the most vulnerable food-insecure communities and governments in building their resilience and capacities to address the impact of climate change on</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies entry points that can guide country offices in developing CSPs. This includes a section on “Community Resilience, Risk

¹¹⁶ “WFP Policy on Country Strategic Plans” (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-C/1/Rev.1*).

¹¹⁷ “Climate Change Policy” (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-A/Rev.1).

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>hunger in the long term. It provides guiding principles and programmatic options for integrating activities¹¹⁸ addressing climate change into WFP work, with a focus on supporting adaptation alongside reducing loss and damage from climate extremes</p> <p>The policy was initially proposed in a WFP paper, Climate Change and Hunger: Towards a WFP Policy on Climate Change, presented to the Executive Board in 2011. It was understood that there were strong interlinkages and important distinctions between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. At the time, the WFP policy on DRR went ahead, approved in 2012</p>	<p>Reduction, Social Protection and Adaptation”, referencing a number of established WFP programmes that contribute to resilience building, such as food assistance for assets, as well as WFP role in introducing and scaling innovative risk financing tools and approaches, such as the R4, FoodSECuRE and African Union’s Risk Capacity</p>
<p>Environmental Policy¹¹⁹ (2017)</p> <p>The policy commits WFP to developing mechanisms for the identification, avoidance, and management of risks to the environment arising from its activities, and to strengthening the capacity of partners to plan and implement environmentally sound activities for food security and nutrition</p>	<p>Concept/ definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy views the foundations for WFP programmatic contribution to environmental sustainability as being laid out in policies such as the Climate Change Policy and the Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition • The policy presents WFP partnerships with beneficiary communities as also empowering communities and increasing their resilience to environmental degradation as part of WFP overall efforts to end hunger • The policy upholds the three-pronged approach to the planning and design of resilience building, and the need to include consideration of environmental issues within efforts to support productive safety nets, disaster risk reduction and preparedness activities
<p>WFP Gender Policy 2015–2020¹²⁰ (2015) And the Gender Policy Update (2017)</p> <p>The policy aims to embed gender in policies, programming, and practices, from headquarters to regional bureaux and country offices. It stresses that risks and crises have different impacts on the food security and nutrition of women, men, girls, and boys. Programme design and implementation should include considerations for: gender equality, women’s empowerment, how risks affect women and men/boys and girls, and what opportunities exist for enhancing their resilience</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>In fact there is only one mention of resilience, in the notes, with reference to the definition of gender-based violence that is being used in the gender policy, as being adapted from the Inter-Agency Standing Committee. 2015. “Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action: Reducing Risk, Promoting Resilience, and Aiding Recovery” is concerned with the concepts of risk and resilience in relation to gender-based violence</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not specified in terms of explicit connections between gender and resilience (concept, programming etc.)

¹¹⁸ Including activities related to emergency preparedness and response, food security analysis, early warning and climate services, community resilience-building, livelihoods and disaster risk reduction programmes, social protection and safety nets, risk management, finance and insurance, and stoves and safe energy for cooking.

¹¹⁹ “Environmental Policy” (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-B/Rev.1).

¹²⁰ WFP/EB.A/2015/5-A

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
<p>The Gender Toolkit (2016)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gender toolkit includes some documents which reference resilience (e.g. Gender and CSP Guidance, Gender and Climate Change) <p>However, while these use the word “resilience” they do not explicitly link a concept of building resilience to concepts about gender relations and gender equality. Nor do they provide specific guidance on how to apply the gender tools (e.g. gender analysis) specifically to resilience approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It could be assumed that the WFP Gender Standards and Toolkit are expected to be applied to all WFP work, e.g. that development of the CSPs will “note that gender is relevant to, and so should be addressed in activities relating to, crisis response, resilience and root causes” (Gender and CSP Guidance, 2016)
<p>Nutrition Policy¹²¹ (2017)</p> <p>The policy recognizes the virtuous circle between nutrition and resilience whereby good nutrition improves people’s abilities to cope with shocks and crises while enhanced resilience reduces the risk of malnutrition arising as a result of them. It builds on the findings of an evaluation of the previous nutrition policy,¹²² recommending the need to address the nutritional “double burden”; emphasize capacity strengthening of national governments; address gaps in evidence; and assess the use of different delivery modalities. It stresses the importance of nutrition-sensitive approaches by emphasizing the following features for all programmes: reaching vulnerable groups across the lifecycle; leveraging multiple sectors to simultaneously address the drivers of malnutrition; layering new and existing programmes with nutrition-sensitive components; and, linking actors and efforts through project implementation</p> <p>Unlocking WFP’s Potential: Guidance for Nutrition-Sensitive Programming, Version 1.0 (2017)</p>	<p>Concept/definition of resilience: Provides no definition of, or concept for, resilience</p> <p>However, the Nutrition Policy and the Guidance for Nutrition-Sensitive Programming (below) do both demonstrate an appreciation for the linkages between nutrition interventions and building resilience, and between building resilience and nutrition outcomes</p> <p>“Nutrition and resilience are mutually reinforcing, and a focus on ensuring good nutrition is an integral component of the resilience building process. Good nutrition results in resilient people, communities and nations as well-nourished individuals are healthier, can work harder and have greater potential physical reserves. Resilient people, communities and nations are also better able to protect the nutrition of the most vulnerable people in the event of stresses and shocks. Conversely, the households that are most affected by shocks and threats face the greatest risk of malnutrition. Therefore, building resilience is an essential component of efforts to reduce malnutrition sustainably”</p> <p>WFP role(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with national governments and other partners to apply a nutrition lens to all WFP activities, this policy commits “WFP to increasing its focus on resilience building and stunting prevention in longer-term humanitarian responses” WFP activities must reduce disaster risk, build resilience and help people to adapt to climate change, in order to improve nutrition “Humanitarian responses and long-term development actions should be mutually reinforcing and responsive to immediate nutrition needs ... Immediate nutrition activities in the short-term ensure that long-term investments in resilience are realized. At the community level, resilience activities are needed to address the underlying causes of undernutrition by improving physical and economic access to essential goods and services. At the national level, policies must be adopted that support resilient food, health and social protection systems. Such systems should be able to expand quickly to meet the needs of individuals and communities, offering services that protect the health and nutrition of the most vulnerable people” <p>WFP role(s):</p>

¹²¹ WFP/EB.1/2017/4-C

¹²² WFP/EB.1/2017/4-C)

Strategy, policy or guidelines	Concept of resilience as defined or used, and descriptions of WFP role(s) in building resilience
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guidance envisages the three-pronged approach (3PA) as being an important platform for “ensuring nutrition integration” into various programmes for resilience building, disaster risk reduction and so on, and indicates that “such opportunities are now being defined together with the Nutrition Division” • The guidance discussed the importance of selecting a measurable nutrition objective for any programme, i.e. nutrition-sensitive programmes retain their primary objective, which might be to build resilience, but include an additional nutrition objective, not intended to replace the primary objective

Source: WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced resilience*. Volume II Annexes. Annex 14

Annex IX. Mapping policy scope

Resilience Policy	Sub-Activity Categories	Description of activities ^{123, 124}
<p>Emergency preparedness . WFP has pioneered systems for emergency preparedness, early warning and rapid response that have been adopted worldwide. Supporting national disaster management authorities' resilience-building efforts will continue to be a priority.</p>	<p>Emergency preparedness activities</p> <p>Food Assistance for Assets</p> <p>Food assets for training</p> <p>Capacity development -Emergency preparedness</p> <p>School feeding</p> <p>Institutional capacity strengthening activities</p> <p>Climate adaptation and risk management activities</p>	<p>Support to governments in enhancing their capacities for emergency preparedness. Key emergency preparedness areas of focus include: developing related national policies and strategies; hazard analysis and early warning; nutrition/food security and vulnerability analysis; food and nutrition assistance planning; humanitarian supply chain management; food security and logistics coordination; and supporting the establishment of shock responsive social protection mechanisms.</p> <p>Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) and Food Assistance for Trainings (FFT) in emergencies: Community driven FFA and FFT can reduce risks and enhance community resilience. They can also play a role in protecting livelihoods, recovery and rehabilitation.</p>
	<p>Food Assistance for Assets</p>	<p>Community-based resilience building, livelihoods, and disaster risk reduction Many WFP programmes, in collaboration with other partners,</p>

¹²³ WFP. Guidance Note for Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Reduction Framing WFP's Support to National Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Reduction Priorities in Country Strategic Plans

¹²⁴ Resilience toolkit and technical briefs

<p>The three-pronged approach (Integrated context analysis; livelihood programming; community seasonal based participatory planning)</p>	<p>Food assets for training</p> <p>Smallholder agriculture market support activities</p> <p>Analysis, assessment and monitoring activities</p>	<p>contribute to resilience building, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Seasonal Livelihood Programming and Community Based Participatory Planning exercises inform the designing of WFP's Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) programmes that help food-insecure households to meet their immediate food needs while building high-quality assets for climate risk management and disaster risk reduction.</p> <p>Examples of such assets and practices include soil and water conservation infrastructures, land rehabilitation, as well as crop diversification and other sustainable agricultural practices. The resilience-building power of FFA can be reinforced by integrating it with services such as the provision of tailored climate information to farmers, microinsurance, and marketing services.</p> <p>The Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) FFA is typically implemented as a package of activities, which typically includes: institutional capacity strengthening; the planning process comprising integrated context analysis (ICA), seasonal livelihood programming (SLP) and community-based participatory planning (CBPPs); FFA committees; cash /food and capacity strengthening transfers; technical training; messaging (or social and behavioural change communication); community, group and household labour; and community/household level assets.</p> <p>FFA programmes contribute to building resilience capacities through a range of pathways: a) improving access to food for the most vulnerable, b) increasing and stabilising food productions, incomes, and value chains; c) reducing climatic risks and enhancing climate adaptation; d) rehabilitating and enriching land, water and other natural resources; e) increasing access to services and infrastructures; f) skills development; g) promoting gender equality and women empowerment; and h) institutional capacity strengthening.</p> <p>FFA programmes are diverse and include the development and management of natural resources, restoration of the agricultural, pastoral, and fisheries potential; risk mitigation assets; community infrastructure and access to markets and social services; trainings related to natural resources management, asset management, and income generating activities.</p> <p>FFA programmes focus mainly on building absorptive and adaptive capacities at the household levels. To a more limited extent, transformative capacities are built. Providing transfers supports households to cope with the effects of shocks and stressors. Through its FFA programme, WFP has also built the transformative capacities through capacity strengthening activities with government technical services and local government.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Support to productive safety nets through community -based asset creation schemes is central to WFP's resilience building work</p> <p>Increase support to social protection and safety nets either through delivering services to support countries with capacity and resource constraints so they can operate safety-net programmes; or through providing technical support and cooperation, capacity development and policy support to governments in establishing safety net mechanisms of their own.</p> <p>Prioritize climate resilience through WFP's innovative work on climate resilience cutting edge tools from climate science and finance are incorporated in national safety net programmes and WFP food assistance programmes.</p> <p>Create productive assets and strengthen livelihoods, especially those related to productive safety nets. WFP will continue to implement programmes that create productive assets, diversify livelihoods strategies and rehabilitate natural resources . Tailored to specific contexts, these programmes will aim to be part of productive safety nets that contribute to government initiatives</p>	<p>Asset creation and livelihood support activities</p> <p>Capacity Development-Strengthening National Capacities</p> <p>Climate adaptation and risk management activities</p>	<p>FFA and use of 3PA (capacity development) for National Public Works Programmes</p> <p>Risk finance (macro insurance and other financing mechanisms)</p>
<p>R4 Rural Resilience initiative. R4 is a strategic partnership between WFP and Oxfam America that helps vulnerable rural HH to increase their food security through community risk reduction, micro-insurance, livelihoods diversification, credit and savings. The most innovative aspect of R4 is the ability of poor farmers to pay for their insurance with their labour on activities that reduce the impact of drought and floods, and increase their productivity.</p>	<p>Climate adaptation and risk management activities</p> <p>Capacity Development-Strengthening National Capacities</p>	<p>Risk financing (with potential integration to shock-responsive social protection and safety nets)</p> <p>WFP has extensive experience in risk transfer mechanisms and supporting governments with risk financing initiatives aimed at reducing hunger. Programming tools WFP include weather index insurance, forecast-based financing (financing released and actions implemented ahead of a climate-related hazard based on climate and weather forecasts) and contingency financing (financing released and actions implemented in response to a climate-related hazard).</p>

<p>WFP support Governments in developing capacity to manage disaster risk through an integrated system of early warning, emergency preparedness, finance and risk transfer tools such as weather risk insurance</p> <p>Supporting national disaster management authorities ' resilience-building efforts will continue to be a priority</p>	<p>Capacity Development - Strengthening National Capacities</p> <p>Institutional capacity strengthening activities</p> <p>Capacity Development - Emergency preparedness</p>	<p>Institutional capacity strengthening within resilience programming aims to strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders to be able to more sustainably plan and deliver products and services to their target groups to absorb, adapt to and transform in the face of shocks and stressors.</p>
--	--	--

Annex X. WFP Criteria for Policy Quality

ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF WFP'S POLICY ON BUILDING RESILIENCE FOR FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION AGAINST CURRENT WFP POLICY QUALITY CRITERIA		
Policy quality criterion	Does the Resilience policy meet the criterion?	
Existence of a context analysis to ensure timeliness and wider relevance		
Clear and consistent use of terminology		
Policy appropriately defines its scope and priorities		
Policy develops a vision and a theory of change		
Policy development included internal consultations		
Policy provides guidance on timeliness, institutional arrangements and accountabilities for its implementation (inclusion of an action or implementation plan)		
Policy identifies the financial and human resources required for its implementation		
Presence of a robust results framework		
Existence/quality of a monitoring and reporting framework and systems for the policy		
Policy based on reliable evidence		
External coherence		
Internal and strategic coherence		
Incorporation of gender consideration into the design of the policy		

["Top 10 Lessons for Policy Quality in WFP"](#) and ["Synthesis of evidence and lessons from WFP's policy evaluations \(2011–2019\)"](#).

Annex XI. Bibliography

- CEB. 2017. *Adopting and analytical framework on risk and resilience: a proposal for more proactive, coordinated and effective United Nations Action*. (CEB/2017/6)
- Constas, d'Errico and Pietrelli. 2020. *Core Indicators for Resilience Analysis: Toward an Integrated Framework to Support Harmonized Metrics*. FAO, Rome. Page 10. (as cited in WFP. 2021. Resilience toolkit)
- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2019. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2017. Building resilience for peace and food security*. Rome, FAO.
- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2019. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2018. Building climate resilience for food security and nutrition*. Rome, FAO.
- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2019. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2019. Safeguarding against economic slowdowns and downturns*. Rome, FAO.
- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2021. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2021. Transforming food systems for food security, improved nutrition and affordable healthy diets for all*. Rome, FAO.
- FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2015. *Strengthening resilience for food security and nutrition: A Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership among the Rome-based Agencies*.
- FAO, IFAD and WFP. 2015. *Strengthening resilience for food security and nutrition: A Conceptual Framework for Collaboration and Partnership among the Rome-based Agencies*.
- General Assembly. 2020. *Implantation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*. (A/75/226).
- High Level Panel of Experts. 2020. *Impacts of COVID-19 on Food Security and Nutrition: Developing Effective*.
- Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre and Norwegian Refugee Council. 2015: *Global Estimates 2015: People displaced by disasters*.
- Joint Inspection Unit. 2019. *Review of the integration of disaster risk reduction in the work of the United Nations system in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development*.
- Klassen, S. & Murphy, S. 2020. *Equity as Both a Means and an End: Lessons for Resilient Food Systems from COVID-19*. World Development 136 (December): 105104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev>.
- Laborde, D., Martin, W., & Vos, R. 2020. *Impacts of COVID-19 on Global Poverty, Food Security and Diets*. Agricultural Economics Forthcoming.
- Mitchell and Harris. 2012. *Resilience: A risk management approach*. London. <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7552.pdf>.
- ODI. 2019. *Risk-informed Development – From crisis to resilience*.
- ODI. 2021. *Guiding resilience measurement in WFP's monitoring and evaluation*. Synthesis paper.
- Policy Responses to Address the Hunger and Malnutrition Pandemic*. Issue Paper. Rome: Committee on World Food Security: High Level Panel of Experts.
- Turnbull, M. et al. 2013. *Toward Resilience : A Guide to Disaster Risk Reductio and Climate Change Adaptation*.
- United Nations. 1994. World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction. (A/CONF.172/9).
- United Nations. 2002. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. (A/Res/56/195).
- United Nations. 2020. *UN Common Guidance on helping Build Resilient Societies*.

Enabling development" (WFP/EB.A/99/4-A).

"Disaster Mitigation: A Strategic Approach" (WFP/EB.1/2000/4-A).

WFP. 2007. *WFP 2008-2013 Strategic Results Framework*.

"WFP School Feeding Policy " (WFP/EB.2/2009/4-A).

"WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction" (WFP/EB.1/2009/5-B).

"WFP Gender Policy - Promoting Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Woman in Addressing Food and Nutrition Challenges" (WFP/EB.1/2009/5-A/Rev.1).

"WFP Policy Formulation" (WFP/EB.A/2011/5-B).

"WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management - Building Food Security and Resilience" (WFP/EB.2/2011/4-A).

"WFP Nutrition Policy" (WFP/EB.1/2012/5-A).

WFP. 2013. *WFP Strategic Results Framework (2014 – 2017)*.

"Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition" (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C).

WFP. 2015. *WFP 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework Indicator Compendium*. 2015 update.

WFP. 2016. *Annual Performance Report for 2015*.

"Policy on Country Strategic Plans" (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-C/1/Rev.1*).

WFP. 2016. *WFP's Implementation of the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review*.

WFP. 2016. *WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021)*. (WFP/EB.2/2016/4-A/1/Rev.2*).

WFP & Oxfam. 2016. *Impact Evaluation of the R4 Rural Resilience Initiative in Senegal*.

WFP. 2017. *Annual Performance Report for 2016*.

"Climate Change Policy" (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-A/Rev.1*).

"Environmental Policy" (WFP/EB.1/2017/4-B/Rev.1*).

WFP. 2017. *WFP Strategic Plan 2008-2013*.

WFP. 2018. *Annual Performance Report for 2017*.

WFP. 2018. *Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans*. Rome, WFP (OEV/2017/014).

WFP. 2018. *2017-2021 revised Corporate Results Framework*. November 2018.

WFP. 2019. *Annual Performance Report for 2018*.

WFP. 2019. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced resilience*.

WFP. 2020. *Annual Performance Report for 2019*.

WFP. 2020. *Approaches to and Principles of WFP's Resilience Building Programmes – Examples from the field*.

WFP. 2020. *Evaluation of the Gender Policy (2015-2020)*. Rome, WFP (OEV/2019/015).

WFP. 2020. *Mid-Term Review of the Revised Corporate Results Framework*.

WFP. 2020. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Capacity to Respond to Emergencies*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2018/010)

WFP. 2020. *WFP Programme Indicator Compendium of the revised CRF*. October 2020 update.

WFP. 2021. *Annual Performance Report for 2020*.

WFP. 2021. *Draft Country Strategic Plan Evaluation Zimbabwe*.

WFP. 2021. *Joint evaluation of collaboration among the United Nations Rome-Based Agencies*. Rome, WFP (OEV/2020/036). Final report to be presented to EB.2 2021.

WFP. 2021. *Policy Evaluation: WFP South-South and Triangular Cooperation Policy*. Rome, WFP. (OEV/2019/027). Final report to be presented to EB.2 2021.

WFP. 2021. *Resilience Toolkit*.

WFP. 2021. *Review of the Implementation of recommendations from Thematic Evaluation of a Strategic and Global Nature- Report on the Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience*.

WFP. 2021. *School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals: A Strategic Evaluation*. Rome, WFP (OEV/2019/019).

WFP 2021. *Update on WFP's engagement in the 2021 United nations food systems summit – informal consultation*.

WFP. 2021. *WFP Strategic Plan (2022-2026)*. Draft, September 2021.

"WFP strategic plan (2022–2025)" (WFP/EB.2/2021/4-A/1/Rev.2).

Zselezcky and Yosef. 2014. *Are shocks becoming more frequent or intense? Resilience for Food and Nutrition Security*. Fan, Pandya-Lorch and Yosef. Washington, IFPRI.

Annex XII. Acronyms and abbreviations

AEW	Analysis and Early Warning Unit
ARC	African Risk Capacity
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CEB	United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRR/M	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
EM	Evaluation Manager
IEWP	International Early Warning Programme
GEN	Gender Office
GEWE	Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment
IP	Implementation Plan
IRG	Internal Reference Group
OEV	Office of Evaluation
NBP	Needs Based Plan
NUT	Nutrition Division
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PD	Programme and Policy Development Department
PRO	Programme Humanitarian and Development Division
PROC	Climate & Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes Unit
PROF	Food Systems and Smallholder Support Unit
PROP	Emergency and Transitions Unit
PROR	Asset Creation, Livelihoods and Resilience Unit
PROS	Social Protection Unit
PROT	Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service
RAM	Research, Assessment & Monitoring Division
RBA	Rome-Based Agency
SBP	School-Based Programmes
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals

SER	Summary Evaluation Report
SO	Strategic Objectives
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNISDR	UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
USD	United States Dollars
WFP	World Food Programme
WHS	World Humanitarian Summit