



**WFP EVALUATION**



**World Food Programme**

SAVING LIVES  
CHANGING LIVES

# Review of the implementation of recommendations from thematic evaluations of a strategic/global nature

Report on the Evaluation of the Corporate Partnership Strategy (2017)

May 2022

# Background

This report on the Evaluation of the Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017) was produced within the framework of the Review of the Implementation of Recommendations from Global Evaluations (2016 – Q2 2020). The review looks at recommendations from Global Evaluations issued between 2016 and the first half of 2020 to shed light on their uptake and identify areas where further action is recommended by the World Food Programme (WFP). The review comprised ten stand-alone reports as well as one synthesis report.

The review was commissioned by the WFP Office of Evaluation and conducted by the consulting firm *hera*. The review team from *hera* based their analysis on data from the Risk and Recommendation (R2) tracking tool that was extracted in March 2021, as well as semi-structured interviews with WFP staff that were conducted between April and June 2021. Before publishing the report, the Office of Evaluation complemented *hera's* analysis by updating outdated information based on comments and inputs received from WFP staff/action-owners in January 2022.

# Disclaimer

Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rests solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by WFP of the opinions expressed.

# Key personnel

## OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Andrea Cook, Director of Evaluation

Rica Terbeck-Soiné, Evaluation Officer

## REVIEW TEAM

Ronald Horstman

Josef Decosas

Federica Fernandez

# Introduction

The Evaluation of the Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017)<sup>1</sup> was conducted in 2016 by the Universalis Management Group and managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation. The evaluation was presented to the Executive Board in June 2017.

The commissioning of the evaluation coincided with the start of the roll out of WFP’s Integrated Road Map (2017–2021), and the evaluation was intended for both accountability and learning purposes. The three questions to be answered by the evaluation were:

1. How good is the strategy?
2. What were the initial results of the strategy?
3. Why has the strategy produced the results that have been observed?

The evaluators found that the quality of the corporate partnership strategy (CPS) was good, that guidelines and tools produced are of high quality, and that WFP’s partnering practices reflect the strategy’s intent. They also found that not all organizational units adhere to WFP’s partnering approach and that awareness of the CPS and enactment on partnership action plans is modest at regional and country levels.

The evaluation issued six recommendations, of which four were agreed and two were partially agreed by management. In responding to the recommendations, management identified six actions to be implemented by three organizational units. The WFP monitoring system (R2) reported in March 2021 that all actions were implemented (see Annex 1).

**Table 1: Summary of recommendations and management responses**

Recommendation (short)	Management response
Rec 1 – Implement the partnership pillar of the <b>Strategic Plan (2017–2021)</b> by finalizing a costed plan.	Agreed
Rec 2 – Include a partnership plan in <b>country strategic plans</b> and interim country strategic plans.	Partially agreed
Rec 3 – Update guidance for engagement in a broad range of partnerships.	Agreed
Rec 4 – Strengthen partnership skills in country offices and regional bureaux.	Agreed
Rec 5 – Strengthen systems for capturing qualitative data on partnering.	Agreed
Rec 6 – Revise prioritized partnership agreements with United Nations agencies/external partners.	Partially agreed

<sup>1</sup> [www.wfp.org/publications/corporate-partnerships-strategy-policy-evaluation-terms-reference](http://www.wfp.org/publications/corporate-partnerships-strategy-policy-evaluation-terms-reference)

# Findings

The evaluation of the CPS is considered by several key informants to be timely and delivering useful recommendations. The evaluation was conducted alongside the development of the Strategic Plan (2017–2021) that elevated Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 17 on partnership as one of the WFP Strategic Goals. One of the key informants found the evaluation very supportive in developing partnership strategies.

Management indicates that the CPS was intended as a mission statement rather than a strategy. The significant organizational changes that accompanied the Integrated Road Map (IRM) and the competition for resources at a time when funding to WFP was increasing, called for anchoring the direction of the partnership function within the organization.

To that end, the investment in establishing the new Partnerships Division has been regarded as a great success, mainstreaming the spirit of the partnership strategy throughout WFP, improving the advocacy role and broadening the range of partnerships while intensifying the relationships. The Executive Board talks about a “partnership revolution”. With this mainstreaming and embedding of partnerships across the organization, the need to renew the strategy is currently not felt to be necessary.

The drafting of the recommendations was supported by a participatory workshop and iterative process of drafting of the management response. The recommendations are specific, actionable and well rationalized. However, for recommendations 1–3, the associated timeframe does not reflect allocated priorities (Post-hoc quality assessment by ITAD).

Overall, progress on implementation of recommendations is sufficient. Implementation of the partnership pillar of the strategic plan and integration of partnership planning into country strategic plans proved successful. Partnership agreements did not need to be revised. Guidance on and capacity building in partnerships progressed satisfactorily, although the latter could not be fully assessed at peripheral levels. Systems strengthening for capturing qualitative data on partnering has not been possible in the Country Office Tool for Managing Effectively (COMET).

## **Rec 1 – Implement the partnership pillar of the Strategic Plan (2017-2021)**

***Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?***

The recommendation was agreed to by management and adequately responded to in the management response.

***Have the actions of the management response been implemented?***

The actions listed in the management response have been fully implemented although with the proviso to have the costed action plan integrated into the IRM and Management Plan.

Management agreed with this recommendation. Partnership is embedded in the IRM process, and guidelines and tools have been developed to support country offices with positioning, partnering and resource mobilization as they implemented the IRM.

In 2017, WFP invested approximately USD 2.7 million in implementing the partnership pillar of the Strategic Plan, through the IRM. In 2018, the costed action plan is integrated into overall resource requirements for the IRM; the partnership pillar is mainstreamed in the Management

Plan, linked to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and Corporate Results Framework (2017–2021). Funding of USD 14 million was provided in 2018 through a critical corporate initiative.

In 2019, recognizing that the Partnerships and Resource Mobilization (PRM) function – while being steered by the Partnership and Advocacy Department (PA) – is actively supported in various parts of the organization, PA carried out an initial review of the corporate PRM function. The objective was to enhance organizational clarity as well as inform WFP re-organization in light of the United Nations Reform, i.e. with a view to decentralize decision making authority to the extent possible.

This phase I of the Functional Review resulted in a draft terms of reference (ToR) for the PRM functions that outlined the roles and responsibilities between headquarters and regional bureaux levels with regards to strategic direction and guidance, technical support and management oversight. Phase II (2020) of the Functional Review aligns with the 2019 exercise, adopting this same format. However, it includes the dimension of the WFP Global Offices in United Nations hubs and donor capitals in terms of their PRM-related work.

The PRM ToR intend to strengthen coherence between headquarters/global offices and regional bureaux engagement on partnerships and resource mobilization and maximize resources and impact for WFP engagement on zero hunger. These inform the ongoing dialogue between the PA leadership and the regional directors and can further be used to inform the 2021 (and/or 2022) Management Plan and related Bottom-Up Strategic Budget Exercise (BUSBE), in terms of budget/staffing required to carry out the functional ToR at each respective level of the organization.

## **Rec 2 – Include a partnership plan in country strategic plans and interim country strategic plans**

**Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?**

The recommendation was partially agreed. The management response did not fully align with the recommendation as it included actions belonging to the next recommendation.

**Have the actions of the management response been implemented?**

Actions have been implemented. As a result of a consultative process, the partnership action plans (PAPs) that were recommended as a mandatory requirement in country strategic plans have now been fully integrated. Guidance and support from headquarters and regional bureaux have supported that process.

The recommendation calls for partnership action plans (PAPs) to be mandatory components of each country strategic plan. Management has partially agreed to this. Initially, regional and country offices envisaged an additional burden on documentation of such a mandatory process in relation to the development of the country strategic plans (CSPs). While they embraced partnerships, they indicated avoiding a top-down approach. In 2017 the IRM steering committee reached consensus not to make the partnership action plans mandatory, based on the reasons cited in the initial management response. Strengthened CSP guidance to country offices would suffice to guide partnering activities tied to CSP objectives.

The second action in the management response on providing PAP support and guidance by headquarters and regional bureaux to mobilize partnership resources by country relates to recommendations 3 (tool development) and 4 (staff skills and knowledge strengthening). The review covers them there. It would have been better to place these actions under the correct recommendation.

Management had closed the action prematurely because it was superseded by the IRM audit report “Internal Audit of the IRM Pilot Phase” (April 2018) that resulted in the agreed action to assess the impact and effectiveness of the PAP with a view to further streamlining the tool and informing whether it should be made a corporate requirement. Now WFP has integrated the PAP in the regular process of the Programmatic work plan in line with CSPs. A joint note between the Programme and Policy Development Department and PA was issued to guide country offices and regional bureaux on this alignment. The second generation of CSPs all have country partnership action plans included.

**Rec 3 – Update guidance for engagement in a broad range of partnerships**

<b>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</b>	The management response is not fully relevant, because the response refers to guidance both in terms of tool development and skill building. This is understandable, but it would have been better, also in terms of accountability, to organize them under the appropriate recommendations.
<b>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</b>	Actions have been implemented. WFP quickly developed tools for specific and mainstreaming purposes on partnerships.

The recommendation is actionable and considered useful. The recommendation calls on WFP to update and revise tools to help staff engage in effective partnership. The recommendation alludes to capacity building by developing and updating the tools, although not to actual staff training and skills building– this is recommendation 4. Nevertheless, the management response includes actions on actual training, and most of the status updates provided in R2 are related to training. The word guidance in this respect is multi-interpretable and has been used in the management responses for this evaluation (2, 3, and 4), in terms of tool development as well as actual knowledge and skills building.

Guidance and tools have been prepared and updated to incorporate lessons learned from the ongoing roll-out of the IRM. The Public Partnerships and Resourcing Division has developed guidance and webinars to make the tool of PAP understood and familiar to headquarters and field colleagues across all functional areas in its formulation and development. For example, a complementary document to the PAP 2019 Revised Template package, which replaces the original template developed in 2016, was prepared.

Guidance and tools are maintained and adapted on an ongoing basis to support country offices in partnership management, including the CSP Partnership Quick Guide that is for use by country offices for PAP development and is posted on the WFPgo portal. The Quick Guide responds to field-level request for such guidance, to support country offices that are in the CSP planning, development or implementation phase in taking a strategic partnership. It is based on the learnings about partner engagement from the first waves of the CSPs as identified through the regional IRM partnership workshops and includes input from all regional partnership focal points, PA offices and divisions and the PA IRM team.

It is important to note the initial recognition, iterated by a key informant, that partnership is not just owned by a partnership officer, but should be something that is done by everyone in the organization. The principles of partnership (including being a good internal partner with your colleagues) has become clear in the training courses that were developed. Although there is one division with the name “strategic partnership”, mainstreaming has become the key approach for roll-out, taking into account the tendencies of different people in different offices to embrace this ethos.

E-learning on partnership, particularly engagement and networking skills, and on resource mobilization were launched for all staff on WFP’s Learning Management System in 2017. See recommendation 4.

#### **Rec 4 – Strengthen partnership skills in country offices and regional bureaux**

<b>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</b>	While the recommendation is actionable and time-bound, the management response, though relevant, refers, for a large part, to ongoing activities.
<b>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</b>	It has been difficult to disentangle the follow-up on actions because of overlap actions across management responses.

The recommendation calls on WFP to build staff partnership skills at country offices and regional bureaux and to develop partner-related knowledge management tools. Actions in the management response had already been set into motion, i.e. guiding country offices’ positioning, partnering and resource mobilization for CSPs. Key informants iterate that at the time of the implementation of the CPS, there was a massive investment in training and guidance using the tools that were developed and continuously updated, because the organization had never done anything like that before.

In collaboration with regional bureaux in 2017, the IRM team conducted a series of Regional Partnerships workshops across the regions, including development of PAPs. The RBP Partnerships team provided further support for those country offices which found the PAP tool at that time useful. Staff at all levels were included in the workshop and training sessions.

The Partnership Channel on WFP’s WeLearn Learning Management System resulted from a PA–HR collaboration. It has built on the increased awareness around WFP’s partnering approach and increased “ownership” by all staff, at all levels, who interface with partners on a regular basis – not only those with formal partnership roles.

Behavioural changes at field and regional levels are hard to measure. Responses from informants confirm the change in thinking about partnerships within the organization as the result of all joint efforts in capacity building at all levels. According to key informants from headquarters, the partnership messages have been put in practice resulting in increased funding allocations, but foremost resulting in intensified relationships with partners and donors.

For partner-related knowledge management, reference is made to Salesforce, the software used by WFP to synthesize and analyse data on forecasted contributions to WFP in the management response. To date, Salesforce does not capture partner-related information. See also under recommendation 5.

## **Rec 5 – Strengthen systems for capturing qualitative data on partnering**

<b><i>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</i></b>	The recommendation was agreed by management, and the response mentions several ways to strengthen the system. However, the response does not adequately address the recommendation as it does not reflect robust systems-strengthening efforts and supportive templates.
<b><i>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</i></b>	According to informants, the identified actions are not all feasible – in particular, capturing qualitative data by COMET. The system does not allow it, and changes to that end have not been made. Nevertheless, the action was reported as completed in R2.

The recommendation calls for a stronger system to capture qualitative data on partnerships. The management response hints at COMET, which was rolled out in the latter part of 2016, being used also to capture qualitative data on partnerships. The Annual Performance Report includes a “qualitative analysis of COMET data on the performance and effectiveness of WFP’s strategic and operational partnerships”.

However, the Performance Management and Reporting Division (CPP), Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison (CPPM) confirms that qualitative data on partnerships is not being captured in COMET. The system has not been designed to capture qualitative data. The Annual Performance Report includes quantitative data on partnerships that is captured in COMET (e.g. as a component of KPI 3 – percentage of outputs achieved in partnerships), in addition to qualitative data on corporate trends and commitments that are provided directly by the Partnership and Advocacy Department (PA). COMET and the dashboards created around COMET data allow for monitoring planned vs actual data between partnerships and distribution and therefore help identify the achievement of planned results. CPP also ensures that control measures are in place through system enhancements.

In 2020, a partnerships section was introduced into the annual country reports, in which country offices are encouraged to tell their annual story about partnerships. The partnerships section should include broader discussion of areas such as knowledge-sharing, advocacy, capacity-strengthening and implementation, with the objective of illustrating how partnerships have empowered the achievement of operational results across the (Transitional-Interim) CSPs.

Resistance to survey WFP’s donor partners was mentioned by an informant, due to presumed survey fatigue and the fact that WFP already is in communication with donors.

## **Rec 6 – Revise prioritized partnership agreements with United Nations agencies/external partners**

<b><i>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</i></b>	The recommendation was partially agreed by management. As not all partnerships require standard partnership agreements, the management response is relevant and clear about establishing formal agreements with major partners only when feasible and effective.
<b><i>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</i></b>	Implementation of the revision of partnership agreements did not take place.



The recommendation calls for WFP to revise its existing partnership agreements. Management notes that this is already underway and that some partnerships no longer require formal standard partnership agreements. Not all partnerships require a written Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or written agreements. The argument was put forward that WFP has been looking for flexibility as WFP is a deeply pragmatic organization.

The recommendation is only partially agreed by management also because of its ambiguous language. It refers to "prioritized" partnership agreements, which is understood by management to mean a chronological prioritization of reviewing agreements, rather than to denote partners of high or lower priority. Moreover, management notes that the deadline for completing this action was the end of 2018. The ambiguous language of the recommendation makes it difficult to determine whether it has been achieved. Management had specifically requested the addition of the term "prioritized" when the recommendations were discussed in the stakeholder workshop.

Partnerships – and corresponding agreements – are "owned" by multiple, different units. As such, revised or new agreements are coordinated individually. Overall, WFP's establishment of agreements supports the partnership pillar of the strategic plan.

Partnership agreements are in part addressed in the Corporate Risk Register, under item 3 – "Slow adaptation to global shifts", mitigating action: "Review of Global MOUs with key UN agencies, funds and programmes, including with FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] and IFAD (bilateral and trilateral Global MOUs)".

The PA Office of the Assistant Executive Director has coordinated with all divisions to track the status of agreements and ensure new agreements are aligned with the strategic plan. Updated private sector legal templates, to reflect more partner-oriented language, are pending finalization. Non-governmental organization (NGO) agreements (FLAs) are aligned with sphere principles, and new guidance is aligned with the strategic plan and the CPS. The NGO Unit has terminated outdated global "legacy" MOUs, which are in most cases 20 years old and obsolete.

Increasingly, country offices look to engage with NGO partners in multi-year agreements through the new CSPs, and high-level "framework" agreements and/or action plans are negotiated at headquarters on a case-by-case basis. CSPs are aligned to partnership principles, acting as de facto agreements with host governments to deliver against Strategic Results 5, 6 and 8. Under CPS implementation, PGC coordinated with LEGC to produce legal template guidance. PA and LEGC continue to coordinate in supporting the field on partnership agreements.

In sum, the recommendation was useful. Instead of using prescribed and prioritized agreements, the organization intends to be flexible, to be cost-effective and to add value in terms of formalizing partnerships where required. It is recognized that partnership agreements with United Nations agencies, international and national NGOs, private-sector actors, international and regional financial institutions, and regional economic organizations are paramount.

# Conclusions

The evaluation of the CPS was timely and supported organizational change towards unprecedented mainstreaming of partnership principles and diversification of funding.

The evaluation recommendations are specific and well rationalized. The follow-up on the evaluation was a relatively straightforward process, with a cadre of partnerships champions taking the recommendations and management responses forward. Respondents regarded the responses actionable and relevant.

Recommendations were implemented in a timely manner (except for recommendation 5, on strengthening the capture of qualitative data on partnering). In terms of results, informants confirmed the change in thinking about partnerships within WFP as a result of joint efforts in capacity building in relation to partnerships at all levels.

Overall, progress on implementation of recommendations is sufficient. Implementation of the partnership pillar of the strategic plan and integration of partnership planning into CSPs both proved successful. Partnership agreements did not need to be revised. Guidance on and capacity building in relation to partnerships progressed satisfactorily, although the latter could not be fully assessed at all levels. Systems-strengthening for capturing qualitative data on partnering has not been possible in COMET.

# Annexes

## Annex 1: Recommendations and Actions

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<b>Recommendation 1: Implementation of the partnership pillar of the Strategic Plan (2017–2021)</b>		<b>Agreed</b>		
By the end of 2017, the Integrated Road Map (IRM) steering committee should finalize a costed action plan for implementing the partnership pillar of the Strategic Plan (2017–2021) that builds on the principles outlined in the Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014–2017) (CPS), clearly identifies major milestones by unit and is aligned with the Corporate Results Framework (2017–2021).	IRM steering committee	<p>Action has been taken through the IRM steering committee to develop a comprehensive budget associated with implementation of the IRM, including the development of a structured approach to positioning, partnering and resource mobilization.</p> <p>In addition, the Executive Management Group will provide guidance regarding the costed action plan, which will be integrated into the Management Plan as a business model to ensure predictable resources for implementation.</p> <p>Management recommends a deadline of December 2018 for full implementation of this action.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>December 2020</p> <p><b>Closed</b></p>	<b>Implemented</b> The actions listed in the management response have been implemented, although with the proviso to have the costed action plan integrated in the IRM and Management Plan.
<b>Recommendation 2: Inclusion of a partnership plan in the country strategic plan and interim country strategic plan.</b>		<b>Partially agreed</b>		
WFP should immediately include the development of a partnership action plan as a mandatory component of each country strategic plan (CSP) and interim	Partnership and Advocacy	Partnership action plans have been developed for pilot (wave 1a) CSPs, with positive impacts. However, the establishment of such plans has not become mandatory because of concerns about the	Not applicable	<b>Implemented</b> Partnership action plans (PAPs) are now part of CSPs.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
CSP, with resources allocated to partnering activities in country portfolio budgets.	Department (PA)	additional burden of having another required document related to CSP formulation, as the strategies and action plans needed to support CSP implementation will differ from country to country.  Headquarters and regional bureaux will provide country offices with support and guidance to facilitate the systematic development of a coherent and detailed CSP implementation plan that enables country offices to mobilize partnership resources.	December 2020 <b>Closed</b>	Management response and action on support and guidance should be covered under the appropriate recommendation.
<b>Recommendation 3: Guidance update</b>		<b>Agreed</b>		
By the end of 2017, WFP should update guidance and revise or develop practical tools that enable staff to engage in a broad range of partnerships, including long-term, multi-functional and non-commodity-based partnerships.	PA	Guidance and tools have been prepared and will continue to be updated to incorporate lessons learned from the ongoing roll-out of the IRM.  E-learning on partnerships, particularly engagement and networking skills, and on resource mobilization will be launched for all staff on WFP's Learning Management System in 2017.  Direct training for staff members whose roles involve managing partnerships will be made available to all headquarters, regional bureaux and country offices that request it.	Not applicable December 2020 <b>Closed</b>	<b>Implemented</b>  Guiding tools on partnerships have been prepared and updated; e-learning modules have been developed for WFP-wide usage.  Management response and action on training of staff members should be covered under the appropriate recommendation.
<b>Recommendation 4: Strengthen partnership skills in country offices and regional bureaux</b>		<b>Agreed</b>		
By June 2018, the Partnership and Advocacy Department (PA) should assist country offices and regional bureaux in strengthening their partnering skills by developing guidance on the preparation	PA	Guidance has been developed to support country offices' positioning, partnering and resource mobilization for CSPs, including a training	Not applicable December 2020	<b>Implemented</b>  Triangulation confirms a change in thinking about partnerships within the organization as a

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
of country-level partnership action plans, working with regional bureaux to prepare and roll out context-specific country-level partnership training modules, and developing tools for partnership-related knowledge management and dissemination.		<p>programme based on the Learning Management System.</p> <p>Targeted support to country offices in the development of partnership action plans is being provided in collaboration with regional bureaux, to ensure that the plans reflect regional strategies and local and regional contexts.</p> <p>In tandem with the roll-out of Salesforce software, a knowledge management system is being established to facilitate analysis of information on government and private-sector partners.</p> <p>The system will ensure seamless knowledge exchange throughout WFP and optimize resourcing opportunities.</p>	<b>Closed</b>	result of joint efforts in capacity building at all levels.
<b>Recommendation 5: Strengthen systems for capturing qualitative data on partnering</b>		<b>Agreed</b>		
By the end of 2018, WFP should strengthen its systems for capturing qualitative data on partnering and develop templates that include a requirement to report on the effectiveness, efficiency and innovative nature of partnerships.	Performance Management and Reporting Division (CPP) Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison	<p>WFP has been capturing partnership data in its Country Office Tool for Managing Effectively (COMET) since 2016. COMET:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) provides evidence of partners' contributions to project implementation and results;</li> <li>ii) captures the capacity to deliver results of individual partners; and</li> <li>iii) strengthens partnerships and working arrangements by highlighting partners' comparative advantages and performance.</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>December 2020</p> <p><b>Closed</b></p>	<p><b>Partially implemented</b></p> <p>The action in the management response to capture qualitative data on partnerships in COMET is not feasible: the system does not allow it, and changes to that end have not been made. Yet, the Annual Performance Report includes qualitative in addition to quantitative data and the ACRs now have partnership sections that illustrate how partnerships have empowered the</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
	Unit (CPPM)	<p>WFP is already capturing partnership information in its reporting: the Annual Performance Report includes qualitative analysis of COMET data on the performance and effectiveness of WFP's strategic and operational partnerships.</p> <p>In the context of IRM implementation, WFP is also developing enhanced tools to capture and analyse partnership data.</p> <p>Annual country reports (ACRs) are envisaged and these will include analyses of partnership arrangements and their impact on achieving planned results.</p> <p>A "value for money" section is expected to provide more information on the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of these arrangements.</p> <p>Executive Board members can access the list of WFP partners available in COMET.</p>		achievement of operational results. The dashboards created around COMET data allow for monitoring partnership results. The action was reported in the Risk and Recommendation (R2) tracking tool as completed.
<p><b>Recommendation 6: Revise partnership agreements with United Nations agencies/external partners</b></p>		<p><b>Partially agreed</b></p>		
<p>By the end of 2018, WFP should ensure that prioritized partnership agreements with United Nations agencies, international and national NGOs, private-sector actors, international and regional financial institutions, and regional economic organizations have been revised to support the partnership pillar of the Strategic Plan (2017–2021).</p>	PA	<p>WFP will continue to establish formal agreements with major partners inside and outside the United Nations system to increase the predictability of joint approaches, including joint resourcing, when feasible and effective, as not all partnerships require standard partnerships agreements.</p> <p>This recommendation is also addressed through the Corporate Risk Register. It should be noted, however, that the deadline for completing this action is the end of 2018. Management believes</p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>December 2020</p> <p><b>Closed</b></p>	<p><b>Not implemented</b></p> <p>The recommendation was partially agreed by management, and implementation of the revision of partnership agreements has not taken place. Instead, the organization strives for flexibility to be cost-effective and add value in terms of formalizing</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
		that the ambiguous language of the recommendation will make it difficult to determine when it has been achieved.		partnerships only where required.

## Annex 2. Abbreviations and Acronyms

COMET	Country Office Tool for Managing Effectively
CPP	Performance Management and Reporting Division
CPPM	Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison Unit
CPS	Corporate Partnership Strategy
CSP	Country Strategic Plans
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
IRM	Integrated Road Map
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
PA	Partnership and Advocacy Department
PAP	Partnership action plan
PRM	Partnerships and Resource Mobilization
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToR	Terms of reference

## Annex 3. Persons Interviewed

Catherine Feeney	Senior Executive Manager, Office of the Partnership and Advocacy Department (PA) AED
Deborah McWhinney	Evaluation manager, Office of Evaluation
Elizabeth Ramborger	Foundations Officer, Private Partnerships and Fundraising Division
Emilia Casella	Senior Partnerships Officer, Regional Bureau for the Middle East and Northern Africa
Natasha Nadazdin	Chief of CPPM Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
Sarah Borchers	Partnerships and Advocacy Department Staffing Coordinator
Shannon Howard	Senior Strategic Partnerships Officer, Strategic Partnerships Division



# Annex 4. Documents consulted

## Executive Board Documents

"Management Response to the Recommendations of the Summary Evaluation Report – Corporate Partnership Strategy" (WFP/EB.A/2017/7-B/Add.1/Rev.1)

"Summary Evaluation Report of the Corporate Partnership Strategy" (WFP/EB.A/2017/7-B\*)

## Non-Executive Board Documents

WFP. 2017. *Policy Evaluation. WFP Corporate Partnership Strategy (2014 2017)*. OEV/2016/010. WFP, Rome, May 2017.

WFP. 2018. *Quick Guide on CSP Partnerships*. June 2018. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. *HQ/RB Terms of Reference for Partnerships & Resource Mobilization*. Internal document, unpublished (no date).

WFP. *Partnership Action Plan Guidance Note and PAP template*. Internal document, unpublished (no date).

WFP. *Partnership Action Plan: Why? Continuity of CO business, systematic thinking, follow up, prioritization of actions*. Presentation (no date).

WFP. 2021. *Risk and recommendation tracking tool (R2)*. Excel extract, update 29/03/2021. Internal document, unpublished.

**Office of Evaluation**

**World Food Programme**

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70

00148 Rome, Italy

T +39 06 65131 [wfp.org](http://wfp.org)