



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 WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (2018)

May 2022

Background

This report on the Evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (2018) 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 Before publishing the report, the Office of Evaluation complemented *hera's* analysis by updating outdated information based on comments and inputs received from WFP staff/action-owners in January 2022.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 World Food Programme (WFP) Humanitarian Protection Policy was conducted in 2017 by DARA and managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation. The evaluation was presented to the Executive Board in June 2018.

The Humanitarian Protection Policy was approved by the Executive Board in 2012 and updated in 2014. The evaluation of the policy coincided with the start of the roll-out of WFP's Integrated Road Map (2017–2021). The three questions to be answered by the evaluation were:

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

The evaluation issued six recommendations, of which five were agreed and one partially agreed by management. In responding to the recommendations, management identified six sets of actions to be implemented by four organizational units. By March 2021, the WFP Risk and Recommendation tracking system (R2) reported that all actions had been implemented (see Annex 1).

Findings

The Evaluation of the WFP Protection Policy was cited by several key informants as an effective and efficient example of commissioning evaluations for policy development and programme improvement. The evaluation documented weaknesses and ambiguities in the existing protection policy and formulated detailed recommendations on how to overcome them. The recommendations were widely supported by senior management and by the Executive Board.

In response to recommendations of the evaluation, WFP created a new P4 position and a new unit in the Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO) to drive the process of developing a new policy. The recommendations and the management response had, at this time, already been formulated and presented to the Executive Board in its 2018 session.

At the time of the review, the actions defined in the management response had been implemented or were on course for implementation. Many target dates for implementation were, however, not met, primarily because many were set without considering that interdependent actions can often not be implemented simultaneously.

Table 1: Summary of recommendations and management response

Recommendation (short)	Management response
Rec 1 – Prepare a new humanitarian protection policy.	Agreed
Rec 2 – Develop a WFP-wide risk and protection framework that includes both risks to populations and programming objectives.	Agreed
Rec 3 – Develop a formal approach to resource mobilization to support the achievement of cross-cutting protection results.	Agreed
Rec 4 – Increase and formalize protection staffing and put in place skills training for targeted staff members.	Agreed
Rec 5 – Reinforce data systems for monitoring and evaluation, and build on existing systems to capture protection-related information.	Partially agreed
Rec 6 – Develop a new strategy for engagement with affected populations and vulnerable groups.	Agreed

Rec 1 – Prepare a new humanitarian protection policy

<i>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</i>	Management agreed with the recommendation and responded in detail, including a commitment to developing a new protection policy and accountability framework.
<i>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</i>	The actions were fully implemented. Both a new protection policy and an accountability framework were adopted by the Executive Board in November 2020, one year later than the completion date specified in the management response. The extended timeframe was agreed by the Executive Board.

Preparation for the development of a new protection and accountability policy started immediately after the evaluation results became available and even before the evaluation was endorsed by the Executive Board in 2018. In 2019, WFP adopted an update to its Strategy for Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) that focused on four areas of acceleration: namely analysis (including operational research), partnerships (including with expert institutions), systems and leadership.

Consultations with United Nations partners, NGOs, governments, the Board, and with affected populations, including in Bangladesh and South Sudan, were conducted. After an extensive consultation process, the WFP Protection and Accountability Policy, including an implementation plan, was adopted by the Executive Board in November 2020. The consultation process, and especially the support provided by WFP leadership, including regional and country directors, helped drive the process of policy development, although some senior managers were hesitant about supporting the inclusion of an accountability framework. Building support for the policy from the ground up required more time than initially set in the management response and so the completion date of December 2019 specified in the management response was not met. The Executive Board was informed and agreed to this change.

The policy is fully aligned with the 2016 Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action. The implementation plan explicitly ties all central and decentralized departments and functions of WFP into the implementation of the policy by specifying roles and responsibilities. According to interviewed informants, the organizational shift towards a rights-based approach as presented in the policy will take time to be fully internalized.

Rec 2 – Develop a WFP-wide risk and protection framework that includes both risks to populations and programming objectives

<i>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</i>	Management agreed with the recommendation and responded in detail, including commitments to updating the risk framework and associated training, without, however, clearly distinguishing between operational and strategic risks.
<i>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</i>	The actions are partially implemented. The completion date, “by 2019”, was not met, primarily because adoption of the policy was delayed. Training is still in preparation and the reclassification of protection from an operational to a strategic risk was pending at the time of the assessment.

An updated Enterprise Risk Management Policy was adopted in November 2018, including a risk categorization framework. Lack of protection of the health, safety and security of beneficiaries is classified under the category of operational risks. Further guidance was issued in 2019 defining direct protection risks for beneficiaries, as well as other risks that impact protection. Training workshops on risk assessment and mitigation were held in 2018. However, training on protection for senior country management staff (listed as an action in the management response) is still in preparation. This relates to a comment by a key informant that the evaluation recommendations were not appropriately sequenced. The policy development and adoption had to precede the development and implementation of training programmes. These are now being developed.

The corporate risk register was updated every quarter and for the last time in November 2021; however, lack of protection has so far remained in the operational risk category (though being among the top seven risks). Although there is no direct reference in the recommendation nor the management response about reclassifying protection of beneficiaries as a strategic risk, this is being pursued by the Protection Unit. In the recommendation, such an effort is indicated in the statement that “the Enterprise Risk Management Division should ensure that the corporate ‘line of sight’ clarifies the links between risks and programming for protection”. In the management response, reference is made to “risks related to the safety, dignity and integrity of beneficiaries”.

Both of these statements indicate that protection risks should not only be seen as operational, i.e. linked to the quality and reach of WFP’s work in alleviating food shortages and hunger, but also as risks to achieving strategic protection outcomes in terms of WFP’s aim to prevent, reduce, mitigate and respond to the risks and consequences of violence, coercion, deprivation and abuse for persons, groups and communities.

Rec 3 – Develop a formal approach to resource mobilization to support the achievement of cross-cutting protection results

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with the recommendation and responded in detail, including commitments to developing a costed strategy and communications materials for cooperating partners, as well as to implementing fundraising initiatives.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	Actions are currently being undertaken, but none has yet been completed although these were closed in R2 in 2020. The completion date of the management response (end of 2018) was not met.

Protection results and activities by WFP have traditionally been funded by earmarked voluntary contributions from some donors. Funds were raised primarily by the efforts of programme directors and staff through contacts with Executive Board members, with support from the Public Partnership and Resourcing Division (PPR). PPR staff confirmed that voluntary, earmarked contributions were received, for instance from Switzerland.

The main strategy pursued by the Programme Department is to fund protection as a cross-cutting objective from WFP’s core budget of non-earmarked funds. A strategy for resource mobilization was developed and is, according to key informants, currently being reviewed by senior management. It could not be shared. It is, however, expected to receive donor support. The issue was raised with donors during consultations that preceded the adoption of the policy, for instance in the third consultation in July 2020 which addressed the issue as follows: “The necessary flexible resources must be consistently made available from both the core budget (direct support costs and the programme support and administrative budget) and extrabudgetary contributions. Donor coordination and flexible funding tools will be critical to enabling the successful implementation of the proposed approach.”

The second part of the recommendation is about the development of communication materials and guidelines on protection for partners, including commercial suppliers. WFP is engaged in a number of partnership initiatives, for instance with the Food Security Cluster which regularly shares tools and guides on protection and accountability issues among participating United Nations agencies and International NGOs. However, communications materials and guidelines that are specific to the new protection policy had to await policy adoption and are now under development in alignment with materials that are being prepared for the launching of WFP’s new Strategic Plan. A commitment to capacity strengthening expressed in the management response will, according to information entered in 2018 in the R2 tracking database, focus mainly on local partners. Although the roll-out of guidelines and supporting tools for capacity building was planned for the second half of 2019, these materials are only now being finalized.

Rec 4 – Increase and formalize protection staffing and put in place skills training for targeted staff members

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with the recommendation and responded in detail, including formulating actions for strengthening technical resources for protection, strengthening protection at country-level, and launching learning programmes on protection.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	Some steps have been taken to implement the actions, although the completion date of mid-2019 was not met and progress has been slow. Efforts are, however, continuing.

In response to this recommendation, WFP has considerably strengthened its human resource complement for protection by creating a Protection Unit in PRO headed by a fixed-term professional at P4 level. Specialists in humanitarian protection had already been mobilized to the regional bureaux, but, contrary to commitments in the management response, they continue to be engaged as consultants rather than transferred to fixed-term staff positions. This indicates progress towards meeting the recommendation but falls short of full implementation.

The consultant status of the regional protection officers is an issue that was raised by key informants as an indication that protection has not yet achieved the status of a core cross-cutting strategic objective. While interviewed staff confirmed that the emphasis on protection and accountability to targeted populations has grown, there is still much work to be done to strengthen the internal organizational understanding around protection issues.

More clarity, however, has been achieved in defining criteria, requirements and processes for accountability to affected populations and for the development of community feedback mechanisms. Dedicated protection officers with specific Terms of Reference for a programme role in strengthening humanitarian protection have been mobilized to some countries with high volumes of humanitarian assistance, such as Yemen and Iraq, and protection is being addressed in new country strategic plans currently being developed. Management, however, noted in its response to the recommendation that it will not always be possible to separate responsibilities of focal points for protection, accountability to affected populations and gender in all country offices.

The integration of protection and accountability as a core strategic objective as outlined in the policy, however, requires that the issue is owned by senior regional and country managers and heads of programmes. The necessary training programmes for senior staff are still being developed and have not yet been rolled out.

Rec 5 – Reinforce data systems for monitoring and evaluation, and build on existing systems to capture protection-related information

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management responded in detail to the recommendation. It did not agree to revise the existing data architecture but committed to improve the collection of protection data, improve existing indicators, and strengthen the focus on protection in evaluations.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	Work on data systems for protection has only just started, protection indicators were included in the corporate results framework and the aspect of protection and accountability has been strengthened in recent evaluations. The completion date of “end 2018” of the management response was not met.

The recommendation for strengthening data systems for the analysis of contexts and protection issues was only partially agreed to by management. PRO is still in the process of building a data team and exploring how to triangulate different sources of data to inform context analysis and discern patterns and trends in protection issues. At the same time, the architecture of the corporate results framework is undergoing major revision to align it with the WFP Strategic Plan 2022–2026.

The 2020 update of the indicator compendium for the corporate results framework includes three indicators on protection. One of them was recently added and reflects the orientation of the new policy. This is, however, only a very preliminary step that will have to be again reviewed once the position of protection in the new strategic plan has been clearly defined. Until then, the recommended actions cannot be implemented.

For evaluation, however, considerable progress towards implementing the actions listed in the management response is reported. With the shift in the focus of evaluations to country strategic plans (CSPs) that encompass all of WFP's programmatic interventions in the country, evaluation questions on performance in cross-cutting areas, including protection, accountability to affected populations and gender, have been strengthened in the evaluation frameworks. Evaluation teams are being directed to give sufficient attention to these areas. This is a recent initiative but, according to informants, it shows promise among the CSP evaluations that have been completed to date.

At the same time, the Office of Evaluation itself has looked at how well it has mainstreamed protection in its processes, including respecting confidentiality and protecting respondents from harm. WFP has had a leading role in developing the United Nations Evaluation Group guidelines for ethical conduct in evaluation, which has become the standard for assuring protection of groups and individuals who provide data and information to evaluators. In terms of accountability to affected populations, the WFP's integrated evaluation function has also expanded primary data collection from beneficiaries, for example through innovative participatory approaches to capture better the voices of communities in evaluations. Recent examples include:

- The Decentralized Thematic Gender Evaluation of the El Salvador CSP, where data collection included short videos prepared by beneficiaries about their lives
- The Decentralized Evaluation of the School-Feeding Programme in Bangladesh, which included a series of community feedback meetings that were accompanied by an artist who illustrated the discussions in real time, generating a running tapestry that was then shared in a workshop with government stakeholders
- The Bangladesh Country Strategic Plan Evaluation, which used participatory interest group discussions (PIGDs) with a community scorecard (CSC) tool, as well as a youth peer-to-peer survey conducted by young women and men in refugee camps
- The Evaluation of WFP's Corporate Emergency Response in Northeast Nigeria, which put a strong focus on systematically mainstreaming protection and gender in the evaluation process, methodology and products, for example by conducting 21 focus group discussions with affected populations
- And the Evaluation of WFP's Regional Response to the Syrian Crisis (2015–2017), which reflected concerns around "Do No Harm" and accountability to the affected population, as well as gender and protection concerns, in its evaluation questions as well as in the evaluation matrix for data collection and analysis; its data collection tools included 35 focus group discussions with over 300 beneficiaries.

Rec 6 – Develop a new strategy for engagement with affected populations and vulnerable groups

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with the recommendation and responded in detail with commitments to strengthen community feedback mechanisms.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	The actions were implemented, and additional action is being taken to strengthen community engagement further.

WFP took immediate steps to implement this recommendation by developing a three-year Strategy for Protection and Accountability to Affected People (2019–2021). Key areas of the strategy include information provision, consultation, and complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFMs). By the end of 2019, the PRO Emergencies and Transitions Unit (OSZPH) reported that 70 percent of country offices had functioning CFMs, which had been developed according to ten minimum standards published by WFP in 2017. Whether

all or any of these CFMs include a specific mention of face-to-face, two-way communication as outlined in the management response is not known.

Since then, the response has further evolved. A new community engagement strategy has been developed that is currently waiting for management approval. It is aligned with WFP's Protection Policy of 2020 and with the 2017 IASC Commitments on Accountability to Affected People and Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in the four areas of (1) Leadership, (2) Participation and partnership, (3) Information, feedback and action, and (4) Results.

Conclusions

The actions defined in the management response to the recommendations of the evaluation fully responded in a structured way to all issues raised. Many actions defined in the management response had, at the time of this assessment, not yet been fully implemented, but most of them were in process and there was evidence of progress. All of them were, however, already marked as implemented in the R2 monitoring database.

The aggregation of several related issues in each of the six recommendations created challenges for implementation even though they were, to some extent, disaggregated in the management response. The aggregation did, however, contribute to centralizing the responsibility for implementation to one functional unit which, according to key informants, contributed to strengthening the technical leadership on protection in WFP.

The timelines for completing actions proposed in the recommendations and the management response were quite unrealistic. They also did not consider that actions are often interdependent and should therefore be phased. For instance, a policy needed to be adopted before it can be communicated.

Key informants interviewed for this assessment agreed that protection and accountability to affected populations have gained traction in WFP's programmes and strategies, and that the recommendations of the evaluation have contributed to this development.

Annexes

Annex 1: Recommendations and Actions

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 1: A new policy		Agreed		
WFP should in 2018 formally affirm, and in later years regularly reaffirm, that protection of and accountability to affected populations are among its core responsibilities in playing its role in food security and partnerships (Sustainable Development Goals 2 and 17). By 2019, WFP should prepare a new humanitarian protection policy. The new policy should have a single objective that encompasses all populations affected by crisis and vulnerability – in both emergency and development settings – and that reflects the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) definition of protection. The policy should: define a role for WFP in reducing the risks for populations; clearly articulate linkages to all policies, strategies and guidelines that are relevant to risks to populations; and include a formal framework for accountability at all organizational levels.	Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	<p>We welcome the recommendation to reaffirm regularly WFP's commitment to the protection of and accountability to affected populations:</p> <p>a) We note the important progress towards integrating protection highlighted by the evaluation findings and recognize the need to formulate a new policy on protection, based on experience to date in implementing the existing policy and taking into account the findings and recommendations of the evaluation.</p> <p>b) WFP fully endorses IASC definition of protection. Based on this, the new policy will articulate clear linkages to other relevant policy frameworks and elaborate the organization's approach to ensuring the inclusion of particularly vulnerable people.</p> <p>c) Internal communications from senior management to staff regarding the organization's commitment to ensuring protection and accountability to affected people, and the role of staff therein, will be strengthened through an internal accountability framework specifying roles and responsibilities across functional areas and at various levels.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>December 2020</p> <p>Implemented</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>A new policy on protection and accountability has been adopted, including an implementation plan that specifies roles and responsibilities across functional areas.</p> <p>The new policy is fully aligned with the IASC policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action.</p> <p>The response to the recommendation was fully implemented. The additional time needed for building support for the policy from the ground up was acknowledged by the Executive Board, which agreed to shift the initial implementation deadline.</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 2: Integration into risk management		Agreed		
<p>By 2019, the Enterprise Risk Management Division (ERM) should ensure that the corporate “line of sight” clarifies the links between risks and programming for protection. A WFP-wide risk and protection framework should be developed to include risks to both populations and programming objectives. The framework should include the integration of protection issues into existing internal control frameworks and security risk management systems, and specific regional and country-level training to build skills in protection-related risk analysis among senior staff.</p>	Enterprise Risk Management Division (ERM)	<p>a) The Risk Management Branch RMR (now become ERMR) will submit an integrated enterprise risk management policy and risk appetite statement to the Executive Board in November 2018. The policy and subsequent guidance will elaborate on the risks related to the protection of beneficiaries. RMR continues to work closely with the Emergencies and Transitions Unit (OSZPH) as the second-line lead to ensure that the risks related to the safety, dignity and integrity of beneficiaries are captured in the updated risk appetite statement.</p> <p>RMR is also consulting with the HQ Security Branch RMQ (now become SECH) as the second-line lead on the integration of specific security-related metrics related to WFP’s risk appetite, including data to inform the identification and mitigation of protection risks at the point of delivery.</p> <p>b) OSZ is the lead for training on protection for senior country office management, who have already been initiated through WFP’s Programme Learning Journey. In addition, separate e-learning modules have been developed for all staff on both social protection and accountability to affected populations (AAP). WFP is also currently reviewing the approach to the induction of the country directors and field senior management positions. As part of that initiative, content related to risk management, oversight and protection will be included in the new country director induction programme,</p>	<p>Not applicable December 2020 Implemented</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p> <p>Implementation of the actions has started but is not completed. The implementation deadline was not met, largely because of the one-year delay in the adoption of the protection and accountability policy.</p> <p>Training programmes for senior country management staff are only now being developed (not feasible prior to policy adoption).</p> <p>Reclassification of protection risks in the corporate risk register is still pending. However, neither the recommendation nor the management response is very clear about the action to be taken. Discussions about reclassification are ongoing.</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
		together with other key input for WFP operations management.		
Recommendation 3: Partnerships		Agreed		
By the end of 2018, the Partnerships and Governance Department and the Programme and Policy Division should develop a formal approach to resource mobilization to support the achievement of cross-cutting protection results. The approach should include strategic engagement with donors in order to increase voluntary funding for the protection function. It should also include communication materials and guidelines for all partners, including commercial suppliers, and should cover WFP's engagement in clusters.	Public Partnership and Resourcing Division (PPR)	<p>a) Building on the recommendations of the evaluation, WFP is in the process of developing a new strategy for the integration of protection that will guide the organization's focus and work while a new policy is being formulated. This strategy will be costed reflecting WFP's management contribution and will be shared with donors and standby partners for their consideration.</p> <p>b) Building on WFP's existing internal guidance on the integration of protection, communications material and guidelines will be developed for cooperating partners, commercial suppliers and other external actors to strengthen their understanding of their responsibilities when it comes to integrating protection. This will be accompanied by a capacity-building strategy that will enhance their ability to meet these responsibilities.</p> <p>c) WFP will engage donors in order to increase voluntary funding for the protection function and will support this through funding and fundraising efforts.</p>	Not applicable December 2020 Implemented	Partially implemented An initiative to fund protection as a cross-cutting strategic objective from WFP's core budget is currently being reviewed by senior management. Meanwhile, resource mobilization for voluntary contributions has been ongoing. Communications and exchanges with partners on protection and accountability issues are also ongoing. Alignment of these actions with the new Protection Policy had to await policy adoption and is only now starting.
Recommendation 4: Leadership and human resources		Agreed		
By mid-2019, the Programme and Policy Division and the Human Resources Division should increase and formalize protection staffing and put in place skills	PRO	a) In 2016, WFP deployed consultant humanitarian advisers at the regional level with the objective of providing dedicated expertise on a number of key humanitarian issues, including protection, AAP,	Not applicable December 2020	Partially implemented A protection specialist has been recruited in a fixed-term position at WFP

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<p>training for targeted staff members. Among other actions, this will require the integration of protection into leadership and induction training and individual performance assessments. Senior managers should be trained and assessed in protection analysis and negotiation skills. New measures should include the allocation of additional funding to protection and humanitarian adviser positions and the formalization of country office protection focal point positions at an appropriately senior level and functionally separate from gender focal points.</p>		<p>peacebuilding, conflict sensitivity and principled humanitarian access. The humanitarian advisers have been critical in assisting country offices better to integrate humanitarian issues into their operations. Maintaining the humanitarian advisers is therefore a priority. In the short term, they will be retained under their existing consultancy posts, funded through extrabudgetary funds. For the long term, the posts will be transferred to fixed-term staff positions funded through the programme support and administrative budget (subject to resource availability).</p> <p>WFP is also taking steps to strengthen human resources that deal with protection matters. A dedicated unit under OSZ focusing on beneficiary protection, engagement, accountability and information management has been established, and a fixed-term post on protection and AAP within this unit has been created.</p> <p>Required actions on protection and AAP will be integrated into WFP's internal control mechanisms, including the self-assessment checklist and assurance statement, to strengthen senior management accountability for these areas.</p> <p>b) New Terms of Reference for country-level protection focal points, requiring that focal points be relatively senior staff members and setting out clear criteria for selection, will be developed, and protection responsibilities will be integrated into the Performance and Competency Enhancement (PACE) tool work plans of staff members chosen to serve as focal points. In recognition, however, of the close inter-linkage between protection, AAP and gender, and considering the</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>headquarters to support the roll-out of the policy and its implementation plan. Meanwhile, the majority of protection adviser positions in the regional bureaux continue to be filled by consultants. However, investment is being made and the Regional Bureau for Western Africa (RBD) is currently recruiting an international fixed-term protection adviser.</p> <p>Protection and accountability issues are increasingly being addressed in new country strategic plans (CSPs).</p> <p>Training packages of senior staff are still being developed and have not yet been rolled out.</p> <p>Implementation of the actions is progressing, but slowly and with considerable delays.</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
		<p>difficulty of ensuring that dedicated staff and resources cover all three issues, responsibilities of focal points for protection, AAP and gender will not always be separate. WFP will soon launch blended learning programmes on both protection and AAP that use new training methodologies to tailor training to staff at different levels. They will complement the existing training initiatives covering protection and AAP mentioned under recommendation 2 above.</p>		
Recommendation 5: Evidence base		Partially agreed		
<p>By the end of 2018, WFP should strengthen its analysis of contexts and protection issues by reinforcing the data systems for monitoring and evaluation and building on existing information management systems to capture protection-related information. This work will include elaboration of a “big data” pool of information on protection that combines: the qualitative and quantitative information gathered; revision of corporate protection indicators; and inclusion of protection analysis in evaluation.</p>	<p>The Resource mobilization Division (RM)</p>	<p>a) WFP welcomes the suggestion to identify existing sources of information on protection within the organization and to systematize them to allow for better collection of protection data. To ensure the coherence of internal systems and in view of resource limits, this work will build on existing monitoring and reporting mechanisms but will not entail a revision of the existing data architecture. The objective of enhancing the organization’s data collection capacities will be to strengthen the understanding of protection in the context of food insecurity and to inform programming decisions.</p> <p>b) As part of the implementation of the Integrated Road Map, WFP is in the process of developing a new corporate results framework. This provides an opportunity to improve existing indicators for protection and AAP and strengthen the capacity to capture protection and AAP information through the corporate monitoring and reporting framework. WFP will also strengthen country-level indicators and processes for</p>	<p>Not applicable December 2020 Implemented</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p> <p>The work of revising and strengthening the data systems for monitoring protection is tied to an organization-wide strategy for data systems development and has therefore not yet been implemented, while much progress has been made in the inclusion of protection in evaluations. In 2021, PRO put in place a data team to analyse systematically complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFM) data and triangulate/complement that data with other</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
		<p>monitoring protection and AAP for the purposes of programme adjustment.</p> <p>c) As part of these efforts, WFP will strengthen the analysis of protection during evaluations to ensure that the integration of protection and AAP into programmes is taken into account in the evaluation of those programmes.</p>		<p>relevant sources of data to inform context analysis, targeting decisions, and programme adaptation and to discern patterns and trends in protection issues. At the same time, the architecture of the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) is undergoing major revision to align it with the WFP Strategic Plan 2022–2026. PRO has proposed a high-level commitment on inclusive community engagement to be included in the CRF and that the number of Protection and Accountability indicators be increased to provide better coverage.</p>
Recommendation 6: Stakeholder dialogue		Agreed		
By the end of 2019, the Programme and Policy Division should develop a new strategy for engagement with affected populations and vulnerable groups,	Programme – Humanitarian and Development	As a member of IASC, WFP endorsed the five IASC commitments on accountability to affected populations in 2011, as well as the update to those commitments in 2017. Together with the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy (WFP/EB.1/2012/5-B/Rev.1), these commitments have formed the policy framework for WFP’s efforts to	Not applicable December 2019 Implemented	Implemented The recommended actions were implemented and the response to the

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
which should be based on strengthened community feedback mechanisms.	Division (PRO)	enhance its accountability to affected people. Community feedback mechanisms and tools that include face-to-face, two-way communication will be streamlined to complement the updated Protection Policy and build on the IASC commitments.		recommendation is currently further expanded in the context of implementing the 2020 Protection and Accountability Policy.

* According to R2 database 29/03/2021.

Annex 2. Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAP	Accountability to Affected Populations
CFM	Complaints and Feedback Mechanism
CRF	Corporate Results Framework
ERM	Enterprise Risk Management Division
IASC	Inter-Agency Steering Committee
OSZPH	Emergency and Transitions Unit (PRO)
PPR	Public Partnership and Resourcing Division
PRO	Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division
R2	Risk and Recommendation (tracking system)
RM	Resource Management Department
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal

Annex 3. Persons Interviewed

Andrea Castorina	Programme Policy Officer, Regional Bureau for the Middle East and Northern Africa
Anne-Laure Duval	Head, Protection Unit, Programme, Humanitarian and Development Division
David Kaatrud	Director, Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division
Gabrielle Duffy	Senior Evaluation Officer, Office of Evaluation
Harriet Spanos	Chief of Risk Management, Enterprise Risk Management Division
Julie Thoulouzan	Senior Evaluation Manager, Office of Evaluation
Rebecca Richards	Chief, Peace and Conflict Office, Programme, Humanitarian and Development Division
Rossella Fanelli	Donor Relations Officer, Public Partnerships and Resourcing Division

Annex 4. Documents Consulted

Executive Board documents

"Management response to the recommendations deriving from the evaluation of the WFP humanitarian protection policy for 2012–2017" (WFP/EB.A/2018/7-B/Add.1).

"Summary evaluation report of the WFP humanitarian protection policy for 2012–2017" (WFP/EB.A/2018/7-B).

"2018 enterprise risk management policy" (WFP/EB.2/2018/5-C).

"WFP protection and accountability policy" (WFP/EB.2/2020/4-A/1/Rev.2).

"WFP protection and accountability policy –Implementation plan" (WFP/EB.2/2020/4-A/2).

Non-Executive Board documents

Food Security Cluster. 2019. *Strategic Plan 2020–2022*. WFP, Rome, 2019.

IASC. 2017. *IASC Commitments on Accountability to Affected People and Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse*. <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/accountability-affected-populations-including-protection-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse/documents-56> (accessed 21/06/2021).

WFP. 2016. *Protection guidance manual*. Emergency and Transitions Unit, Programme and Policy Division, WFP, Rome, 2016.

WFP. 2017. *Minimum standards for implementing a CFM*. WFP Emergencies and Transitions Unit, Rome, February 2017.

WFP. 2018. *Annual session of the Executive Board; Agenda item 7b): Summary evaluation report of the WFP humanitarian protection policy for 2012–2017 and management response*. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2018. *Evaluation Report. Evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy*. OEV/2016/015, WFP, Rome, May 2018.

WFP. 2019. *Post hoc Quality Assessment of WFP Evaluations: Evaluation of the WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy*. OEV/2016/015. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2020. *Second regular Agenda item 4 a) WFP protection and accountability policy and implementation plan*. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2020. *WFP protection and accountability policy 2020: Third informal consultation, 24 July 2020*. WFP, Rome, 2020.

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

WFP. 2021. *Protection Guidance Manual*. <https://protection.manuals.wfp.org/en/protection/> (accessed 14/06/2021).

Office of Evaluation

World Food Programme

Via Cesare Giulio Viola 68/70

00148 Rome, Italy

T +39 06 65131 wfp.org/independent-evaluation