



World Food Programme

SAVING LIVES
CHANGING LIVES

WFP EVALUATION

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

Report on the Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience (2019)

May 2022

Background

This report on the Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience 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 Before publishing the report, the Office of Evaluation complemented *hera's* analysis by updating outdated information based on comments and input received from WFP staff/action-owners in January 2022.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

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the review team, and do not necessarily reflect those of WFP. 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 Strategic Evaluation of World Food Programme (WFP) Support for Enhanced Resilience was conducted in 2018 by an evaluation team from ITAD and managed by the WFP Office of Evaluation. The evaluation was presented to the Executive Board in February 2019. It was a formative evaluation of which the purpose predominantly was to assist learning regarding the extent to which WFP is organizationally capable of undertaking resilience programming. The evaluation resulted in seven recommendations (see Annex 1), of which six were agreed and one partially agreed by management. In responding to the recommendations, management identified 19 actions to be implemented by five organizational units.

Findings

The evaluation adopted a broad approach which involved many parts of WFP because resilience programming is a topic that requires engagement and participation across all departments. At the stakeholder workshop held in Rome in September 2018, there were representatives from regional bureaux, country offices and a cross-section of people from headquarters.

The evaluation promoted organizational change and reflection on the concept of resilience, moving beyond the traditional understanding of resilience as a rural, agrarian approach to strengthening productive capacities against shocks, to a much broader concept. It also pushed the organization to reflect on how to build resilience in a consistent way across divisions and departments and to reflect on which activities contribute to building resilience.

The Asset Creation and Livelihoods Unit (PRO-R) was very engaged during the evaluation process because it had been informally given the responsibility of leading WFP's thinking on resilience building. However, it is only after this evaluation that PRO-R was formally recognized as the technical unit responsible for resilience inside the Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO). In this capacity PRO-R acted as sort of a key interface, working with other technical units to consolidate the management response in a participatory way.

There have been positive developments in response to all seven recommendations. Informants mentioned it was really a collaborative effort, and the organization was ready to implement the recommendations, as there was an active interest in and desire for leadership on this topic. In addition, it was important for WFP to position itself clearly against other organizations developing joint resilience strategies and programmes. Furthermore, having a dedicated team avoided the common problem of having things not getting finalized when there is no leadership. Finally, the evaluation identified specific gaps across the organization and gave WFP a much stronger platform on which to articulate them.

On the other hand, due to the ambitious nature of the management response, in terms of the number of actions, and no specific allocation of funding, managers were required to be quite dynamic in the way in which they sought funding to implement them, making the response very demanding and complex.

This review found that considerable progress has been made in the implementation of most actions. With the exception of recommendations 4 (on commissioning a workforce study), 5 (on integrating a framework for measuring resilience into the corporate results framework, or CRF) and 7 (on the generation of evidence on the relevance of food security and resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crises), which have been partially implemented, the other recommendations have been implemented and can be closed.

Table 1 Summary of recommendations and management responses

Recommendation (short)	Management response
Rec 1 – Establish an inter-divisional leadership team tasked with developing a strategy for enhancing resilience in order to achieve zero hunger and chaired by the Assistant Executive Director of the Operations Services Department.	Agreed
Rec 2 – Integrate issues related to gender equality, empowerment and resilience into guidance on the zero hunger strategic review process and the Integrated Road Map (IRM) for country offices.	Agreed
Rec 3 – Strengthen the financial and partnership base for initiatives on resilience enhancement.	Agreed
Rec 4 – Building on the strategy developed (recommendation 1), commission a workforce study that assesses the horizontal and vertical adjustments needed in order to ensure that WFP employees can successfully deliver on resilience-focused commitments.	Agreed
Rec 5 -- Consolidate performance measurement data from resilience-related initiatives for corporate reporting and sharing with national partners.	Partially agreed
Rec 6 – Strengthen the ability of headquarters units and regional bureaux to collect, collate and analyse information on covariate, transboundary and localized shocks before they happen.	Agreed
Rec 7 – Support the generation of evidence on the relevance of food security and resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crises.	Agreed

Rec 1 – Establish an inter-divisional leadership team tasked with developing a strategy for enhancing resilience

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

Management agreed with the recommendation and identified three actions which adequately address it. In their response, management details how the recommendation will be implemented by referring to work already in progress.

Have the actions of the management response been implemented?

The agreed actions have been implemented in a satisfactory way despite a delay in implementation (due by December 2020) and despite management having adopted in some cases a different approach. The recommendation is still marked as open in R2.¹

In 2018, although many parts of WFP were contributing to, or doing, work described as resilience, there was no clear definition of resilience within the organization, despite the Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition from 2015. Therefore, to generate a common vision of resilience, an inter-divisional leadership team was considered necessary.

The inter-divisional leadership team, chaired by the Assistant Executive Director of the Programme and Policy Development Department (PD), as prescribed by the recommendation, has not been able to meet due to broader operational challenges and other priorities.² Therefore, its responsibilities have been taken over by a steering committee,³ composed of deputy directors, department chiefs, representatives of multiple divisions and units, and regional bureaux.

The steering committee meets the requirements of the recommendation. As mentioned by several informants, the steering committee has been fundamental in allowing for a discussion among all different

¹ According to the WFP Risk and Recommendation (R2) tracking system, 29/03/2021.

² The Terms of Reference (ToR) and membership list of the inter-divisional leadership team were established but the group was not able to meet due to operational exigencies.

³ Co-led by the Asset Creation, Livelihoods and Resilience Unit (PRO-R) and the Research, Assessment and Monitoring Division (RAM).

entities and building technical capacity. High-level management, including the Assistant Executive Director of PD, has been briefed on a regular basis. The informants believed that this approach was reasonable as the inter-divisional leadership team would have relied on technical input as the steering committee did.

In May 2020, the steering committee set up a stream of work referred to as the “Resilience Building Blocks Project” to respond to selected sub-recommendations of recommendations 1 and 5. The Resilience Building Blocks Project finalized an internal testing version of the Resilience toolkit in July 2021⁴ that contains a Resilience Design Support tool, which supports the integration of resilience-building principles into programming (action 1.1). The toolkit also contains eleven technical briefs that explain the contributions of different WFP units to the enhancement of resilience (action 1.2)

The evaluation had recommended the development of a strategy, including explicit approaches to the enhancement of resilience in future country strategic plans (CSPs). Management agreed and formulated action 1.3 in line with the recommendation, however they developed a toolkit instead. This review found the decision to develop a toolkit to be reasonable and appropriate to address the recommendation because it is intended to operationalize the WFP vision on resilience (which was the exact purpose of the strategy). The toolkit is currently being piloted in selected country offices. It should also be noted that a specific page on designing resilience-building programmes (last updated in November 2021) was incorporated into the CSP manual.

The toolkit contains five Theories of Change (ToCs) that describe different approaches as to how resilience capacities are built in settings affected by recurrent and worsening climate shocks, and how this ultimately leads to improved food and nutrition security. The descriptions and ToCs are aimed at supporting country offices in conceptualizing and designing integrated resilience programmes.

Management agreed to define the approaches to the strengthening of resilience in protracted crises and conflict situations in action 1.3, but this is still to be completed. Similarly, the partnership mapping should still link the different priorities of key donors that are funding resilience with the different activities and resilience capacities to which these activities contribute. However, this last action does not appear in the R2 system, and should be added.

Among the results produced by implementing this recommendation, the technical briefs have contributed to formulating PRO’s contribution to the new Strategic Plan, with regards to changing lives. Therefore, the action has gone beyond just addressing this recommendation. Moreover, the strategic evaluation and the work done across the organization in recent years have contributed to moving the topic of resilience forward.

Rec 2 – Integrate issues related to gender equality, empowerment and resilience into guidance on the zero hunger strategic review process and the IRM for country offices

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

Management agreed with the recommendation to which they responded by identifying one action that adequately addresses the recommendation.

Have the actions of the management response been implemented?

The actions have been implemented (in line with what is reported on R2; deadline June 2019 not met). The recommendation has been implemented in part by the Resilience toolkit, which provides country offices with information on why gender is important in resilience-building, and also by updating existing guidance that provides information to country offices when designing their CSPs.

The recommendation to integrate issues related to gender equality, empowerment and resilience into the guidance of the zero hunger strategic review (ZHSR) process and the IRM was made to ensure that the resilience work that country offices do is gender-sensitive. The recommendation was perceived to be useful

⁴ A finalized version of the Resilience toolkit is expected to be released by the end of Q1 2022.

in highlighting how WFP conceptualizes resilience at the CSP level. Previous resilience programmes did not disaggregate the target group in terms of gender, but in terms of livelihood groups, therefore highlighting the importance of the gender aspect for resilience, although other aspects of unequal distribution of power should also be considered.

This recommendation has been implemented to some extent by the Resilience toolkit, which provides country offices with information on why gender is important in resilience-building, and also by updating existing guidance that provides country offices with information for designing their CSPs. The CSP manual includes guidance on designing resilience-building “Focus Area” programmes. Similarly, the guidance on “Key considerations and resources for designing CSPs” was updated in February 2021, and it contains key considerations and resources from each functional area across headquarters, including gender and resilience. The Country Portfolio Budget guidelines refers to resilience-building as one of three focus areas (the others being crisis response and root causes) and includes an annex on CSP Gender-Responsive Planning and Budgeting.

In 2020, the Gender Office updated the guidance on “Gender and Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews” in order to mainstream gender in ZHSR processes and content. The guidance supports country offices establishing a solid evidence base for addressing the diverse needs and priorities of women, men, girls and boys in an empowering manner that promotes sustained food and nutrition security, in environments of equality. Further, two of the six guiding principles of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) are to “promote gender equality and women’s empowerment” and “build pathways to resilience”, which are also articulated and developed in the specific WFP guidance to the UNSDCF.

The Programme Cycle Management Unit has taken over the implementation of this recommendation from the Strategic Partnerships Division in 2020. The transition between these two entities has delayed the implementation of the various guidance notes. In addition, the need to align the guidance revision with the UNSDCF process was another reason that might have contributed to delays in implementing this recommendation.

Rec 3 – Strengthen the financial and partnership base for initiatives on resilience enhancement

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

Management agreed and issued three actions, which in one case (action 3.2) appear less concrete than the corresponding sub-recommendation. Nonetheless, the agreed actions are sufficiently aligned with the recommendation.

Have the actions of the management response been implemented?

Concrete actions have been taken to increase access to resources for longer-term resilience-building. The actions can be considered implemented (in line with what is reported on R2).

Management perceived this recommendation to be helpful because it encouraged cross-departmental collaboration between the financial and partnerships departments on funding. The actions committed to in the management response, however, were considered vague as it was complicated to articulate specific outputs. This review did not find an increased collaboration among the two departments because of this recommendation. However, there have been some positive developments made by both departments, although they do not seem to have been specifically triggered by this recommendation.

The Public Partnerships and Resourcing Division (PPR) continued to strengthen efforts to analyse donor priorities and resourcing opportunities for WFP’s changing lives/resilience agenda as part of the holistic approach to fundraising and advocacy. An informant mentioned there was an increased focus on strengthening and systematizing how WFP mobilizes additional resources for changing lives/longer-term resilience-building. Some evidence for this is represented by more structured and continued efforts to engage with donors at capital as well as country office levels to mobilize additional resources for WFP’s changing lives/longer-term resilience-building agenda. A key action is the Critical Corporate Initiative, launched by Partnerships and Programme departments in 2019, to analyse priorities and additional opportunities for engagement with donors on key thematic areas for the access to resources in the changing life agenda.

PPR has utilized the Partnership Action Plan (PAP) process, including launching the Second Generation PAPs in 2019, to support country offices in strengthening context-relevant mapping of partners and outlining targets for partnership, positioning and resource mobilization across the CSP portfolio, including Resilience-building Strategic Outcomes.

Through strengthened support and structured engagement at the capital and field levels, country offices and regional bureaux continue efforts to increase access to longer-term resilience-building funds through targeted engagement, including the use of results to demonstrate the long-term impacts of resilience investments on food security. The Integrated Resilience Scale-Up Plan (2018–2023) is a positioning exercise done by WFP with key donors in the Sahel response, including the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

The Resource Management Department (RM) undertook a revision of the prioritization process for the CSPs to make sure that WFP responds to resilience needs and aligns with the peace and development parts of the triple nexus⁵ strategy. Since 2020, WFP projects the amount of annual multilateral funds and pre-allocates them to resilience and root causes at the beginning of the year to make sure that country offices can plan their expenditures.

Rec 4 – Building on the strategy developed (recommendation 1), commission a workforce study that assesses the horizontal and vertical adjustments needed in order to ensure that WFP employees can successfully deliver on resilience-focused commitments

<i>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</i>	Management agreed and formulated actions which, overall, adequately address the recommendation. Some aspects of the recommendation, such as the suggestion to appoint team leaders for integrated teams to replace the silo working environment, have, however, not been reflected in the actions.
<i>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</i>	The actions are marked as implemented on R2. However, the strategic workforce planning exercise for PD has not yet been completed.

When the management response was formulated, the aim of the recommendation, helping to prepare the organization's workforce in resilience-building activities, was not clearly understood as more attention was given to other recommendations they believed to be more important. However, management now thinks this recommendation is useful to reflect on the technical requirements needed for WFP to implement its work around resilience.

It was mentioned by one informant that the recommendation could have been better articulated, to reduce the total number of actions. However, the Evaluation Manager said the recommendation is specific, and this number of actions was required, following the lengthy discussions on what was needed to push it forward during the development of the recommendations.

The accountability of this action was given to PRO with support from the Human Resource Management Division (HRM). Recommendation 4 relied on the completion of recommendation 1, however they were both given the same deadline by management, which should have been considered in their planning.

HRM finalized and WFP issued the global staffing framework in autumn 2021 with a view to making the right contractual modalities available and offering competitive, fit-for-purpose contracts and adequate conditions of employment to attract and retain the best talent. The Strategic Workforce Planning exercise for the PD is still ongoing and expected to be completed in March 2022 with an identification of the skills that need to be enhanced and a specific action plan about how to bridge the skills gap. At the beginning, there were discussions about whether to conduct a specific workforce planning exercise for different programmatic areas, such as resilience, in PD, but in the end it was decided to conduct a single exercise for all areas together.

⁵ Humanitarian-Peace-Development

Another aspect of the recommendation that has been taken forward concerns the technical rosters. PRO-R maintains and regularly updates an internal roster of staff and consultants with knowledge and experience that can be made available to regional bureaux and country offices for short-term support. During 2021, the external roster has been expanded with a new call for interested technical experts. In addition, a Future International Talent (FIT) pool specifically dedicated to resilience and social protection is being launched in January 2022. It will ensure a continued and growing pool of technical experts are available for the long-term growth of WFP's programming, including integrated strategies and resilience-building.

Regarding the results produced, management believes that WFP's internal capacity in building resilience has increased compared to 2017. Some evidence of this is the Building Blockx Project that was instigated to action some of the recommendations, the colleagues allocated at regional level to support the pilot and, finally, the perceived increase in understanding of resilience which implies there should be a greater number of people who understand it. However, more still needs to be done. One positive result has been the recognition that specific technical people must be identified to take responsibility for resilience instead of adding this to all Terms of Reference (ToR).

Rec 5 – Consolidate performance measurement data from resilience-related initiatives for corporate reporting and sharing with national partners

Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?	The recommendation was partially agreed due to some misunderstanding on what was recommended under sub-recommendations 5.1 and 5.4. In some cases, management proposed slight variations in approach for the implementation (e.g. action 5.4). However, overall, the agreed actions are aligned with the recommendation.
Have the actions of the management response been implemented?	The commitments were mostly implemented in line with what is reported on R2. The agreed actions have been adequately addressed, but following additional discussions one action (5.3) was agreed to be implemented differently. Furthermore, integration of resilience measurements into the CRF is pending.

The recommendation was considered very useful by management because it helped advocate for enhanced processes for monitoring and measuring resilience outcomes. The recommendation was partially agreed due to some misunderstanding on what was recommended under sub-recommendations 5.1 and 5.4.

Sub-recommendation 5.1 suggested integrating a framework for measuring resilience into the CRF, and not developing a parallel framework for measuring resilience alongside the CRF, as perceived by management. Similarly, action 5.4 was partially agreed due to a misunderstanding of the action required, as in this case, econometric analysis, such as Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA), was suggested and not compulsory. These misunderstandings could have been clarified by the Evaluation Manager, but the management response was not shared again after the first draft.

To implement this recommendation, PRO and Corporate Planning and Performance (CPP) co-financed research led by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) to review existing monitoring and reporting systems in WFP. The report then formed the basis of a programme of work to develop a WFP-specific measurement/monitoring approach for resilience aligned with the CRF (action 5.1).⁶ The five ToCs, which describe different approaches as to how resilience capacities are built, provided the basis for identifying and reaching the outputs and outcomes, including the underlying assumptions (action 5.2). However, management notes that besides ToCs, to efficiently integrate resilience programming into second-

⁶ Management notes that besides ToCs, to efficiently integrate resilience programming into second-generation CSPs, this strategy also needs to be clearly reflected in CRF business rules, minimum monitoring requirements, budgets, bundling/unbundling rules and corporate reporting. This would be key to fully achieve the purpose of recommendations 5 and 7.

generation CSPs, this approach also needs to be clearly reflected in CRF business rules, minimum monitoring requirements, budgets, bundling/unbundling rules and corporate reporting.

Approximately 400 measurement indicators were identified. Dr Mark Conostas of Cornell University and Resilience Evidence for Decisions in Development Initiative (REDDI) has collaborated with the Resilience Building Blocks Project to develop a process for resilience monitoring and measurement. Field testing of this process started in July 2021. However, developing an aggregated index that feeds into the CRF (action 5.3) has been subject to debate because it requires sophisticated modelling. Moreover, since integrated resilience packages are always context-specific, it is very difficult to have a universal index. The ODI study also confirmed there is no need to implement an aggregate index. For these reasons, WFP did not pursue the development of a composite indicator.

Finally, regarding action 5.4, in some contexts where WFP collaborates with FAO, RIMA is used where funds and resources are available for data collection and analysis, and where RIMA is most appropriate to measuring the outcome of the programme. Furthermore, WFP, in collaboration with Dr Conostas, has developed a five-step approach to monitoring integrated resilience programmes. This approach examines trends in resilience accounting for shocks and stressors and analyses for programmatic contribution. Management notes that this five-step approach needs to be reviewed and updated using the new CRF documents and corresponding monitoring framework.

In sum, it is necessary to use indicators available in the CRF and beyond to measure how resilience is being accomplished. This will only be possible when WFP can articulate how its interventions contribute to building resilience and measure the effect of a combination of activities. A process for monitoring and measuring resilience integrated activities was piloted starting in July 2021. The results of this pilot will be very important. While some of the actions under this recommendation have been implemented, the recommendation can only be considered implemented once resilience has been integrated into the CRF.

Rec 6 – Strengthen the ability of headquarters units and regional bureaux to collect, collate and analyse information on covariate, transboundary and localized shocks before they happen

<i>Are the actions defined in the management response relevant to the recommendation?</i>	The management agreed with the recommendation and issued four actions that adequately address the recommendation.
<i>Have the actions of the management response been implemented?</i>	The actions can be considered implemented (in line with what is reported on R2). Some actions were already in progress when the recommendation was released and will continue as part of the ongoing work.

The recommendation, with three sub-recommendations, refers to what WFP has to do in order to have a strengthened evidence base for its resilience-building programmes. Management found it important to acknowledge that WFP has a huge amount of evidence and data and analytics, which in many cases are not integrated nor used to design improved resilience integrated programmes.

Concerning the first sub-recommendation, about expanding the use of climate modelling, various types of analysis have been implemented since 2019 to understand better and operationalize the data on climate modelling and the data's relevance to resilience programming. For example, country offices have started to collect and analyse more data on climatic shocks to meet the requirements of the Green Climate and Adaptation Funds about the impact of climate on various sectors. Another example is the climate risk modelling currently being carried out in nine countries vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change within the framework of the Critical Corporate Initiative for climate, which aims to support a gap analysis of climate risk management actions in CSPs to identify thematic funding needs and priority actions.

The activities committed to address sub-recommendation 2 have pushed the different units to think about how to bring together different methodologies, tools and analytics that are stored across different divisions, units and departments, and integrate them to support the design of resilience programmes in

order to help country offices to be more reactive in terms of anticipating an emergency. To implement the recommendation, some existing analytics were made available digitally onto different platforms to make them inter-operable.

Concerning the third sub-recommendation, about supporting regional bodies in connecting and understanding the food security implications and uses of their data, PRO-R has developed a global guidance note on the use of existing analytics to enhance emergency preparedness and response programming, which has been introduced for application in future, specific crises.

Concerning the fourth sub-recommendation, (about continuing to test the “trigger” functions introduced by index-based insurance and forecast-based financing for facilitating early, anticipatory action in shock-prone settings) this has also been implemented, and forecast-based financing has now been up-scaled from quick onset shocks to also slow onset shocks.

Rec 7 – Support the generation of evidence on the relevance of food security and resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crises

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

Management agreed with the recommendation and responded with three actions that in some cases suggest a different approach. For example, they did not commit to organizing a consultation with WFP beneficiaries (7.2), but opted for a desk review of findings from previous studies to inform further field research.

Have the actions of the management response been implemented?

The commitments are partially implemented. Considerable progress was made on action 7.1, on building partnerships with other academic institutions to move forward evidence-generation (though not with a focus on conflict and protracted crises settings).

The three sub-recommendations refer to the generation of evidence in the area of resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crises to understand better the work done in this area. The first sub-recommendation was perceived useful because it encouraged managers to further reach out and identify academic partnerships to move forward on the evidence generation. PRO-R worked with several external academic and research institutes, such as the ODI, and Dr Conostas of Cornell University and REDDI, on evidence generation and performance measurement (see recommendation 5), though not necessarily with a special focus on conflict situations and protracted crises. Prior to the evaluation, WFP and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) established a multi-year knowledge partnership aimed at laying the groundwork for evidence building, operational refinement and policy development around the peace agenda (in which resilience came up several times). Based on country studies that were conducted under this partnership, PRO-P has produced a paper on “Resilience Programming, Peace Contribution and Conflict Sensitivity”.

To implement the second sub-recommendation, an external consultant was hired to conduct a desk review of different evaluations, assessments and studies implemented by WFP in the past. However, the findings were inconclusive. The action has been put on hold, the reason being that the task of looking at the evidence generated was greater than the team’s capacity. It is, however, considered important to identify where the gaps in the evidence are and where to focus further research. Therefore, PRO-R will proceed by potentially commissioning another study.

The third sub-recommendation, commissioning an internal desk review of food security and resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crisis settings, is open according to R2 and further follow up is needed.

Conclusions

Despite the delay, there have been positive developments in response to all seven recommendations. Almost all actions identified in the management response have been implemented, despite it being considered an ambitious response.

Regarding recommendation 1, alternative approaches were used which this review found to be reasonable and effective (for example, creating a resilience toolkit instead of a strategy).

The implementation of some actions was not triggered by the recommendations, but they related to work that was already ongoing and/or initiated by other factors (for example, some parts of recommendations 3 and 6).

Recommendation 5 was partially implemented. The strategy and five-step approach to monitoring integrated resilience programmes helped reflect key considerations in the new Strategic Plan. These documents need, however, to be reviewed and updated in light of the new CRF. Furthermore, following the pilot testing, it is important to integrate resilience measurements into the CRF as well as the financial framework and corporate reporting guidance.

The purpose of the evaluation was to assist learning around resilience, and it has increased the understanding of and attention to resilience in the organization, in addition to the work that has been conducted in recent years.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: recommendations, actions and progress

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 1		Agreed		
<p>Establish an inter-divisional leadership team tasked with developing a strategy for enhancing resilience in order to achieve zero hunger and chaired by the Assistant Executive Director of the Operations Services Department.</p> <p>Responsibilities should include the following:</p> <p>i. Define clear principles for WFP's work on enhancing the resilience of women, men, boys and girls against shocks that set back progress on food security.</p>	Programme and Policy Development Department (PD)	1.1 WFP will review the principles outlined in the 2015 Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition and the conceptual framework for collaboration and partnership on strengthening resilience for food security and nutrition of the Rome-based agencies, in order to identify potential additional areas of engagement for WFP's work on enhancing the resilience of women, men, boys and girls against shocks.	Not applicable 31/12/2020 Open	Implemented The principles outlined in the 2015 policy were reviewed and a Resilience Design Support tool has been developed to support country offices in the integration of resilience building principles into programming.
ii. Define the contributions of different WFP units and divisions to the enhancement of resilience to different types of shocks, including climate, economic and political shocks, in different	PD	1.2 The resilience working group of the leadership team will foster the development of a business process that defines the roles of units and divisions in strengthening resilience before, during and after various types of shock and in various settings. The process model will be based on the 12 operational models described in response 1iii) below.	Not applicable 31/12/2020 Open	Implemented Eleven technical briefs that explain the contributions of different WFP units to the enhancement of resilience were developed and were integrated in the Resilience toolkit.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<p>iii. Develop a strategy for including explicit approaches to the enhancement of resilience in future country strategic plans (CSPs).</p> <p>iv. Define approaches to the strengthening of resilience in protracted crises and conflict situations.</p> <p>v. Define approaches to the strengthening of resilience in settings affected by recurrent and worsening climate shocks.</p> <p>vi. Review activities according to the resilience capacities that they are intended to support and link them to partnership mapping.</p> <p>vii. Conduct an internal review of, and synthesize existing knowledge about, WFP's approaches to and lessons learned from the implementation of programmes that contribute to enhanced resilience, including work on shock-responsive social protection.</p>	PD	1.3 WFP will develop a resilience strategy that is based on examples of 12 models for operations that contribute to strengthening resilience at various levels and in various settings. Country offices will be encouraged to draw from the operational models when designing CSPs that include activities which contribute to a resilience outcome. These models will then be tailored to different settings, priorities and national government requirements for use in future CSPs.	Not applicable 31/12/2020 Open	<p>Implemented</p> <p>The evaluation recommended developing a strategy, including explicit approaches to the enhancement of resilience in future CSPs. Management agreed and formulated action 1.3 in line with the recommendation, however a toolkit was developed instead. This review found the decision to develop a toolkit to be reasonable and appropriate to address the recommendation because it is intended to operationalize the WFP vision on resilience (which was the exact purpose of the strategy). It should also be noted that a specific page on designing resilience-building programmes (last updated in November 2021) was incorporated into the CSP manual.</p>
Recommendation 2		Agreed		

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<p>Integrate issues related to gender equality, empowerment and resilience into guidance on the zero hunger strategic review process and the Integrated Road Map (IRM) for country offices.</p> <p>An open set of questions that encourage country offices to adopt a resilience approach should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose resilience should WFP contribute to enhancing (by gender and age group)? • Against which types of shock does resilience need to be built (economic, political, climate)? • How will resilience be enhanced – through what combination of governance, social, ecological, technological, welfare, food or market assets and systems? • Which capacities can WFP best support? • How is WFP's contribution linked to those of other actors, including government entities? • What food security and nutrition-related results are expected? 	<p>Gender Office (GEN)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although facilitated by WFP, zero hunger strategic reviews are independent, country-owned exercises for “localizing” Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 2. WFP will continue to influence the country-specific approach and methodology for, and the analytical content of, each review and will promote the inclusion of gender equality, empowerment and resilience issues in country-owned processes where possible. WFP will also continue to advocate for inclusive and consultative zero hunger strategic review processes that ensure that the voices of various stakeholders are heard, follow a whole of society approach and include representatives of marginalized groups at risk of being left behind. • The Strategic Coordination and Support Division will review guidance on the preparations of zero hunger strategic reviews with a view to strengthening guidance on the inclusion of gender equality and empowerment issues in the review. • Where possible, guidance on the IRM and related issues will be reviewed, taking into consideration the inclusion of the questions raised in recommendation 2, first bullet, to recommendation 2 sixth bullet, where they are not already included in the existing guidance, and strengthening the coverage of issues that are already included as required. • Substantial inputs have already been provided by various divisions in the Operations Services Department and the Gender Office. These units 	<p>Not applicable 30/06/2019 Closed</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>This recommendation has been implemented by means of the Resilience toolkit, which provides country offices with information as to why gender is important in resilience building, by updating existing guidance that provides country offices information when designing their CSPs, and by updating the guidance on gender and zero hunger strategic reviews.</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
		will now review any relevant sections of the guidance from the perspective of resilience building. In particular, the following chapters of the IRM guidance on “Functional area resources for successful strategic reviews and country strategic plans” will be reviewed: chapter 17 by the Technical Assistance and Country Capacity Strengthening Service; chapter 18 by the Rural Resilience Pilot; chapter 24 by the Resilience and Prevention Unit; chapter 25 by the Food Systems Service; and chapter 27 by the Programme Policy Service.		
Recommendation 3		Agreed		
Strengthen the financial and partnership base for initiatives on resilience enhancement. i. Identify seed money for baseline data collection and the planning of integrated resilience initiatives. Funding could be provided through un-earmarked funds, such as the proposed 2030 Transition Fund.	Resource Management (RM)	i. Through the strategic resource allocation process, WFP will explore the use of un-earmarked funding in supporting country offices with the collection of baseline data and the planning of integrated resilience initiatives.	Not applicable 28/02/2021 Closed	Implemented The recommendation is being implemented as part of ongoing work.
ii. Develop a fundraising strategy for long-term funding of initiatives on resilience enhancement, including through thematic funding windows (such as for climate resilience) and engagement with the private sector (for example, on insurance instruments).	RM	ii. WFP will follow a holistic approach to fundraising in advocating for the commitment of resources at the strategic outcome level of CSPs, including resources for initiatives that are aimed at enhancing resilience. The approach will capitalize on strategic and operational partnerships for the attainment of commonly agreed outcomes.	Not applicable 31/12/2019 Closed	Implemented See above.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<p>iii. Revise the partnership action plan template in order to incorporate a “resilience lens” with explicit roles defined for government and non-governmental partners.</p>	<p>Public Partnership and Resourcing Division (PPR)</p>	<p>iii. A thorough internal review and lessons learned exercise on the use of partnership action plans have been undertaken, including a review of the template and related guidance. Guidance will be updated and issued by mid-2019 and will include guidance on the identification of and follow-up on thematic funding opportunities at the country office level.</p>	<p>Not applicable 30/06/2019 Closed</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>PPR revised the partnership action plan template to incorporate a “resilience lens” with explicit roles defined for governmental and non-governmental partners. Review of the first wave PAP has been done and recommendations applied. A new process and template has been prepared and is posted in WFPgo, a joint note with PD/PA for alignment with CSPs has been issued. Webinars have been held with the six regions between 2019 and 2020 to communicate the new generation of PAPs (2G).</p>
<p>Recommendation 4</p>		<p>Agreed</p>		

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<p>Building on the strategy developed (recommendation 1), commission a workforce study that assesses the horizontal and vertical adjustments needed in order to ensure that WFP employees can successfully deliver on resilience-focused commitments.</p> <p>The study would examine ways of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting the development of integrated teams to replace the “silos” working approach in country offices, regional bureaux and headquarters units and appointing team leaders who will lead on behalf of the various units represented in each team and be accountable to senior managers; • based on a sustainable financing model, increasing the availability of headquarters and regional bureau staff for providing sustained technical support to country offices, including through secondments; • at headquarters, maintaining specialist capacity to develop and curate technical methods and guidance suitable for incorporation in integrated programmes; • matching job profiles, skills and contract terms with needs, bearing in mind the long-term nature of resilience work; • developing a roster of “non-traditional” 	<p>Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Human Resources Division (HRM) will work with technical units on a corporate workforce planning exercise, which will ensure that WFP has the skills required for meeting the challenges of the future, including in resilience programming. The specialist capacities required for resilience programming will be compared with existing skills across WFP, and plans for filling gaps will be formulated using the full array of contractual modalities. Function-specific rosters for supporting resilience programming will be developed as part of this work. •WFP will enhance the technical support provided to country offices by regional bureaux and headquarters. Attaining a sustainable funding model for WFP programme activities remains a challenge, which was beyond the scope of the strategic evaluation. •Implementation of this recommendation is contingent on successful completion of the responses to recommendations 3(i) and 3(ii). In addition, limited specialist capacity will be developed at regional bureaux in order to facilitate evidence generation for the operational models and approaches described in the responses to recommendations 1 and 7. •The matching of job profiles, skills and contract terms will be part of a global staffing review, which is expected to start in 2019. HRM is exploring various contract options that are in accordance with WFP's funding rules and regulations and that would facilitate the use of 	<p>Not applicable 31/01/2021 Closed</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p> <p>HRM has completed, and WFP issued, a corporate staffing framework, while the strategic workforce planning exercise for PD is still ongoing and expected to be completed in April 2022.</p> <p>In addition to this, PRO-R maintains and regularly updates an internal roster of staff and consultants with knowledge and experience that can be made available to regional bureaux and country offices for short-term support.</p> <p>Management believes that WFP's internal capacity has increased compared to 2017. However, more still needs to be done to prepare the organization's workforce in resilience-building activities.</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<p>employment profiles useful for resilience programming; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • considering adding to staff performance evaluation an indicator of staff members' performance in working as part of an integrated team. 		<p>job profiles and contract terms that reflect the longer-term nature of resilience work. Examples will be documented and circulated as good practice among country offices and regional bureaux.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Technical units and divisions are encouraged to develop technical and leadership rosters of short-term consultants who can provide specific and timely technical support for operations and activities that contribute to resilience. In addition, the establishment of the "Future International Talent (FIT) pool" will provide WFP operations with vetted technical officers for deployment under fixed-term contracts in multi-year integrated resilience programmes. •Having considered the recommended indicator for working as part of an integrated team, management is of the view that such an indicator would be too specific for corporate use as a standard feature of the performance evaluation system. This does not prevent individual managers and staff members from including a performance indicator related to integrated team work, where appropriate. 		

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
Recommendation 5		Partially Agreed		
<p>Consolidate performance measurement data from resilience-related initiatives for corporate reporting and sharing with national partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a result tracking framework that is compatible with the corporate results framework (CRF). 	Monitoring and Evaluation Liaison (CPP - RMPM)	5.1 WFP acknowledges that there are gaps in the data and tools used for measuring resilience-building results. However, rather than developing a separate framework for tracking these results, WFP will explore the potential for developing indicators and methodologies for measuring resilience that would be integrated into the CRF. WFP will therefore use existing monitoring and reporting systems in addressing the specific recommendation points as follows (5.2, 5.3 and 5.4).	Not applicable 31/12/2020 Closed	Partially implemented PRO and Corporate Planning and Performance (CPP) co-financed research led by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) to review existing monitoring and reporting systems in WFP. The report then formed the basis of a programme of work to develop a WFP-specific measurement/monitoring approach for resilience aligned with the CRF. Yet, to date, resilience measures are not reflected in the CRF.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include information on the contributions and outcomes related to resilience, including underlying assumptions, that WFP and its partners expect to see in shock-prone populations. 	Programme - Humanitarian and Development Division (PRO)	5.2 Minimum standards for outcome and impact measurement, with underlying assumptions, will be developed drawing on quantitative and qualitative studies that help quantify the contributions that the activities of WFP and its partners make to building resilience in shock-prone areas.	Not applicable 31/12/2019 Closed	Implemented The five Theories of Change (ToCs), that describe different approaches as to how resilience capacities are built, provided the basis for identifying and achieving the outputs and outcomes, including the underlying assumptions.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop an aggregate or indexed score that feeds into the CRF, with short accompanying contextual descriptions of external and internal influences on the results. 	PRO	<p>5.3 Not all approaches to measuring resilience allow for the creation of aggregated or index-based scores. WFP will commission a desk review of the 45 resilience frameworks and tools referred to in the evaluation with a view to exploring how existing qualitative and quantitative indicators could be used to denote the changes that occur in various dimensions of resilience to hazards and stressors. Additional research will explore how to measure the rate at which households and communities recover from shocks for potential inclusion as a measurement tool.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p> <p>31/01/2021</p> <p>Closed</p>	<p>Implemented</p> <p>Approximately 400 measurement indicators were identified. Dr Mark Conostas of Cornell University and Resilience Evidence for Decisions in Development Initiative (REDDI) has collaborated with the Resilience Building Blocks Project to develop a process for resilience monitoring and measurement. Field testing of this process started in July 2021. However, developing an aggregated index that feeds into the CRF has been largely debated because it requires sophisticated modelling. Moreover, since integrated resilience packages are always context-specific, it is very difficult to have a universal index. The ODI study also confirmed there is no need to implement an aggregate index. For these reasons, WFP did not pursue the development of a composite indicator.</p>

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country offices should consider measuring differences in resilience outcomes using dedicated econometric analysis such as Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis II, ensuring that analytical processes can be conducted annually. Routine monitoring could act as a lighter, less expensive option for facilitating learning and reporting applied more regularly than a large-scale measurement of resilience capacities. <p>This recommendation is only feasible if WFP converges interventions to create resilience outcomes. Where interventions remain singular and separate, WFP should consider further use of perspective-based indicators (introduced in the CRF) to move beyond the output level monitoring to a better understanding of how interventions help or hinder people's ability to pursue food security.</p>	PRO	5.4 Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) II is complex and WFP will continue to collaborate with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on its development, while ensuring that stakeholders understand RIMA II and its role in WFP monitoring and reporting in specific instances. WFP will also explore the potential for using quantitative and qualitative analyses that examine resilience capacity and response indicators over time in order to measure resilience outcomes. In addition, as recommended by the resilience measurement working group of the Food Security Information Network, WFP will ensure that it puts equal emphasis on qualitative and quantitative or econometric analysis in highlighting and quantifying the impacts that its actions and those of its partners have on strengthening resilience against various shocks and stressors in different settings.	Not applicable 31/01/2021 Closed	Implemented WFP may use RIMA in countries where it collaborates with FAO because of availability of funding and resources for data collection and analysis. For other countries, a plausible contribution analysis has been developed.
Recommendation 6		Agreed		
<p>Strengthen the ability of headquarters units and regional bureaux to collect, collate and analyse information on covariate, transboundary and localized shocks before they happen.</p> <p>This would involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> expanding the use of climate modelling and linking it to existing information from 	PRO	6.1 Where possible, WFP will identify such data sources and integrate them into programme design tools and the workstreams that are being pursued jointly with partners, such as integrated context analyses, emergency food security analyses, seasonal livelihoods programming, the Shock Impact Simulation Model and comprehensive food security and vulnerability analyses.	Not applicable 30/06/2021 (6.1) Closed	Implemented Various types of analysis have been implemented since 2019 to understand better and operationalize the data on climate modelling and the data's relevance to resilience programming.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
market, agro-ecological and population data (possibly including other categories, such as data on drops in remittances);				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reviewing WFP's information systems with a view to strengthening the connections among different databases and thereby enlarging the evidence base for resilience programming; 	PRO	6.2 As part of WFP's digital transformation initiative, the Programme and Policy Division (OSZ now become PD) will work with the Emergency Preparedness and Support Response Division and other divisions in the Operations Services Department on a review of information systems, such as Automated Disaster Analysis and Mapping, the Data Visualization Platform for Agro-Climatic Seasonal Monitoring, the operations portal OPweb, the Corporate Alert System and early warning with a view to strengthening connections among different databases.	Not applicable 31/12/2020 (6.2) Open	Implemented Existing analytics were made available digitally onto different platforms to make them inter-operable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supporting regional bodies in connecting and understanding the food security implications and uses of their data; and 	PRO	6.3 Headquarters and regional bureaux will continue to engage with global and regional entities in order to create links among different data streams for decision making and advocacy purposes.	Not applicable 31/12/2020 (6.3) Closed	No information available

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuing to test the “trigger” functions introduced by index-based insurance (the Rural Resilience Initiative and the African Risk Capacity initiative) and forecast-based financing for facilitating early, anticipatory action in shock-prone settings. 	PRO	6.4 WFP will continue to test the advance financing and risk financing mechanisms that are supported by forecast-based financing, African Risk Capacity and micro-insurance. It will also explore the application of these tools in order to strengthen resilience to various non-weather-related shocks in different settings. WFP will continue to advocate for multi-year investments in preparedness, recovery and resilience-building, which will complement the resources generated through “trigger” functions by governments, development partners and other United Nations agencies.	Not applicable 31/01/2021 (6.4) Closed	Implemented The testing of the “trigger” functions introduced by index-based insurance and forecast-based financing for facilitating early, anticipatory action in shock-prone settings has been implemented, and the latter has been up-scaled from quick onset shocks to also slow onset shocks.
Recommendation 7		Agreed		
Support the generation of evidence on the relevance of food security and resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crises. This would include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with research institutions, governments and United Nations partners, including those with specialized mandates on gender, to commission operational research and evaluations to generate learning and evidence on the appropriateness of resilience programming for different individuals (women, men, boys, and girls) and communities. 	PRO	7.1 Resources permitting, WFP will continue to expand its work with research institutes such as SIPI and Peri-Peri in order to deepen the evidence base on the appropriateness of resilience programming for various individuals, and household communities in various settings. In addition, WFP will participate in and review partners’ learning and evidence building on resilience in conflict-affected areas and other settings, including the findings of research supported by global working groups, such as Resilience Evidence for Decisions in Development (www.fsincop.net/resource-centre/detail/en/c/1144786/)	31/01/2021 (7.1) Closed	Partially implemented PRO-R engaged several external academic and research institutes such as the ODI and Cornell University on evidence generation and performance measurement (see recommendation 5), though not necessarily with a special focus on conflict situations and protracted crises. PRO-P has also produced a paper on “Resilience Programming, Peace Contribution and Conflict Sensitivity” based on work done with SIPRI.

Recommendations	Action by	Management response / Actions	Priority Closure date Status*	Assessment of progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizing a wide consultation with WFP's current or past beneficiaries from these contexts to establish how food/cash/asset/other interventions help or hinder their coping strategies. 	PRO	7.2 WFP has commissioned studies including analyses and assessments of the impacts of different transfer modalities and activities on empowerment, nutrition and food security in conflict, protracted crisis and other settings. A desk review of the findings will be conducted in order to inform the development of ToR for further field research on how different interventions influence coping strategies.	31/12/2019 (7.2) Open	<p>Partially implemented</p> <p>An external consultant was hired to conduct a desk review of different evaluations, assessments and studies implemented by WFP in the past. However, the findings were inconclusive. The action has been put on hold.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation or review of WFP's interventions in this area with attention to entry and exit strategies and beneficiary experience. 	PRO	7.3 WFP will commission an internal desk review of food security and resilience interventions in conflict and protracted crisis settings, from which to identify good practices for circulation by the resilience working group of the leadership team (see response to recommendation 1.1).	30/06/2020 (7.3) Open	<p>Not Implemented</p> <p>This action has not been implemented. Yet, in response to recommendation 1, five ToCs have been developed. These are generic templates but can be applied to resilience in conflict and protracted crisis settings.</p>

* According to R2 Database 29/03/2021

Annex 2: abbreviations and acronyms

CPP	Corporate Planning and Performance
CRF	Corporate result framework
CSP	Country strategic plan
FIT	Future International Talent
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PAP	Partnership Action Plan
PD	Programme and Policy Development Department
PPR	Public Partnerships and Resourcing Division
PRO	Programme – Humanitarian and Development Division
PRO-R	Asset Creation and Livelihoods Unit
RAM	Research, Assessment and Monitoring Division
REDDI	Resilience Evidence for Decisions in Development Initiative
RIMA	Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis
RM	Resource Management Department
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
STR	Strategic Partnerships Division
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNSDCF	UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
ZHSR	Zero Hunger Strategic Review

Annex 3: Persons Interviewed

Deborah McWhinney	Senior Evaluation Manager, Office of Evaluation
Kathryn Milliken	Climate Change Adviser , Regional Bureau for Latina America and the Caribbean
Mark Gordon	Chief, Resilience & Food Systems Service
Monia Ladjimi	Budget and Programming Officer, Resource Management Department
Natasha Nadazdin	Chief, Corporate Planning and Performance Division
Oscar Ekdahl	Programme Policy Officer – Climate Change and DRM, Regional Bureau for the Middle East and Northern Africa
Patrick Foley	Consultant Programme Policy, Emergencies and Transitions Service
Ronald Tranbahuy	Deputy Director, Field Monitoring Service
Rossella Fanelli	External Relations Officer, Public Partnerships and Resourcing Division
Vera Mayer	Programme Officer, Climate & Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes Unit
William Affif	Head, Programme Cycle Unit
Zalynn Peishi	Senior Programme Consultant, Resilience & Food Systems Service

Annex 4. Documents Consulted

Executive Board documents

Beasley, D. (2019). Transcript from speech at the June 2019 Annual Session of the Executive Board. WFP, Rome.

"Management response to the recommendations deriving from the strategic evaluation of WFP's support for enhanced resilience" (WFP/EB.1/2019/7-A/Add.1).

Non-Executive Board documents

WFP. (2019). *Post hoc Quality Assessment of WFP Evaluations: Strategic evaluation of WFP's support for enhanced resilience*. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. (2019). *'Strategic Evaluation of WFP Support for Enhanced Resilience'*. OEVI/2017/003. WFP, Rome.

ODI. (2021). *Guiding resilience measurement in WFP's monitoring and evaluation. Synthesis Paper*. Internal document, unpublished.

ODI. (2020). *Review of resilience-building indicators. Guiding WFP's monitoring and evaluation*. Draft document. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. (2020). *Approaches to and Principles of WFP's Resilience Building Programmes*. Internal document, unpublished.

WFP. (2020) *Gender & National Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews*. Internal document, unpublished.

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

WFP. (2021). *Resilience Toolkit Module A to D testing version*. Internal document, unpublished.

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

WFP. (2019). *WFP Partnership Action Plans Guidance Note*. Internal document, unpublished

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/independent-evaluation