WFP EVALUATION

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

Report on the Strategic Evaluation of the
Pilot Country Strategic Plans (2018)

May 2022

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES

Background

This report on the Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans 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 Before publishing the report, the Office of Evaluation complemented *hera's* analysis by updating outdated information based on comments and input received from WFP staff/action-owners in January 2022.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 was conducted in 2018 by Mokoro Ltd and managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation. The evaluation was presented to the Executive Board in November 2018. It had the dual objectives of accountability and learning related to the implementation of WFP's Integrated Road Map (IRM). The IRM is a platform for organizational change in WFP, in response to the 2030 United Nations Agenda for Sustainable Development. It comprises four main elements:

1. **Culture:** Ensure engagement and communication, clarify accountabilities and support staff ownership of the change process.
2. **Organization:** Define roles, responsibilities and reporting lines, organizational structures and contractual modalities.
3. **Skills:** Align organization and individual skills, identify critical audiences, map range of skill gaps, identify learning objectives, define, design and deliver learning solutions and measure results/need for follow-up training.
4. **Talent:** Determine if the right people are in the most critical roles, identify gaps, and design effective strategies to address their immediate and mid-term talent needs.

WFP established a steering committee and a functional unit to guide the implementation of the IRM from 2016 to 2021.

The evaluation assessed pilot country strategic plans (CSPs) in light of the Policy on Country Strategic Plans that was adopted in November 2016. The objectives of the evaluation were to:

1. Assess the quality and results of WFP implementation of the new strategic direction related to country strategic planning.
2. Determine reasons why the expected changes did or did not occur and draw lessons for further implementation of the new strategic direction.

The evaluation issued five recommendations, each with several sub-recommendations and sub-sub-recommendations. Management fully agreed to all recommendations except for one sub-recommendation to which it agreed only partially. In responding to the recommendations, management identified 34 actions to be implemented by eight functional units of WFP. By March 2021, all but one of the actions were listed as implemented in the WFP Risk and Recommendation (R2) tracking system (see Annex 1).

Findings

The evaluation of pilot CSPs in a very early phase of the IRM roll-out was seen by WFP management as an important opportunity for learning through an independent assessment of gaps between the planned and the implemented strategy. By engaging in this activity at such an early, "pilot" stage, it was predictable that many gaps would be identified due to the early timing of the evaluation. As confirmed by several key informants, many of the issues identified by the evaluation and formulated into operational recommendations were already well known and were being addressed while the evaluation was being conducted.

The evaluation provided an independent assessment that confirmed country-focused, needs-based programming as a major strategic direction of WFP. It helped build internal understanding and support for this direction across the organization by elevating the initiatives taken by many functional units into actions that were discussed with the Executive Board in response to evaluation recommendations.

At the time of the review, the actions outlined in the management response had been implemented in line with the roll-out of the IRM. Some, for instance the alignment of CSPs with United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)/United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSCDF) cycles, require more time for full implementation, but were ongoing as new CSPs were being developed. The recommendations on performance monitoring and on WFP financing addressed longer-term priorities that were taken up in the development of the new WFP Strategic Plan.

Table 1: Summary of recommendations and management responses

Recommendation (short)	Management response
Rec 1 – Strengthen existing CSP management structures and the system of systematic learning; undertake a comprehensive review in 2020.	Agreed
Rec 2 – Complete the CSP simplification process, develop and update existing guidance, and address cross-cutting issues.	Agreed
Rec 3 – Continue to engage in the United Nations reform process and develop strategies to align CSPs with UNDAF cycles.	Agreed
Rec 4 – Ensure that the comprehensive system of monitoring and reporting performance is aligned with the revised corporate results framework (CRF).	Partially agreed
Rec 5 - Address constraints to more flexible and predictable financing.	Agreed

Recommendation 1 – Strengthen existing CSP management structures and the system of systematic learning; undertake a comprehensive review in 2020

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with the 11 sub-recommendations and formulated nine actions that responded fully, including one action on emergency response preparedness that is not mentioned in any sub-recommendation.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	The actions of the management response include statements to "maintain priority" and descriptions of established processes that had already responded to recommendations before they were issued. All actions had been implemented by the deadlines that ranged from January to December 2019 except for the review of emergency response activities which is an ongoing activity.

The recommendation is divided into three sub-recommendations that focus on: (a) the prioritization and continued improvement of the IRM and the CSP approach; (b) the monitoring and learning approach, including adaptation of the corporate results framework (CRF); and (c) the implementation of a comprehensive review of the experience of applying the CSP format.

Since inception, the implementation of the IRM, which is subject of the first sub-recommendation, has been a major focus of WFP, directed by a senior level function in the organizational structure. Implementation is closely followed by the Executive Board. This has ensured that the introduction of CSPs received priority attention. Based on the experience, CSP guidelines continued to be improved, and a technical guidance note for the second generation of CSPs was issued in February 2021.

The second sub-recommendation, as well as the five related actions of the management response, broadly address monitoring and learning, with four of them referring to adaptation and implementation of the CRF. The CRF is continuously being reviewed and updated based on feedback from country offices. This is an ongoing process and not necessarily a direct response to the evaluation. A revised CRF was released in 2018 and indicator compendia were updated in 2019 and 2020. A new revision of the CRF for the period of 2022 to 2026 is currently in preparation. Webinars for training were conducted, as well as biweekly meetings with regional monitoring advisers and a virtual space accessible to all WFP monitoring staff for learning and discussions of monitoring issues.

The fifth action under this sub-recommendation is the review of emergency response and preparedness activities in CSPs and interim CSPs, as well as associated training activities. It is not clear why this action was formulated in the management response as it does not respond to any of the sub-sub-recommendations. According to key informants, these reviews and associated training are ongoing.

The review of the CSP format and system recommended in the third sub-recommendation was implemented in the context of the mid-term review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021), including the elements specified in the sub-recommendations.

Recommendation 2 – Complete the CSP simplification process, develop and update existing guidance, and address cross-cutting issues

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with the 11 sub-sub-recommendations and responded by defining 12 actions that included affirmations of existing practice ("revisions of CSPs are permitted") or commitments to continue already established review processes.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	As stated in the management response, "most recommendations are underway or already implemented". One action related to joint zero hunger strategic reviews (NZHSR) was no longer relevant as no new reviews were planned. The commitment to revise the emergency response guidelines was not yet completed although marked as "implemented" in the R2.

The recommendation addresses CSP processes, including streamlining the implementation of CSPs, strengthening tools and systems for monitoring and learning, and increasing attention to cross-cutting issues such as accountability to affected populations, protection, gender and environment.

The first sub-recommendation acknowledged that efforts to streamline and simplify systems and structures for the implementation of CSPs were already underway. It recommended the continuation of these efforts with a timeframe for completion of six months (by January 2019), which was agreed to by management albeit within an extended timeframe to December 2019. In the R2 database, the recommendation closure date was extended to February 2021.

The second and third sub-recommendations with their eight sub-sub-recommendations about monitoring systems and cross-cutting issues are, to a major extent, also recommendations confirming a chosen direction. In the response, management established a one-year timeline for implementation noting that most were already implemented or that implementation was already underway. Different from the first sub-recommendation, these recommendations mostly addressed functional units of WFP other than the IRM Implementation Office. The recommendations were therefore seen by one informant as messages to draw other units more strongly into the IRM process, which somewhat balanced the feeling of redundancy. Nevertheless, converting the factual statement about zero hunger strategic reviews (ZHSR) into an action, for example, was clearly redundant, especially since no further ZHSRs were planned within a foreseeable future.

All actions were implemented, although some are linked to other corporate processes, such as regular reviews and revisions of the corporate results framework or a more extensive revision of WFP's emergency response systems and processes that have timelines other than those specified in the management response. As for the emergency response and preparedness, for example, a new framework will become effective in the Executive Director's Circular "Emergency Activation Protocol" in February 2022. The new protocol substantially modifies WFP's approach to emergency response by adhering to the Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC)'s principle of "no regrets" and empowerment of leadership, as well as WFP's internal principles of decentralization, subsidiarity and partnership. In response to this protocol, all emergency documentation and guidance will need to be updated to reflect the new procedures. Defining a firm closure date is therefore not always obvious.

Recommendation 3 – Continue to engage in the United Nations reform process and develop strategies to align CSPs with UNDAF cycles.

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with the four sub-recommendations and formulated four actions that, like in other responses, included affirmations of established practice ("continued engagement in UN reform")
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	WFP's engagement in the United Nations reform process continued. The action to align WFP processes with United Nations processes with an implementation deadline of June 2019 is marked as "implemented" in R2, but it is a complex task that has not yet been completed.

The first sub-recommendation addresses WFP's partnership with the Rome-based agencies (FAO and IFAD) and its engagement in the development of United Nations inter-agency country-level development cooperation instruments, primarily the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCF, formerly known as UNDAF). The second addresses the alignment of CSPs with the planning and implementation cycles of these instruments.

The collaboration among the three Rome-based United Nations agencies is very broad and includes coordinated or joint inputs into United Nations processes. Strong engagement with the New York-based United Nations agencies was historically not prioritized by WFP. However, this started in 2016 after the adoption of the United Nations Agenda for Sustainable Development. It was accompanied by internal discussions about the relevance of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in relation to WFP's strong profile in humanitarian work. The recommendation was therefore perceived as helpful in further engaging internal support for the extensive work and important role played by WFP in the development of the UNSDCF.

Alignment of CSP cycles and content is well underway, with about 75 percent of CSPs currently aligned with UNSDCF cycles (either strictly aligned or with a grace period after UNSDCF approval, up to one year). Various budget revisions are also planned to bring additional CSPs into alignment in the near future. Alignment is being pursued as new CSPs and UNSDCF are being developed. A thorough analysis of alignment challenges has been conducted, and solutions have been discussed and agreed with all regional bureaux to implement this complex process requiring extending or shortening existing programmes. The global guidance on UNSDCF was released in June 2019 and complementary instructions were circulated in the form of Companion Pieces at a later stage; the implementation deadline of June 2019 was therefore not realistic, although the process of implementation had certainly been initiated by then.

Recommendation 4 – Ensure that the comprehensive system of monitoring and reporting performance is aligned with the revised corporate results framework (CRF)

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed with four sub-recommendations and partially agreed with two about rating systems for CSP evaluations which required further feasibility testing. Six actions were identified that responded fully to the recommendation.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	Actions responding to the four agreed sub-recommendations were implemented, albeit some time past the due date of January 2019. The two actions responding to the partially agreed sub-recommendations on a rating system have also been closed, but the implemented actions do not fully respond to those formulated by management.

The two sub-recommendations address the alignment of CSP monitoring and evaluation systems and processes with the CRF. The CRF is an essential component of WFP's strategy. A CRF was developed for the Strategic Plan 2017–2021, and a new CRF is currently being developed for the Strategic Plan 2022–2026. Throughout the current strategy, the measurability and uptake of indicators by country offices was monitored and updates to the CRF were prepared annually in cooperation with relevant functional units,

including in response to recommendations issued by policy or strategy evaluations (e.g. the Gender and Protection Policy Evaluations).

The adoption of the CSP model implied a shift in WFP's evaluation approach towards an increased focus on comprehensive performance at country level encompassing all of WFP's interventions adapted to country contexts. It implied the development of common sets of evaluation questions and analytical approaches, including for the evaluation of cross-cutting strategic objectives, with contextual adaptations for each evaluation. A framework based on the previous country portfolio evaluation model was developed. Lessons from the first round of CSP evaluations (CSPEs) have been integrated in the current second round.

Issues of assured funding of CSPEs are reported as having been solved, although one informant noted that the solution was not fully satisfactory with some ongoing resistance to including the costs of these evaluations in country office budgets. The feasibility of systematically rating CSP performance is still being explored by the Office of Evaluation. It is anticipated that once this action has been implemented, the Corporate Planning and Performance Division (CPP) will be able to reflect the agreed approach in the annual performance reporting.

Recommendation 5 – Address constraints to more flexible and predictable financing

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	Management agreed to the five sub-recommendations and formulated three actions that include statements of existing commitments and strategies and one actionable response on training. No response was provided to two sub-recommendations.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	As noted in the management response, WFP undertakes ongoing initiatives to address funding constraints independent of the evaluation recommendations.

The findings of the evaluation noting the funding constraints in the implementation of CSPs align with the findings of many strategy and policy evaluations. The high proportion of earmarked funding for WFP is a known and persistent constraint in WFP's work that is continuously addressed in negotiations with donors. WFP is far from reaching its goal of 30 percent flexible funding.

Management did not respond to two sub-recommendations: (1) to demonstrate the gains in efficiency and effectiveness that predictable and flexible funding delivers, and; (2) to set clear and time-bound targets for more flexible and predictable funding. According to informants, predictable funding is a less central issue than addressing the funding gap, and WFP's strategy has been primarily to expand the donor base. These sub-recommendations were apparently ignored in the management response, although management did not explicitly disagree with them.

Training and guidance of staff involved in fundraising has, on the other hand, been provided although, according to interviewed staff, not necessarily in response to the recommendation. As stated in the management response, fundraising negotiations are tailored to individual donors. One informant noted that fundraising cannot only be guided by an internal assessment of funding needs as, for instance, determined by this evaluation. It is even more important that it is based on an analysis of the external funding environment.

Conclusions

The evaluation was tasked with evaluating a pilot initiative under the IRM to generate lessons that support, reject or help improve the strategy. It issued a long list of sub-recommendations, many of them of the nature "continue on the path". Management responded by committing to 34 actions, many of them setting out existing strategies and ongoing initiatives. The overall actionability of the management response was therefore low, and interviewed stakeholders commented on the transaction cost of reporting against actions that did not define a distinct action.

Nevertheless, all interviewed informants appreciated the findings and recommendations, as independent confirmation and support for a course of actions taken to deliver a significant strategic shift in how WFP operates. Most of the recommendations were implemented. Some, for instance the alignment of CSP cycles and a shift to more flexible funding of WFP, require a longer process of change.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Recommendations and Actions

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 1: Strengthen existing management structures and the system of systematic learning; undertake a comprehensive review in 2020.				
(a) From now until 2021, mainstream Integrated Road Map (IRM)-specific structures while strengthening all existing structures to ensure effective coordination of the IRM and effective operationalization of the country strategic plan (CSP) approach in a transparent and inclusive manner: ➢ Maintain implementation of the CSP framework as a top management priority for WFP until the end of 2021. ➢ Continue to dedicate senior staff time to CSPs at headquarters and the regional bureaux. ➢ Ensure the continuation of an active, carefully coordinated effort to optimize the efficiency and complementarity of all relevant systems and procedures, as well as the ongoing strategic monitoring of the fitness of the current CSP model for its many diverse purposes.	**1.a: Agreed**			
	Integrated Road Map (IRM)	1.1 Prioritization of the CSP framework implementation.	Not applicable February 2021 **Closed**	**Implemented** IRM implementation continues to be prioritized by WFP. Executive Board regularly apprised of progress.
	IRM	1.2 IRM steering committee will oversee the coordination and operationalization of the CSP framework.	Not applicable February 2021 **Closed**	**Implemented** Steering committee in place throughout 2021 to oversee development of second generation CSPs and assure alignment with the corporate results framework (CRF), the financial framework and the new strategic plan.
	IRM	1.3 IRM steering committee will re-evaluate WFP's success in mainstreaming IRM-specific structures.	Not applicable March 2020 **Closed**	**Implemented** A review of the IRM-specific structures, systems and processes in 2020 resulted in revisions that

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
(b) By the end of June 2019, strengthen the process of systematic learning from the				were presented for approval to the Executive Board in April 2020.
implementation of the CSP framework and	**1.b: Agreed**			
strengthen implementation process monitoring to support learning across all areas. ➢ Incorporate high-level elements of the CSP monitoring system and the existing performance management system. ➢ Systematically monitor the development of partnerships. ➢ Strengthen the capacity of country offices to learn from their experiences and adapt as necessary. ➢ Encourage the exchange of information and	Corporate Planning and Performance – Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison (CPP-CPPM)	1.4 Revision of the corporate results framework.	Not applicable December 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** In 2018, a revised CRF was adopted. A new framework for the period 2022 to 2026 is being developed. Learnings from the application of the CRF by country offices are continuously being applied. Some complex composite indicators that were not used by country offices were improved or removed.
experience from country office to country office and from regional bureau to regional bureau. **(c) In the first quarter of 2020 carry out a comprehensive review of experience with the CSP format and systems to generate**	Emergency Operations Division (EME)	1.5 Revision of all emergency response and preparedness activities.	Not applicable December 2019 **Open**	**Ongoing activity** It is not clear how this activity relates to the recommendation. EME noted that reviews of CSPs are an ongoing activity.
recommendations for improving the CSP framework and other elements of the IRM. ➢ The review should cover a full implementation cycle of the pilot CSPs (which will include the formulation of the second-generation CSPs in the pilot countries).	CPP-CPPM	1.6 Development of a partnership outcome indicator to be included in the revised corporate results framework.	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** A partnership index was included in the CRF but it is currently under discussion as it is not being picked up by country offices.
➢ The review should build on all existing efforts, including those of the regional bureaux. ➢ The process should be linked to the mid-term review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021).	CPP-CPPM	1.7 CPP to provide training on the corporate results framework and Office of Evaluation to continue	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** Training through webinars was conducted throughout 2019,

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
➢ The review should focus on areas that are relatively difficult to assess, such as alignment with national priorities and the development of strategic partnerships. It should also include updates on the extent and nature of the earmarking of contributions and the alignment of CSPs with United Nations development assistance frameworks (UNDAFs) (in terms of both content and cycles).		reviewing all draft CSP concept notes.		specifically targeting new features of the 2018 CRF.
	CPP-CPPM	1.8 Updated systemic guidance to be rolled out.	Not applicable December 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** In response, biweekly meetings with regional monitoring advisers were established, as well as an MS Teams space where monitoring issues and learnings are accessible to all WFP monitoring staff.
	1.c: Agreed			
	IRM	1.9 Initiate a management review linked to the mid-term review of the strategic plan.	Not applicable February 2021 **Closed**	**Implemented** IRM challenges were discussed in a workshop with regional deputy directors in 2019, as well as in the mid-term review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021). Changes were initiated that included, among others, an update of the CSP manual for the development of second-generation CSPs, as well as further alignment of CSPs with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSCDF) (replacing the former UNDAF).

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 2: CSP processes and guidance: Complete simplification process; develop and update existing guidance; address cross-cutting issues.				
(a) Building upon existing efforts, ensure that the simplification process is complete by 1 January 2019.	**2.a: Agreed**			
➢ Ensure that country offices have systems that are fit for purpose. ➢ Reduce transaction costs as far as possible. ➢ Keep staff workloads within acceptable limits.	IRM	2.1 Ensure that the tools, training and support structures needed for CSP implementation are mainstreamed.	Not applicable December 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** A toolkit for CSP development and implementation for country offices was published in 2018 and is available on WFPgo.
(**b) By the end of the first quarter of 2019, update existing guidance related to the development and implementation of CSPs and prepare a single and comprehensive set of new guidance that reflects the need to undertake differentiated processes according to national context.** ➢ All existing guidance related to the implementation of the CSP framework and the WFP Programme Guidance Manual should be replaced by a new comprehensive CSP manual that will guide all aspects of the formulation and implementation of CSPs. ➢ WFP should now confirm that the CSP is a dynamic model and that the next generation CSPs (and their supporting procedures, notably joint zero	IRM	2.2 Implementation of recommendations from IRM alignment and simplification workshop.	Not applicable December 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** Organizational alignment reviews were conducted in over 50 country offices. Regional bureaux and Human Resources Division (HRM) continue to assist the offices in aligning their organizational structures with the CSPs.
	IRM	2.3 Introduction of a simplified budget structure to minimize any additional workload for country offices.	Not applicable December 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** The country portfolio budget structure and related internal processes were simplified in 2018 and 2019 with a view to reducing the complexity of fund management for staff.
	2.b: Agreed			

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
hunger strategic reviews, NZHSRs) may vary more according to local conditions – while all adhering to core systems that facilitate standardized management, monitoring and reporting procedures. All guidance should specify what is mandatory, where there should be flexibility and where waivers can be obtained. ➢ NZHSR processes should better reflect national needs and provide opportunities to use the approach in areas beyond Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 2. ➢ There should be a light option for the mandatory mid-term review for countries with CSP cycles of under five years. ➢ Mid-term review and country portfolio evaluation processes should be aligned in sequence and method. ➢ Guidance should take the United Nations reform process into account, and the revision of guidance should be designed accordingly. **(c) By the end of the first quarter of 2019, define cross-cutting issues and provide guidance on how to address them in the context of CSPs.** ➢ Review the WFP policy compendium and streamline it to reflect the findings and recommendations of recent Office of Evaluation policy evaluations.	Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	2.4 A new CSP manual has been created, providing a "one-stop-shop" for users.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** A comprehensive CSP manual was created and is available in the WFP internal repository of manuals.
	IRM	2.5 Permit revisions of CSPs and Interim CSPs in response to changing circumstances.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** Revisions of CSPs due to changing circumstances are permitted.
	EME	2.6 Revision of emergency response and preparedness activities guidance.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Partially implemented** Some revisions were made, but the work is ongoing. A new Executive Director's Circular, "Emergency Activation Protocol", will become the new framework for WFP's emergency response and preparedness and is expected to become effective as of February 2022.In response to this protocol, all emergency documentation will need to be updated to reflect the new procedures.
	IRM	2.7 Use of zero hunger strategic reviews (ZHSRs) for other SDGs and the new UNDAF.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**No longer relevant** No new NZHSRs have been launched since 2018.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
➢ Incorporate gender equality and other cross-cutting issues into all other CSP guidance.	CPP-RMPM	2.8 Issuance of mid-term review guidelines to country offices.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** Short guidelines for internal mid-term reviews of CSPs by country offices were issued in January 2019.
	Office of Evaluation	2.9 Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison (RMP) and Office of Evaluation to finalize the mid-term review and country portfolio evaluation guidance.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** A comprehensive guide for mid-term reviews was published in February 2021.
	PRO	2.10 Guidance revision in line with United Nations reform decisions.	Not applicable January 2021 **Closed**	**Implemented** Guidance for CSPs on the United Nations cooperation framework was integrated in the CSP manual. It has been updated as compendium pieces of the global framework were released.
	2.c: Agreed			
	PRO	2.11 Review and update of WFP policy compendium.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** The WFP compendium of policies related to the strategic plan is updated annually. The 2020 update presented to the Executive Board includes an extensive list of documents to be reviewed, including in consideration of the policy on CSPs.
	Gender Office	2.12 CRF review to include revision of gender equality, accountability to	Not applicable	**Implemented**

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
	(GEN)	affected populations and protection cross-cutting indicators.	June 2019 **Closed**	Cross-cutting indicators on accountability, protection, gender and environment have been reviewed and are integrated into the indicator compendium of the CRF.
Recommendation 3: Continue engagement in United Nations reform process; develop strategies to align CSPs with UNDAF cycles.				
(a) Continue strong engagement with the United Nations reform process and participate in the practical work of developing a new generation of UNDAFs, including by introducing WFP innovations and experiences into the process. ➢ Tailor lesson-learning documents to United Nations reform workstreams, especially those related to developing the new generation of UNDAFs. ➢ Options may include joint country strategic reviews and planning with the Rome-based agencies and possibly other United Nations entities, or the whole United Nations country team. **(b) By mid-2019, develop strategies to ensure that all CSP cycles match UNDAF cycles as quickly as possible.** ➢ For each ongoing CSP that does not match the corresponding UNDAF cycle, examine opportunities	**3.a: Agreed**			
	Strategic Partnership Division (STR)	3.1 WFP's continuous engagement in the United Nations reform process.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** WFP participated in the reform of UNDAF and chaired one of the committees developing the UNSDCF.
	STR	3.2 WFP to explore ways of increasing collaboration among the Rome-based agencies on NZHSRs as inputs to UNDAFs.	Not applicable June 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** WFP collaborates broadly with FAO and IFAD. NZHSRs were completed prior to the evaluation. Updates may be done in a few years. If this is decided, joint reviews with Rome-based agencies and other United Nations partners would be appropriate.
	3.b: Agreed			
	PRO	3.3 Alignment of inter-agency instruments and WFP instruments.	Not applicable	**Partially implemented** Alignment of CSP cycles and contents is an ongoing process as

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
to shorten or extend the CSP cycle to align with that of the UNDAF. ➢ Include a short section on the strategy for UNDAF alignment (or an explanation for the absence of such a strategy) in all concept notes for CSPs.			January 2021 **Closed**	new CSPs are being developed. Alignment of about 75 percent of CSPs has been achieved.
	PRO	3.4 CSP concept note to refer to alignment with UNDAF outcomes and describe how the CSP reinforces the UNDAF.	Not applicable January 2021 **Closed**	**No longer relevant** Concept notes for CSPs are no longer required in order to streamline and shorten the CSP development process, which also contributed to better alignment with UNSCDF cycles.
Recommendation 4: Monitoring and reporting performance: Ensure that the comprehensive system of monitoring and reporting performance is aligned with the revised CRF; ensure a central role for country portfolio evaluations.				
(a) By the second quarter of 2019, ensure that the comprehensive system for monitoring and reporting performance is aligned with the revised corporate results framework. ➢ Gender-responsive monitoring and reporting systems based on a revised corporate results framework should be tested. Once confirmed workable, they should be adopted by country offices after adequate training and should be in place to	**4.a: Agreed**			
	CPP-RMPM	4.1 Training to support monitoring and reporting through the revised framework will be provided.	Not applicable January 2021 **Closed**	**Implemented** Training on the revised CRF has been provided as mentioned under action 1.7, including training that focused specifically on new features of the CRF.
	CPP-RMPM	4.2 Information gaps analysis to be conducted by RMP.	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** Information gap analysis in the corporate operational database (COMET) is done annually as this is the primary source for all

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
support the comprehensive monitoring and reporting of all CSP results. ➢ In the meantime, WFP will need to confirm to donors and other stakeholders that it will not be able to report in full on all activities under certain CSPs for the first one or two years of implementation because indicators and a supporting methodology were not in place when the CSPs were launched. (b) By mid-2019, ensure country portfolio evaluations are at the centre of the performance management system to ensure better assessment of WFP's contribution to development results. ➢ Office of Evaluation to review and revise the current country portfolio evaluation model and adapt it to CSPs (by end 2018). ➢ Ensure the sustainable financing of country portfolio evaluations. ➢ Introduce a rating system in country portfolio evaluations that gauges CSP performance in terms of contribution of CSP activities to strategic outcomes. ➢ Incorporate the results of country portfolio evaluations into annual performance reporting using the rating system.				information presented in annual reports.
	4.b: Partially agreed			
	Office of Evaluation	4.3 Review of the country portfolio evaluation model and process to inform CSPs design.	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** A new framework for CSPEs was developed and piloted in seven countries in 2019/20. Lessons have been integrated into subsequent CSPEs.
	CPP Budget and Programming Division (CPP-RMB)	4.4 Set up of a sustainable financing task force by RMB.	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Implemented** Solutions have been found by assuring that CSPE budgets are included in CSP implementation plans, but discussions are continuing, including suggestions to fund evaluations from central budget.
	Office of Evaluation	4.5 Office of Evaluation to explore the feasibility of developing a rating system for all CSPEs.	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Not implemented** According to Office of Evaluation informants, the exploration of the feasibility of systematically rating the performance of CSPs is being explored.
	CPP-RMPM	4.6 Consider including CSPs' operational ratings in annual performance reports.	Not applicable January 2019 **Closed**	**Not implemented** Implementation of this action is pending and depends on implementation of action 4.5.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 5: Address constraints to more flexible and predictable financing				
By mid-2019, address constraints to more flexible and predictable financing. To ensure more flexible and predictable financing, WFP should do the following: ➢ Undertake strategic dialogue with the Executive Board on multilateral funding and earmarked funding. ➢ Strengthen engagement with donors on adapting to the new model. ➢ Make greater effort to demonstrate the gains in efficiency and effectiveness that predictable and flexible funding delivers in the context of the long-term CSP framework. ➢ Make special efforts to reduce earmarking by strengthening staff negotiating skills. ➢ Set clear and time-bound targets for more flexible and predictable funding.	**5: Agreed**			
	Partnership and Advocacy Department (PA)	5.1 Advocate for more fully flexible funding and predictable multi-year funding.	Not applicable "through 2019" **Closed**	**Ongoing activity** Advocacy for flexible funding is not new, and it continues to be a main theme in the strategic plan under development.
	PA	5.2 Implementation of a strategy to maximize funding impact.	Not applicable "through 2019" **Closed**	**Ongoing activity** A strategy for maximizing funding impact is currently being implemented. It involves bilateral strategic financing dialogues with major donors, taking into consideration flexibility and predictability in the context of the relatively long-term CSP framework. Strategic dialogues have been undertaken with Executive Board members on flexible funding through consultations.
	PA	5.3 Guidance to staff to ensure that deliberate efforts are made to improve the nature of funding.	Not applicable "through 2019" **Closed**	**Implemented** Guidance and training were provided to staff in the Private Partnership and Fundraising Division to enhance negotiation and other skills relevant for fundraising.

* According to R2 Database 29/03/2021

Annex 2. Abbreviations and Acronyms

CPP	Corporate Planning and Performance
CPP-RMB	CPP - Budget and Programming Division
CPP-CPPM	Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison
CRF	Corporate results framework
CSP	Country strategic plans
CSPE	Country strategic plan evaluation
EME	Emergency Operations Division
GEN	Gender Office
HRM	Human Resources Division
IRM	Integrated Road Map
PA	Partnership and Advocacy Department
PRO	Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division
PROM	Programme Cycle Management Unit
R2	Risk and Recommendation (tracking system)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
STR	Strategic Partnerships Division
UNDAF	Unite Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNSCDF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
ZHSR	Zero hunger strategic review

Annex 3. Persons Interviewed

Aldo Spaini	Senior Government Partnership Officer, PA
Arif Husein	Chief Economist and Director, RAM
David Kaatrud	Director, PRO
Joseph Manni	Deputy Director, IRM
Julie Thoulouzan	Senior Evaluation Manager, Office of Evaluation
Marine Delanoe	Programme Policy Officer, PROM
Natasha Nadazdin	Chief, CPP
Stanlake Samkange	Senior Director, STR
Vernon Archibald	Project Manager, EME

Annex 4. Documents Consulted

Executive Board documents

"Annual performance report for 2019" (WFP/EB.A/2020/4-A).

"Compendium of policies relating to the WVP strategic plan" (WFP/EB.2/2020/4-D/Rev.1).

"Management response to the recommendations set out in the summary report on the strategic evaluation of the pilot country strategic plans (2017–mid-2018)" (WFP/EB.2/2018/7-A/Add.1).

"Mid-term review of the WFP Strategic Plan (2017–2021)" (WFP/EB.A/2020/5-A/Rev.2).

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

"Summary evaluation report of the strategic evaluation of the pilot country strategic plans (2017–mid-2018)" (WFP/EB.2/2018/7-A).

"Update on the Integrated Road Map: Proposed delegations of authority and other governance arrangements" (WFP/EB.1/2020/4-A/1/Rev.2).

Non-Executive Board documents

WFP. 2017. *Toolkit: Integrated Road Map (IRM) Country Office Organizational Readiness.* Updated October 2017. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2018. *Evaluation Report: Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans*. OEV/2017/14, WFP, Rome, October 2018.

WFP. 2018. *Second regular session of the Executive Board; Agenda item 7 a) Summary evaluation report of the strategic evaluation of the pilot country strategic plans 2017 mid-2018 and the respective management response*. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2019. *Post hoc Quality Assessment of WFP Evaluations: Strategic Evaluation of Pilot Strategic Plans (CSP)*. OEV/2017/014. Internal report, unpublished.

WFP. 2020. *Evaluation Report: Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Capacity to Respond to Emergencies.* OEV, WFP, Rome, January 2020.

WFP. 2020. *Overview of the Integrated Road Map Framework (2016–020).* MISC-EBA2020-18557E. WFP, Rome, 2020.

WFP. 2020. *Revised Corporate Results Framework: Programme Indicator Compendium 2017–2021: October 2020 Update.* Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2020. *WFP Guidance to the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework: Implications for WFP country strategic planning.* Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. 2021. *Guidance note on Mid-term Reviews, February 2021*. Internal document, unpublished.

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

WFP. 2021. *Technical Guidance Note: Key considerations and resources for designing Country Strategic Plans*. Internal document, unpublished.