

Strategic Evaluation

From Food Aid to Food Assistance- Working in Partnership: A Strategic Evaluation – Vol. IV Survey results: Partnership Scorecard Review (Annex xxv)

January 05, 2012

Commissioned by the
Office of Evaluation
Measuring Results, Sharing Lessons

Prepared by

Dale Thompson, Team Leader
Kate Godden, Evaluator
John Horekens, Evaluator
Stuart Reid, Subject Matter Specialist
David Fleet, Subject Matter Specialist
Emma Mason, Researcher
Jeffery Ruhl, Researcher
K. Tracy Wallis, Assistant

[Report number: OE/2012/003]



WFP

World Food Programme

wfp.org

Acknowledgements

Before commencing this Evaluation Report, we would like to express our sincere thanks to all stakeholders with whom we have collaborated during this evaluation, giving special recognition to the staff and management of WFP offices worldwide. We also wish to thank the staff and management of OE for rapidly mobilizing data, and for engaging a network of global partners in the evaluation process. It is as a direct result of this level of cooperation and enthusiasm that the realization of this evaluation has become possible.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed are those of the Evaluation Team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme. 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.

The designation employed and the presentation of material in the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WFP concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

Evaluation Management

Evaluation Manager:	Jamie Watts
Director, Office of Evaluation:	Helen Wedgewood

Annex XXV - Survey results: Partnership Scorecard Review

Table of Contents

1. Non-Governmental Organizations	1
1.1 Aide-Memoire Field Agreements – WFP/ICRC 1999	1
1.2 FLA – WFP/Action Aid Kenya 2010	3
1.3 FLA – WFP/Consortium for Cooperative partners 2010	6
1.4 LOU – WFP/CI 1998	9
1.5 MOU ACF 1997	11
1.6 MOU ADRA 1997	14
1.7 MOU Care Australia 1996	17
1.8 MOU Care Canada 2001	19
1.9 MOU Care US 1996	22
1.10 MOU Concern 2001	25
1.11 MOU CRS 1995	28
1.12 MOU FHI 1996	30
1.13 Mou GAA 1996	33
1.14 MOU Islamic Relief 2006	36
1.15 MOU LWF 1998	38
1.16 MOU Movimondo Molisv 1998	41
1.17 MOU MVP 2009	44
1.18 MOU SCF US 1996	46
1.19 MOU WVI 1996	49
1.20 Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Danish Refugee Council 1999	52
1.21 SA – WFP/Swiss Federation of Mine Action 2002	54
1.22 SA – WFP/Norwegian Refugee Council 2002	57
1.23 SA – WFP/RedR Aus. 2003	59
1.24 TA – WFP/Islamic Relief Worldwide 2007	62
1.25 TA – WFP/Mercy Corps 2007	65
2. Private Sector	68
2.1 Framework Contract – WFP/Ericsson 2005	68
2.2 MOU – WFP/Koninklijke DSM N.V 2007	70
2.3 MOU – WFP/TNT 2009	72
2.4 SA – WFP/Ericsson AB 2003	74
2.5 SA – WFP/Svendborg Marine Surveyors A/S 2004	77
3. Regional & Governmental	80
3.1 General Agreement – WFP/Ghana 2006	80
3.2 General Agreement – WFP/Malaysia 2010	82
3.3 IA – WFP/Italian Ministry of Defence 2007	84
3.4 MOU (SBA) – WFP/The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation 2003	86
3.5 MOU – WFP/DFID 2000	89
3.6 MOU – WFP/Minister of Development Cooperation of the Netherlands 2000	91

3.7	MOU – WFP/League of Arab States 2004	93
3.8	MOU – WFP/Panama 2008	96
3.9	MOU – WFP/Swiss Humanitarian Aid 1996	98
3.10	MOU – Sweden 2000	101
3.11	MOU – WFP/The Peace Corps 2007	103
3.12	SA – WFP/Directorate for Civil Defence and Emergency Planning 2003	105
3.13	SA – WFP/UK Department for International Development 2003	108
3.14	SA – WFP/EMERCOM (Rus.) 2003	111
3.15	SA – WFP/Republic of France 2009	113
3.16	SA – WFP/Iceland’s Crisis Response Unit 2003	116
3.17	SA – WFP/Irish Aid 2007	119
3.18	SA – WFP/Swedish Civil Aviation Authority 2003	121
3.19	SA – WFP/Swedish Rescue Services Agency 2003	124
3.20	Subgrant Agreement – WFP/Thai Red Cross Aids Research Centre 2010	126
3.21	TA – WFP/Denmark 1996	129
3.22	TA – WFP/ECOWAS 2010	131
3.23	TA – WFP/German Technical Assistance Grant 1998	134
3.24	TA – WFP/Irish Aid 2006	136
3.25	TA – WFP/SRSA 2006	139
4.	UN Bodies	142
4.1	Cooperation Framework Agreement – WFP/UNDP 2010	142
4.2	Letter of Intent – WFP/WHO 2001	144
4.3	Letter of Understanding on Technical Cooperation – WFP/ICAO 2001	146
4.4	MOU – WFP/FAO 1999	148
4.5	MOU – WFP/UN DHA 1995	151
4.6	MOU – WFP/UNDP	153
4.7	MOU – WFP/UNDRO 1976	155
4.8	MOU – WFP/UNEP 2011	157
4.9	MOU – WFP/UNFPA 2010	159
4.10	MOU – WFP/UNHCR 2011	162
4.11	MOU – WFP/UNICEF 2011	164
4.12	TA – WFP/FAO 2007	166
4.13	TA – WFP/UNV 1996	169
4.14	TA – WFP/WHO 2007	171

1. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

1.1 AIDE-MEMOIRE FIELD AGREEMENTS – WFP/ICRC 1999

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Aide-Memoire Field Agreements – WFP/ICRC (1999)		N.B. This document supplements an earlier (1999) Letter of Understanding which will also be reviewed here to provide context. Also, both Aide-Memoire and Letter of Understanding are unsigned.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	
Identification of representatives and their status	5	Representatives named and identified in LOU, not in Aide-Memoire (AM)

WHY?		
Vision statement	7	Expressed in LOU. Little detail in AM.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	As above.
WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Sketched, but not in detail. Field Agreements are to be ad hoc.

WHY?		
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vaguely defined: Partners can either be donor or recipient depending on inventory and needs assessment, and availability of surplus materials.
Roles and responsibilities	5	As above: roles and responsibilities shift based on need or surplus reflecting the ad hoc spirit presiding over the agreement.
Performance indicators	4	Field level reporting following operation; operations will not require monitoring by donor partner (assumed to be “good faith” understanding).
Sustainability strategy	0	Requires greater detail.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not outlined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Detailed at field level.
Milestones	2	Milestones should be more concretely developed to help manage and guide partnership goals and objectives beyond field level.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Requires greater detail.
Governance arrangements	5	As above.
Decision-making procedures	5	Primarily made ad hoc at field level with HQ consultation.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	6	Generally detailed.
Measures to mitigate risks	0	Not defined.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	5	Unspecified commitment to study opportunities for potential collaborative training ventures contained in LOU as well as bilateral information sharing/review meetings and what appears to be a “good faith” arrangement between partners omitting donor monitoring of recipient operations. Assumed to build trust between partners. (This is also contained in AM).
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners’ objectives & shared objectives	2	Requires greater detail/metrics, etc...
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A – As this is a field level agreement, it is assumed that personnel working in the field have already undergone these procedures.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	5	Requires greater detail.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	These are ad hoc agreements made at field level assumed to rest outside of this domain.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	As above.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	5	Requires greater specification.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	5	Unclear as to whether termination arrangements are for individual agreements or partnership as a whole.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 110 out of 270

1.2 FLA – WFP/ACTION AID KENYA 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood

– 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
FLA –WFP/Action Aid Kenya (2010)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	2	Minimal description of partner org. No description of WFP.
Identification of representatives and their status	2	FLA signed, however representatives' names not clearly identified. Action Aid rep's title identified, but not WFP's. No other representatives or liaison contacts identified within the document.

WHY?		
Vision statement	0	Not defined
Shared objectives	3	Expressed in WFP FLA template; "shared" objectives not articulated beyond standard objectives and obligations set forth by WFP.
Individual partner objectives	0	Objectives identified and expressed by EACH partner non-existent. Again, expressed in standardized WFP language e.g. Organization X will to fulfil preset objectives determined by WFP.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Outline work plan	8	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	8	As above.
Performance indicators	4	Expressed in terms of WFP expectations and monitoring of partners' performance. Partner obligated to report on performance. Reciprocal performance indicators outside of resource, technical and funding obligations made by WFP not well defined.
Sustainability strategy	3	Implied, but not defined as such. A specific section outlining sustainability strategy would be useful.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Apart from standard clauses relating to commodity and equipment, Force Majure, liability, immunity and negligence, risks pertaining to specific partnership and individual partners not specified.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Milestones	8	As above

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined, but asymmetrical or “Top down.”
Governance arrangements	5	As above. Moreover, agreement infers that partnership will be governed by WFP.
Decision-making procedures	5	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Stated, but could be more fully addressed and considered, again, with respect to specific partnership and individual partners.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	3	Stated in standard terms; non-specific to partner. No provisions made for scheduled meetings between partners for purpose of partner review, or inter-agency review/steering committee as with other agreements.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners’ objectives & shared objectives	4	This is more developed than with other partnership agreement templates. However, actual metrics not defined, rather reporting obligations outlined in agreement. Moreover, “individual” and “shared” objectives seem to derive solely from WFP as FLA is a standard template. Again, top-down...
Health check / review procedures	2	Vaguely expressed in terms of commodity and cargo transport (e.g. “WFP seeks to ensure commodities are fit for human consumption...”). Ill defined with respect to personnel and beneficiaries.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	3	Vaguely described in terms of community consultation mobilization and sensitization relating to project goals and objectives.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Vaguely defined within WFP FLA standard template. Communication protocols relating to constituents and other interested parties unique to partnership not specifically defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	5	Well defined as per WFP FLA standard template. However, the agreement stipulates that barring an amenable settlement between parties, conflict resolution is to be arbitrated in accordance with English legal code. Such a provision potentially reinforces asymmetrical and historic tensions between developed and developing states and, again, potentially undermines the collaborative equitable and reciprocal qualities that govern a healthy partnership.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	8	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	4	Minimally defined, some provisions made within document (e.g. retention of records by partner for 5 years following termination). A section specifically dedicated to an Exit Strategy including short and long term goals/obligations created by BOTH parties would be useful.

TOTAL SCORE: 139 out of 300

1.3 FLA – WFP/CONSORTIUM FOR COOPERATIVE PARTNERS 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
FLA –WFP/ Consortium for Cooperating Partners (COCOP) (2010)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	2	Minimal description of partner org. No description of WFP.
Identification of representatives and their status	1	FLA signed, however representatives' names and titles not identified. Moreover, no contacts listed in document.

WHY?		
Vision statement	0	Not defined
Shared objectives	3	Expressed in WFP FLA template; "shared" objectives not articulated beyond standard objectives and obligations set forth by WFP.
Individual partner objectives	0	Objectives identified and expressed by EACH partner non-existent. Again, expressed in standardized WFP language e.g. Organization X will fulfil preset objectives pre-determined by WFP.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Outline work plan	8	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	8	As above.
Performance indicators	4	Expressed in terms of WFP expectations and monitoring of partners' performance. Partner obligated to report on performance. Reciprocal performance indicators outside of resource, technical and funding obligations made by WFP not well defined.
Sustainability strategy	3	Implied, but not defined as such. A specific section outlining sustainability strategy would be useful.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Apart from standard clauses relating to commodity and equipment, Force Majure, liability, immunity and negligence, risks pertaining to specific partnership and individual partners not specified.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Milestones	8	As above

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined, but asymmetrical or “Top down.”
Governance arrangements	5	As above. Moreover, agreement infers that partnership will be governed by WFP.
Decision-making procedures	5	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Stated, but could be more fully addressed and considered, again, with respect to specific partnership and individual partners.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	3	Stated in standard terms; non-specific to partner. No provisions made for scheduled meetings between partners for purpose of partner review, or inter-agency steering committee as with other agreements.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners’ objectives & shared objectives	4	This is more developed than with other partnership agreement templates. However, actual metrics not defined, rather reporting obligations outlined in agreement. Moreover, “individual” and “shared” objectives seem to derive solely from WFP as FLA is a standard template. Again, top-down...
Health check / review procedures	2	Vaguely expressed in terms of commodity and cargo transport (e.g. “WFP seeks to ensure commodities are fit for human consumption...”). Ill defined with respect to personnel and beneficiaries.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	3	Vaguely described in terms of community consultation mobilization and sensitization relating to project goals and objectives.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Vaguely defined within WFP FLA standard template. Communication protocols relating to constituents and other interested parties unique to partnership not specifically defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	5	Well defined as per WFP FLA standard template. However, the agreement stipulates that barring an amenable settlement between parties, conflict resolution is to be arbitrated in accordance with English legal code. Such a provision potentially reinforces asymmetrical and historic tensions between developed and developing nations and, again, potentially undermines the collaborative and reciprocal qualities that govern a healthy partnership.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	8	Defined as per WFP FLA standard template.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	4	Minimally defined, some provisions made within document (e.g. retention of records by partner for 5 years following termination). A section specifically dedicated to an Exit Strategy including short and long term goals/obligations created by BOTH parties would be useful.

TOTAL SCORE: 138 out of 300

1.4 LOU – WFP/CI 1998

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
LOU – WFP/CI (1998)		N.B. Letter is unsigned and authored solely by WFP E.D.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	5	Vague description of partners/missions
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	7	Broadly defined.
Shared objectives	6	As above.
Individual partner objectives	2	Poorly defined. Individual objectives help to maintain the synergy animating partnership.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	7	Broadly detailed; specific projects and activities TBD at HQ and country office level.
Outline work plan	5	Work plans to be specified in country level arrangements between WFP Country Office and CI Members. Agreements to be based on LOA.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Requires greater detail.
Roles and responsibilities	5	As above; WFP assumes leadership role in partnership.
Performance indicators	5	Reporting mechanisms for HQs and country level agreements to be established. However, letter stipulates that in joint-operations where WFP is food commodity donor, CI member will submit regular financial and operational reports, and will provide final report when requested by WFP. These provisions do not exist vice-versa.
Sustainability strategy	3	Further development required in this regard.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Some liability provisions.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	4	Scheduling requires greater development.
Milestones	4	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Requires greater definition and symmetry.
Governance arrangements	5	Commitment to establish joint-taskforce at HQ level. Field level arrangements to be governed by field offices.
Decision-making procedures	5	Commitments to further consultation; decision making procedures not specified.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	0	Not specified.
Measures to mitigate risks	4	More detail required.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	5	To be pursued. Still in development stages as partnership comes into effect.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	Ill defined. Metrics need to be established in addition or, to compliment review mechanisms.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A - As partnership defined at country and HQ levels, it is assumed that personnel are already covered under such provisions.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Generally outlined through commitment to establish joint review and other consultation mechanisms.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	0	Not defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	6	Broadly defined; should be more rigorously developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	0	Not defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	0	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	As above.

TOTAL SCORE: 111 out of 290

1.5 MOU ACF 1997

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be

split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/ACF (2007)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Mission outlined; partner organizations not fully described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	Well defined.
Individual partner objectives	9	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	9	Well defined.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	Well defined.
Roles and responsibilities	9	Well defined.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual review. Indicators could be more concretely defined.

WHAT?		
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally considered in terms of audit and organizational enmeshment. Strategy could be more clearly expressed.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Briefly mentioned in terms of 3 rd party liability.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	0	None outlined.
Milestones	0	None outlined.
HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	9	Well defined.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Well defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Defined in terms of audit provisions, but risk assessment and subsequent mitigation of same lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	Expressed in agreement for annual consultations at country level for the purposes of identifying and pursuing further opportunities and possibilities for streamlining.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	None specifically outlined; although provisions detailed for annual head offices review.
Health check / review procedures	0	None outlined.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	9	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	8	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not evident.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	0	None specified.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	Well defined.

WHAT IF?		
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 189 300

1.6 MOU ADRA 1997

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached "Essential Elements" to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the "comments"
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU - WFP/Adventist Development and Relief Agency (1997)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.

HOW?		
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206

300

1.7 MOU CARE AUSTRALIA 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU - WFP/Care Australia 1996		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners’ mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.

HOW?		
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206 300

1.8 MOU CARE CANADA 2001

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/CARE Canada (2001)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners’ mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.

WHAT?		
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. “Next steps” following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit (‘moving on’) strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206 300

1.9 MOU CARE US 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references

- 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
- 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/CARE US (1996)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. “Next steps” following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit (‘moving on’) strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206 300

1.10 MOU CONCERN 2001

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/CONCERN (2001)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.

WHO?		
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.
WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.

HOW?		
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206

300

1.11 MOU CRS 1995

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Catholic Relief Services (1995)		N.B. A revised 1996 MOU extends scope of collaboration to non-emergency/development; establishes annual HQ review; affirms commitment to improve the condition of women; Re-titles the MOU to “MOU on Collaborative working arrangements.”

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	Well defined.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	Well defined.
Individual partner objectives	9	Well defined

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Outline work plan	9	Well defined.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Broadly defined. Specific or estimated dollar amounts/budgetary considerations are not evident.
Roles and responsibilities	9	Well defined.
Performance indicators	7	Implied in semi-annual HQ review and “regular” field-level assessments. However, this is amended to annual HQ review in the revised 1996 MOU.
Sustainability strategy	6	Implied throughout; could be more directly engaged within MOU.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	Ill-defined. Potential risks should be considered more thoroughly.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Apart from e.g. Semi-Annual HQ Reviews and some other deadline commitments, firm deadlines as described in later NGO MOUs (e.g. Care Aus 1996) not evident.
Milestones	6	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	9	Well defined and collaborative.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Comprehensive. However estimated dollar amounts not specified.
Measures to mitigate risks	2	MOU does not specifically assess risk or offer tangible measures for mitigation.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well covered in HQ reviews, field-level assessments, collaborative training and ongoing consultation at HQ and field levels.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners’ objectives & shared objectives	5	Tangible metrics outstanding, but implied in HQ review, field level-assessments, etc...
Health check / review procedures	2	Not specifically evident; should be more fully developed in light of risks to workers/health and S-E data for target populations/beneficiaries.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	2	Not defined as in later NGO MOUs (e.g. Care Aus 1995).
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	1	As above.

COMMUNICATION		
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	9	Well defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 199 out of 300

1.12 MOU FHI 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague, non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10 = Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU - WFP/Food for the Hungry Int'l (1996)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.

WHAT IF?		
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206 300

1.13 MOU GAA 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/German Agro Action (1996)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.

HOW?		
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206

300

1.14 MOU ISLAMIC RELIEF 2006

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Islamic Relief Worldwide (2006)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partners identified but not described; a brief description of the individual partners and their mandates would be useful in terms of rationalizing/contextualizing the partnership.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Could be more clearly expressed in terms of individual mandates of partner organizations and the specific vision that these individual orgs. share so the partnership may be more thoroughly rationalized.

WHY?		
Shared objectives	6	General objectives are stated. However, as above, could be more concretely framed in terms of individual mandates and contextualized within a more nuanced shared vision. This MOU leaves aspects of collaboration and specific responsibilities to be developed at the “design stage” of project.
Individual partner objectives	6	Again, remains general and follows WFP MOU template (i.e. WFP provides food resources; IR distributes at local level).

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Well defined.
Outline work plan	8	Well defined.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	Well defined.
Roles and responsibilities	8	Well defined.
Performance indicators	9	MOU establishes audit mechanisms and data collection for purposes of monitoring vulnerability factors and resource utilization in terms of development. It also establishes other review mechanisms such as annual headquarter performance reviews.
Sustainability strategy	6	Sustainability strategy could be more explicitly stated in MOU.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Briefly described in terms of assumption of liability for lost or damaged commodities. Risks (if any) could be more clearly stated.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	Duration of partnership not defined; however, firm timelines in place for report submission and performance review.
Milestones	0	Not defined.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	6	Procedures or mechanisms for decision making should be more clearly defined.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Risks are ill-defined as are measures of mitigation.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	Well defined.

HOW?		
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	3	Mechanisms in place (e.g. Annual Performance Review). However, actual metrics for evaluation non-existent.
Health check / review procedures	3	Health check/review procedures should be more concretely defined as such.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	9	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	6	Expressed in terms of host nations, other NGO's, etc. However, protocols could be more clearly expressed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 201 out of 300

1.15 MOU LWF 1998

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached "Essential Elements" to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the "comments"

- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Lutheran World Foundation (1998)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.

WHAT?		
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. “Next steps” following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit (‘moving on’) strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206 300

1.16 MOU MOVIMONDO MOLISV 1998

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Movimondo Molisv (1998)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.

HOW?		
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	10	Well defined in terms of Italian and international operations.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 207

300

1.17 MOU MVP 2009

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Millennium Villages Project (2009)		N.B. MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	10	Well defined.
Individual partner objectives	10	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined.
Outline work plan	7	Generally defined under “Collaborative Objectives”; specifics left to subsequent implementation agreements to be negotiated following this MOU.

WHAT?		
Resource commitments from each partner	7	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	7	As above.
Performance indicators	8	Expressed through commitments to monitoring and evaluation “M&E” procedures and assumed to be addressed more fully in subsequent implementation agreements.
Sustainability strategy	8	Defined throughout Recitals and Collaborative Objectives in terms of establishment of sustainable outcomes for beneficiaries, not as fully defined in terms of sustainability of partnership.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	Ill defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	2	Not concretely defined; assumed to be more fully developed in future implementation agreements.
Milestones	2	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Collaborative and consultative; relationship to be managed through implementation agreements. Commitment to annual HQ reviews as in other NGO MOUs not evident.
Governance arrangements	7	Defined in terms of ongoing partner consultation and the negotiation of further implementation agreements that specifically address collaborative objectives. Individual governing boards have final authority.
Decision-making procedures	7	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	6	Generally expressed; assumed to be more specifically determined in future implementation agreements.
Measures to mitigate risks	4	Risk assessment and measures for mitigation not detailed outside of measures to protect individual public profiles and confidentiality.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Defined in terms of pursuing further implementation agreements
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners’ objectives & shared objectives	5	Implied in commitment to develop further implementation agreements built upon this MOU based on needs, available resources and objectives of individual partners. However, no specific metrics detailed.
Health check / review procedures	7	Defined in terms of monitoring and evaluation “M&E” of beneficiary health and nutrition. Detailed procedures not specified.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Generally defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	10	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	10	Well defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	10	Well defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	1	Ill defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	1	Ill defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 212 out of 300

1.18 MOU SCF US 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached "Essential Elements" to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the "comments"
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Save the Children US (1996)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	Well described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	More collaborative/nuanced tone than otherwise generic NGO MOUs.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	9	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	9	Well described.
Resource commitments from each partner	9	Well defined.
Roles and responsibilities	9	As above.
Performance indicators	7	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations; data reporting on food-aid operations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	7	This MOU is comprehensive and as such, lays a foundation for sustainability. However, strategy could be more clearly expressed and specifically stated..
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Risks could be more thoroughly vetted.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.

HOW?		
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. While this MOU is more collaborative in tone, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and other specified areas of consultation allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual or potential costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation identified risks could be more fully developed.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics could potentially be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	10	Well defined in terms of Italian and international operations.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Outlines distribution of non-proprietary information between partners AND protection of proprietary information when necessary (secs. 69, 70 & 76).
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	8	Outlined in terms of the establishment of advisory/communications structures that allow communities and other aid agencies to effectively interface with beneficiaries as well as WFP establishment of coordinating mechanisms with other NGOs, orgs., donors, governments, etc...

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. “Next steps” following grievance negotiations not specified). Also, establishes mechanism for resolving issues relating to policy.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit (‘moving on’) strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 236 300

1.19 MOU WVI 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/World Vision Int’l (1996)		N.B. This MOU is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partner organizations identified but neither orgs. nor their missions fully described. For a suitable example, see TA WFP/Islamic Relief 2007.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Stated, but generic to MOU template. Could be more nuanced to individual partner orgs and reflect individual partners' mission/vision.
Shared objectives	8	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	Individual responsibilities broadly stated, specific objectives could be more nuanced and contextualized in terms of individual missions of partner orgs.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined
Outline work plan	7	Could be more fully/schematically developed.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Broadly defined; specifics said to follow at design and appraisal stage of project.
Performance indicators	6	Generally expressed in terms of annual HQ review; socio-economic and nutrition data tracking; audit mechanisms; country-level consultations. Indicators could be more concretely defined.
Sustainability strategy	5	Not specifically described; more generally expressed as above. Strategy could be more clearly expressed in terms of specific goals, measures, budgetary considerations, etc... for maintaining sustainability.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Expressed in terms of liability for commodity losses (sec. 15). Otherwise, not specifically defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well expressed in terms of annual country-level consultations, annual HQ review and other process-related deadlines.
Milestones	5	Implied as above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.

HOW?		
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance of partnership as outlined in MOU largely rests with WFP/UN protocols and procedures.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above. However annual HQ reviews and country-level consultations allow for greater opportunities for bi-lateral decision making.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Well defined. However, specific details (e.g. budgetary considerations, actual costs, etc...) not outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generally defined in terms of audit procedure, country-level consultation and annual HQ reviews. However, detailed risk assessment and measures for mitigation lacking.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	None specifically outlined; although implied in annual HQ review and data tracking provisions. Specific metrics should be developed within MOU in terms of establishing a detailed rubric that appraises attainment of objectives and goals as envisioned by the partner orgs.
Health check / review procedures	5	Briefly described in terms of the collection of socio-economic and nutritional data (sec. 23).

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	10	Well defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Protocols could be more clearly expressed/developed.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Well defined. Although outcomes of grievance resolution negotiations at partner HQ level not detailed (i.e. "Next steps" following grievance negotiations not specified).
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 206

300

1.20 STAND-BY AGREEMENT – WFP/DANISH REFUGEE COUNCIL 1999

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Danish Refugee Council (1999)		N.B. This agreement was amended in 2004; Of note: stand-by personnel shall operate under the direction of UNJLC officer.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with proposed project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Well defined in terms of timeframes for missions, reporting and annual reviews.
Milestones	N/A	

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	8	Well defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	8	Well defined. However, governance is predominately managed through WFP.
Decision-making procedures	8	Defined, especially under consultation article (X). However, decision making largely rests under the auspices of WFP.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Well defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	8	Defined in terms of insurance and coverage of liability. Especially in articles pertaining to Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX)
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Generally described under consultations article (X) in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	4	As above. However, no specific metrics detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not explicitly described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 160 out of 270

1.21 SA – WFP/SWISS FEDERATION OF MINE ACTION 2002

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Swiss Federation of Mine Action (2002)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.
HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ("moving on") strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

1.22 SA – WFP/NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL 2002

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Norwegian Refugee Council (2002).		N.B. This agreement was amended in 2004; Of note: stand-by personnel shall operate under the direction of UNJLC officer. Moreover, while generic in format, this Stand-By Agreement does not include Article VI (Service Modules) as in other SBAs (e.g. DRC 1999).

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.

WHY?		
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with proposed project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).

HOW?		
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

1.23 SA – WFP/REDR AUS. 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/RedR Aus. (2003)		N.B. This agreement was amended in 2004; Of note: stand-by personnel shall operate under the direction of UNJLC officer.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outlined Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.

WHAT?		
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.

COMMUNICATION		
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

1.24 TA – WFP/ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/Islamic Relief Worldwide (2007)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners' individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and Force Majeure)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.

WHEN?		
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 158 out of 260

1.25 TA – WFP/MERCY CORPS 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/Mercy Corps (2007)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	General description of Mercy Corps and its mission.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.

WHY?		
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners' individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and <i>Force Majeure</i>)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 155 out of 260

2. PRIVATE SECTOR

2.1 FRAMEWORK CONTRACT – WFP/ERICSSON 2005

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Framework Contract – WFP/Ericsson (2005)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partners identified.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	8	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	
Outline work plan	9	
Resource commitments from each partner	9	
Roles and responsibilities	9	
Performance indicators	8	Implied though the effective fulfilment of obligations between partners culminating in the establishment of communication infrastructure where WFP operations are being conducted.
Sustainability strategy	8	
Risks (collective and to each partner)	8	

WHEN?		
Timeframes	9	
Milestones	9	Identified.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	
Governance arrangements	9	
Decision-making procedures	9	
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	
Measures to mitigate risks	9	
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	10	"Responsibility Matrix" appended to the agreement.
Health check / review procedures	3	Should be more thoroughly defined if this is a requirement for contract personnel retained for WFP operations.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	9	
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	9	
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	8	Obligations relating to Indemnification and Limitation of Liability Article to survive the termination of the contract.

TOTAL SCORE: 250 out of 290

2.2 MOU – WFP/KONINKLIJKE DSM N.V 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Koninklijke DSM N.V		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	9	
Identification of representatives and their status	9	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	
Shared objectives	9	
Individual partner objectives	9	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	
Outline work plan	9	
Resource commitments from each partner	9	
Roles and responsibilities	9	
Performance indicators	9	
Sustainability strategy	9	
Risks (collective and to each partner)	9	Parties to remain independent and will assume their own risk and liability; measures in place to protect reputation, etc...

WHEN?		
Timeframes	9	
Milestones	9	

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Thorough and collaborative.
Governance arrangements	9	As above.
Decision-making procedures	9	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	
Measures to mitigate risks	9	Each party assumes own liability and risk; DSM to extend insurance arrangements to WFP for activities relating to agreement. Risk to reputation protected in agreement.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	8	Specific metrics not defined; However, measurement and monitoring of partnership thoroughly defined and collaborative.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	9	

COMMUNICATION		
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	9	
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	9	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	9	

TOTAL SCORE: 260 out of 290

2.3 MOU – WFP/TNT 2009

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/TNT (2009)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Vague.
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	5	Vague

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	
Outline work plan	N/A	N/A The annex that outlines the work plan of this MOU was not attached to the .PDF.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	TNT commitments made clear, WFP resource commitments not discernable.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Described, although difficult to assess without Annex detailing work projects.
Performance indicators	8	Review mechanisms; audit provisions.
Sustainability strategy	7	Could be more defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Addressed in Indemnity Article. Other risks presumed outlined in Annex.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	
Milestones	8	

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	8	In place.
Governance arrangements	8	
Decision-making procedures	6	TNT takes lead throughout MOU.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	
Measures to mitigate risks	8	Covered through Indemnity Article, protection to reputation, etc...
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Measures could be more thoroughly defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	No metrics specified. However, evaluative and accountability mechanisms in place to monitor the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A - Assumed to be included in Annex.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	In place
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	9	
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Intellectual property rules consider TNT intellectual property. Confidentiality rules consider both parties.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	8	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	5	Some identified legal entitlements and obligations remain in place following termination or conclusion of agreement.

TOTAL SCORE: 211 out of 280

2.4 SA – WFP/ERICSSON AB 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood

– 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Ericsson AB (2003)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). However, as with “SBA-Irish Aid (2007)” this SBA contains extended clause relating to third party liability differing somewhat from basic SBA model.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	9	Defined beyond basic SBA model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 150 out of 280

2.5 SA – WFP/SVENDBORG MARINE SURVEYORS A/S 2004

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Svendborg Marine Surveyors A/S (2004)		
WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with proposed project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.

HOW?		
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

3. REGIONAL & GOVERNMENTAL

3.1 GENERAL AGREEMENT – WFP/GHANA 2006

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Basic Agreement – WFP/Ghana (2006)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Expressed as rationale rather than vision of agreement.
Shared objectives	8	Assumed in preamble (rationale).
Individual partner objectives	8	Expressed throughout although WFP objectives more thoroughly described.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well described; largely infrastructural in nature.
Outline work plan	9	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Implicitly and explicitly stated throughout. However, not as specifically as e.g. GA Malaysia 2010 - Annex A
Roles and responsibilities	9	As above.
Performance indicators	N/A	Infrastructural/personnel agreement.
Sustainability strategy	8	Expressed throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	8	Expressed in terms of potential risks to WFP infrastructure, property and personnel; government assumes all risks relating to the operations outlined in the agreement and indemnifies WFP except in cases of gross negligence and wilful misconduct.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	9	Well defined.
Milestones	N/A	

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	9	Well defined.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	7	Defined, but not as specifically as e.g. GA Malaysia 2010 - Annex A
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Defined through host government commitment to protect infrastructure, property and personnel when/if required by WFP and through waiver of liability and risk except in cases of gross negligence and wilful misconduct.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	N/A	This agreement sets in place the infrastructural, legal, financial and security parameters and obligations for humanitarian response operations between government and WFP.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	N/A	As above.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	As above.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Defined throughout.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	

COMMUNICATION		
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	9	Well defined in terms of protection and inviolability of WFP intellectual property.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit (“moving on”) strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	6	Expressed in terms that protect WFP assets/personnel following termination of agreement.

TOTAL SCORE: 188 out of 220

3.2 GENERAL AGREEMENT – WFP/MALAYSIA 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Basic Agreement – WFP/Malaysia (2010)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Expressed as rationale rather than vision of agreement.
Shared objectives	8	Assumed in preamble (rationale).
Individual partner objectives	8	Expressed throughout although WFP objectives more thoroughly described.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well described; largely infrastructural in nature.
Outline work plan	9	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	Specified especially in Annex A.
Roles and responsibilities	9	As above.
Performance indicators	N/A	Infrastructural/personnel agreement.
Sustainability strategy	8	Expressed throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	8	Expressed in terms of potential risks to WFP infrastructure, property and personnel; government assumes all risks relating to the operations outlined in the agreement and indemnifies WFP except in cases of gross negligence and wilful misconduct.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	9	Well defined.
Milestones	N/A	

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	9	Well defined.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Specified especially in Annex A
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Defined through host government commitment to protect infrastructure, property, operations and personnel when/if required by WFP.

HOW?		
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	N/A	This agreement sets in place the infrastructural, legal, financial and security parameters and obligations for humanitarian response operations between government and WFP.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	N/A	As above.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	As above.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Defined throughout.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	9	Well defined in terms of protection and inviolability of WFP intellectual property.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	6	Expressed in terms that protect WFP assets/personnel following termination of agreement.

TOTAL SCORE: 190 out of 220

3.3 IA – WFP/ITALIAN MINISTRY OF DEFENCE 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Implementation Agreement – WFP/Italian Ministry of Defence (2007)		N.B. This IA governed by a pre-existing MOU.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Identified, not defined.
Identification of representatives and their status	5	Reps identified, not statuses.

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Outlined in preamble.
Shared objectives	7	Generally defined as above.
Individual partner objectives	4	WFP objectives defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Defined.
Outline work plan	8	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	8	As above.
Performance indicators	N/A	N/A – Infrastructural agreement.
Sustainability strategy	8	Defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Risks should be more thoroughly/specifically outlined.
WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	Throughout, however actual time frame of this agreement is not specified.
Milestones	4	Briefly outlined in terms of triennial review of excess costs between Joint Committee.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	8	Defined.
Governance arrangements	8	As above.
Decision-making procedures	8	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	As above.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	More consideration/specific detail required.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	N/A	N/A – Infrastructural agreement; partnership arrangement and obligations outlined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	N/A	N/A
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	N/A	N/A
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	6	Briefly described in terms of proximity to US installation at San Vito.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	N/A	N/A - Governed by pre-existing MOU
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	8	Detailed.

TOTAL SCORE: 151 out of 220

3.4 MOU (SBA) – WFP/THE SWISS AGENCY FOR DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU (SBA) – WFP/The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (2003)		N.B. There is a 2004 addendum to this MOU outlining the establishment, role and authority of UNJLC in emergency humanitarian operations.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Identified, not described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Established in preamble.
Shared objectives	8	Well described.
Individual partner objectives	3	Could be more thoroughly described in order to more fully rationalizing partnership.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Well defined.
Outline work plan	8	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	9	As above.
Performance indicators	7	Specific indicators not outlined. Assumed in personnel reviews and debriefings and MOU implementation reviews between parties.

WHAT?		
Sustainability strategy	6	Sustainability of partnership detailed throughout, although no specific strategy outlined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	8	Liability and security detailed.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Timeframes generally detailed.
Milestones	5	Some milestones detailed; further detailing would be useful in terms of monitoring performance of partnership.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	As above.
Decision-making procedures	9	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	As above.
Measures to mitigate risks	8	Security and health, medical and insurance provisions for personnel and donor; standard liability assumptions and indemnifications.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	Well defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	No specific metrics detailed. Partnership performance measured through personnel reviews and debriefings and MOU implementation reviews between parties.
Health check / review procedures	9	Donor ensures stand-by personnel will be medically fit with appropriate inoculations. Following deployment, stand-by personnel will report on health aspects inc. stress management; WFP also will train personnel and advise on health matters relating to living conditions and disease prevention.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	2	Not defined; assumed in subsequent TORs.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	6	Defined in terms of relating Donor contribution to other UN agencies.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	3	Defined insofar as required debriefings of personnel following operations; not in terms of partnership as a whole.

TOTAL SCORE: 205 out of 280

3.5 MOU – WFP/DFID 2000

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/DFID (2000)		N.B. This MOU outlines DFID financial contribution for WFP programming.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Identified, not described.
Identification of representatives and their status	5	Reps identified, not statuses.

WHY?		
Vision statement	3	Vaguely defined.
Shared objectives	3	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	As above.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Broadly defined in terms of contributing funds for use in WFP programs.
Outline work plan	3	Vaguely described.
Resource commitments from each partner	4	Described mainly in terms of DFID contribution.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generally described in terms of financial reporting/accountability.
Performance indicators	3	Briefly described in terms of reports, bilateral consultation and one field level inspection. No actual indicators specified.
Sustainability strategy	3	Poorly outlined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	Vaguely specified in terms that protect DFID from WFP employee liability.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Clearly states the timeframe of the contribution and deadlines for supports.
Milestones	0	No milestones specified.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Broadly defined through reporting, consultation, and grievance mechanism; protocols not specifically stated.
Governance arrangements	4	Contribution to be governed by WFP Financial Regulations, applicable procedures and practices. With some oversight by partner.
Decision-making procedures	4	As above; donor reserves right to modify or terminate donation.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Thoroughly detailed.
Measures to mitigate risks	2	Poorly detailed.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	4	Broadly assumed through provision of financial and programming reports, commitments to joint consultation and joint visit to WFP country programme.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	3	As above. No metrics specified.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Generally detailed in terms of bilateral consultations, reporting, joint country-programme visits and individual reports if necessary.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	None specified.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	0	As above.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	As above.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	0	As above.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	6	Generally detailed.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	5	Rules provide for DFID to leave if desired.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	7	Provided through review at MOU conclusion taking stock of overall partnership and suggesting modifications if necessary.

TOTAL SCORE: 110 out of 290

3.6 MOU – WFP/MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION OF THE NETHERLANDS 2000

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references

- 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
- 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
- 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Minister of Development Cooperation of the Netherlands (2000)		N.B. This is a “General Arrangement” for funding defined in preamble as MOU; it is neither signed nor dated.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	8	Identified.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	
Shared objectives	9	
Individual partner objectives	8	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	
Outline work plan	N/A	This is a funding arrangement.
Resource commitments from each partner	N/A	As above; resource (financial) contributions intended to provide resources for the implementation of WFP operations.
Roles and responsibilities	9	
Performance indicators	N/A	
Sustainability strategy	8	Maintained through regular audit and reporting mechanisms.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	8	

WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	Generally defined.
Milestones	N/A	

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	9	Well defined.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Thoroughly defined although no specific dollar amounts stipulated.
Measures to mitigate risks	9	Auditing mechanisms in place.

HOW?		
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	N/A	
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	9	Financial records/expenditures to be maintained, reported and evaluated; provision for biennial external auditing.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Defined through e.g. reporting mechanisms.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	N/A	
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	N/A	

TOTAL SCORE: 167 out of 190

3.7 MOU – WFP/LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES 2004

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/League of Arab States (2004)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	Well defined.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	Well defined.

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	Well defined.
Individual partner objectives	9	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	7	Defined but mainly general in terms of overarching shared objectives between partners with some description of potential projects/activities as in secs. 7-13
Outline work plan	5	Non-specific as above.
Resource commitments from each partner	3	Not specifically detailed.
Roles and responsibilities	3	As above. It should be noted that the MOU sets a framework for potential future collaboration between parties, which possibly accounts for the non-specific tenor of this MOU.
Performance indicators	7	Assumed TBD under periodic joint reviews.
Sustainability strategy	3	As above, could be more thoroughly developed.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	1	Not adequately defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	2	Outside of termination clause, no firm times or dates specified.
Milestones	1	Ill defined.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	10	Well defined; highly collaborative and reciprocal.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined; to be managed through each partner's governance structure with ongoing development TBD by periodic joint committee and through joint reviews and (when appropriate) observations of partners' organizational meetings, conferences, etc...
Decision-making procedures	7	Expressed in terms of deference to organizational governance structures (e.g. 2); through of mutually agreed common accord amendments to MOU (20); and assumed through periodic joint committee/review.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	4	Assumed TBD in the negotiations of future joint-projects. Otherwise not defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	2	Briefly expressed in terms of safeguarding confidential or restricted information and docs (9).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Generally expressed through commitments to mutual consultation, exchange of info., periodic joint review, reciprocal representation and liaisons.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	No specific metrics outlined; monitoring and measurement of partnership assumed through periodic joint committee/review.
Health check / review procedures	5	Generally outlined

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Defined esp. in terms of establishment of periodic joint committee and review process.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	2	Little detail.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	8	Confidentiality rules defined in sec. 9
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Not adequately defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	2	Ill defined; assumed in periodic joint review.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	1	Not adequately defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 163 out of 300

3.8 MOU – WFP/PANAMA 2008

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Panama (2008)		N.B. This MOU is preceded and governed by an earlier (2002) basic agreement.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Identified.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	Identified in terms of rationale for establishing UNHRDs.
Shared objectives	N/A	As opposed to objectives, MOU sets forth terms and conditions for government's provision of Exclusive/Non-Exclusive Premises for use and at disposal of WFP.
Individual partner objectives	N/A	As above.
WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined.
Outline work plan	N/A	N/A – MOU is infrastructural rather than project-based.
Resource commitments from each partner	9	Well defined.
Roles and responsibilities	9	Well defined.
Performance indicators	N/A	N/A – Infrastructural in nature.
Sustainability strategy	9	Well defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	6	Addressed in terms of claims (third party or otherwise) against WFP.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	Well defined in terms of fixed term of MOU and termination mechanism. However, this mechanism is exclusively afforded to WFP.
Milestones	8	Well defined in terms of automatic 10 year extension of fixed term of MOU at conclusion of current arrangement.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	Well defined.
Decision-making procedures	8	Defined but largely limited to continuance of MOU.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Well defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	6	Expressed through Government's responsibility for any claims brought against WFP (excepting gross negligence and wilful misconduct) and indemnifies WFP against any third party claim.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	N/A	N/A – Parameters of infrastructural commitments, obligation and usage pre-set in this MOU and assumed to be expressed in 2002 Basic Agreement.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	N/A	N/A
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Communication procedures/mechanisms expressed throughout.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A - MOU does not involve a public profile; infrastructural in nature.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A - As above.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	N/A	N/A – Assumed to be addressed in 2002 Basic Agreement.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	N/A	N.B. Mechanisms put in place in 2002 Basic Agreement remain in tact.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	7	Rules in place, however asymmetrically favour WFP.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	6	Expressed through allowance of appropriate period of de-installation in event of termination.

TOTAL SCORE: 144 out of 180

3.9 MOU – WFP/SWISS HUMANITARIAN AID 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references

- 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
- 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/Swiss Humanitarian Aid (1996)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Identified.
Identification of representatives and their status	7	Representatives identified; Catherine Bertini's status with WFP not identified in MOU, but is identified in covering letter.

WHY?		
Vision statement	7	General description of vision of partnership.
Shared objectives	7	Generally defined.
Individual partner objectives	3	Vaguely defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Broadly defined. Specific projects, activities to be detailed case-by-case through exchange of letters.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Generally defined.
Roles and responsibilities	6	Broadly defined. Specific projects, activities to be detailed case-by-case through exchange of letters.
Performance indicators	3	Generally based on ad-hoc evaluations during or following operations; no specific indicators outlined.
Sustainability strategy	2	Vague.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	4	Generally expressed in terms of liability relating to loaned employees of donor (SHA)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	Generally described in terms of MOU duration (1 year).
Milestones	0	Not specified.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	6	Broadly defined.
Governance arrangements	4	Broadly governed through ad hoc arrangements.

HOW?		
Decision-making procedures	3	As above; decision making procedures need to be more thoroughly established between partners.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	5	Broadly covered in Annex 1; MOU should provide more comprehensive detailing of funding arrangements.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Briefly stated in terms of SHA assumption of liability and indemnification of WFP of all liability incurred by its employees except in cases of gross negligence, etc.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	4	Broadly covered through ad hoc arrangements TBD through duration of MOU.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics outlined; partnership monitored and evaluated through ad hoc review and potentially extended through mutual consultation at MOUs end.
Health check / review procedures	7	Generally detailed in Annex 1

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Generally defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	0	Not defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	5	Defined as both parties finding optimal levels of coordination and integration for other parties involved in joint operations. Also commitments to include other involved parties in ad hoc operational reviews.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	7	Generally described; not as specifically detailed as in other MOUs.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	2	Implied in terms of mutual consultation resulting in the shortening of MOU duration.

TOTAL SCORE: 135 out of 300

3.10 MOU – SWEDEN 2000

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – Sweden (2000)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	9	Well defined.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Identified.
Shared objectives	8	Expressed in terms of Sweden’s support for ongoing WFP projects/initiatives.
Individual partner objectives	8	As above.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Expressed in terms of Sweden’s financial commitment to established WFP initiatives and activities.
Outline work plan	7	Work plan outlined insofar as Sweden makes financial commitment to already established WFP initiatives and activities.

WHAT?		
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Resource commitments as above.
Roles and responsibilities	8	Defined as above.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined in terms of Sweden's welcoming of WFP's establishment of RBMS which includes the development of performance indicators. WFP shall report grain tonnage to IGC.
Sustainability strategy	4	Vaguely described in terms of mutual consultation and ongoing execution of WFP projects and contribution of Swedish funds.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	Briefly outlined in terms of Sweden's recognition of WFP's efforts to mitigate risks associated with diversion and misuse of food aid.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Timeframes for contributions and financial reporting detailed.
Milestones	8	Described in terms of payment schedule and criteria for continued funding until fulfilment of MOU.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally described in terms of close dialogue and annual consultations.
Governance arrangements	5	Sweden in good faith makes contribution to be administered under WFP governance.
Decision-making procedures	5	Decisions relating to funding allocation and usage are either outlined in MOU or are deferred to WFP (with due consultation with Sweden).
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	10	Thoroughly detailed.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	WFP is recognized by Sweden for its efforts to mitigate risks associated with misuse and diversion of food aid. Contribution subject to external audit.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Described in terms of Sweden's support of ongoing efforts by WFP to improve upon transparency and accountability. WFP commitment to retain SRSA partnership.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	Defined through pre-established
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Generally described through maintenance of “close dialogue” and “annual consultations on issues of mutual concern.” Other mechanisms relating to changing
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	2	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	6	WFP ensures, when appropriate, Sweden will be recognized for their contribution.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	1	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	8	WFP is responsible for keeping its relevant departments and beneficiaries apprised of the Swedish contribution. In regard to this MOU, Sweden will communicate and liaise with other UN partners.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	3	Vaguely defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	0	Not defined.
Exit (‘moving on’) strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	N/A	N/A – 1 year funding arrangement.

TOTAL SCORE: 170 out of 280

3.11 MOU – WFP/THE PEACE CORPS 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand

- 1-3 = Minimal and short references
- 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
- 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
- 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/The Peace Corps (2007)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	Thoroughly defined.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	Well defined.
Individual partner objectives	9	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	7	Generally described.
Outline work plan	N/A	N/A - TBD through future implementing instruments.
Resource commitments from each partner	N/A	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Specifics TBD through implementing instruments, generally defined and collaborative in character.
Performance indicators	7	Assumed that specific indicators will be evaluated
Sustainability strategy	6	General, unspecific.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	Not defined in MOU.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	Generally defined.
Milestones	4	Vague; assumed TBD through implementing instruments.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Defined and collaborative.
Governance arrangements	9	Collaborations subject to internal review and mutual agreement of partners.
Decision-making procedures	9	Defined and collaborative.

HOW?		
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	N/A	N/A - TBD through future implementing instruments.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Not defined but assumed to be vetted and determined through implementing instruments.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	MOU provides for implementing instruments, encourages informal consultation between country offices, annual review and the identification of potential projects with which partners may participate. Defined and collaborative.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	6	No specific metrics detailed; partnership to be monitored and evaluated through annual joint coordinating committee.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A – Assumed to be included in implementing instruments if required.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well described; collaborative in nature.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	8	Defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	8	Defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	2	Not defined in MOU, potentially in later implementing instruments.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	5	Generally described in terms of each party promoting MOU through respective field offices.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	3	Not well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Well defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	1	Ill defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 178 out of 260

3.12 SA – WFP/DIRECTORATE FOR CIVIL DEFENCE AND EMERGENCY PLANNING 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement

becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Directorate for Civil Defence and Emergency Planning (2003)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.

WHAT?		
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outlined Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 147 out of 280

3.13 SA – WFP/UK DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/UK Department for International Development (2003)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outlined Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	4	Generally defined throughout. However, this SBA does not provide for the dispatch of DFID Liaison Officer for certain operations (this provision is usually stipulated in 2.8).
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.

WHAT IF?		
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 145 out of 280

3.14 SA – WFP/EMERCOM (Rus.) 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/EMERCOM (Rus.) (2003)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outlined Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.

HOW?		
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

3.15 SA – WFP/REPUBLIC OF FRANCE 2009

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Republic of France (2009)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.

WHAT?		
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with proposed project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	More thoroughly defined than Basic SBA models.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 147 out of 280

3.16 SA – WFP/ICELAND’S CRISIS RESPONSE UNIT 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Iceland’s Crisis Response Unit (2003)		N.B. There is a 2004 addendum to this SBA pertaining to the establishment, role and authority of UNJLC with respect to humanitarian emergencies..

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	4	Generally defined throughout. However, this SBA does not provide for the dispatch of ICRU Liaison Officer for certain operations (this provision is usually stipulated in 2.8).
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.

WHAT IF?		
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 145 out of 280

3.17 SA – WFP/IRISH AID 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Irish Aid (2007)		N.B. This MOU is not dated by Irish Aid Rep.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.

WHY?		
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”
WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outline Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). However, this SBA contains extended definition of risks and liability differing somewhat from basic SBA model.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s). In this SBA, however, Also 4.2 amended from basicSBA models to reflect “Personal Security” as opposed to “Security.”

HOW?		
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 150 out of 280

3.18 SA – WFP/SWEDISH CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/SCAA (2003)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generally defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outlined Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).

WHAT?		
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

3.19 SA – WFP/SWEDISH RESCUE SERVICES AGENCY 2003

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Stand-By Agreement – WFP/Swedish Rescue Services Agency (2003)		N.B. This agreement was amended in 2004 to reflect the establishment and authority of UNJLC in humanitarian response.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified but neither parties nor missions described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Vision should be more nuanced and in line with rationale for the specific partnership in agreement.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	3	Individual partner objectives could be more fully described in terms of rationalizing partnership. More broadly expressed “within the context of WFP’s operation.”

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	5	Generically defined as with other SBAs. Should be more tailored to individual partnership.
Outline work plan	5	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague: Funding commitments and human resource provision are documented, but are to be determined on a case by case basis.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Generically expressed as with other SBAs. SBA should outlined Roles and Responsibilities specific to the partner in question and in line with propose project.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined under consultation article (X).
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy is assumed, though not specifically stated throughout.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Generically defined. E.g. Articles outlining Liability & Indemnification and Security (VIII & IX). Assessment should take into account specific risk factors relating to individual partners, partnership and nature of assignment(s).

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	Again, generic in nature. Timeframes and milestones should reflect individual objectives of partners and shared objectives of partnership.
Milestones	5	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	5	Generally defined throughout.
Governance arrangements	5	Governance is predominately managed through WFP; should be more collaborative.
Decision-making procedures	5	Follows basic WFP SBA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.

HOW?		
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Basically defined. As with risk assessment, mitigation should be tailored to individual partners, the partnership and specific assignment(s).
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally described in terms of joint evaluations, personnel reviews, information exchanges, liaison officers and annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	As above. However, no specific metrics relating to individual partnerships and objectives detailed.
Health check / review procedures	2	Not adequately described.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Lines of communication defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	7	Well defined in terms of WFP expectations.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	3	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	9	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 146 out of 280

3.20 SUBGRANT AGREEMENT – WFP/THAI RED CROSS AIDS RESEARCH CENTRE 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Subgrant Agreement – WFP/Thai Red Cross Aids Research Centre (2010)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	6	More thoroughly expressed in terms of WFP regional/HIV related objectives. Vision could articulate a greater spirit of collaboration
Shared objectives	6	As above.
Individual partner objectives	6	As above, TRC objectives expressed mainly in organizational description.
WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	7	Defined, esp. in Annex 1. Expressed in terms of WFP expectations and subgrantee obligations.
Outline work plan	7	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	8	Specified esp. in Annexes.
Roles and responsibilities	7	As above. Expressed in terms of WFP expectations and subgrantee obligations.
Performance indicators	8	TRC to provide quarterly progress reports in narrative and quantitative format; financial reports; a final narrative report at the conclusion of the project.

WHY?		
Sustainability strategy	8	Short-term agreement (1 year); sustainability features well detailed in this context.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	5	Expressed in terms of risks and liabilities incurred by Subgrantee. Also outlined in Force Majure. Collective and/or Subgrantee risks not well defined outside of Force Majure.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	9	Duration of agreement, scheduling, reporting etc...well defined.
Milestones	9	Short-term agreement – milestones well defined.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Well defined but largely managed by WFP.
Governance arrangements	7	As above.
Decision-making procedures	6	Agreement largely based on funding of project and grantee's provision of deliverables. Decisions and parameters relating to "partnership" therefore pre-set in agreement and stipulated mainly by WFP.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	10	Well defined, esp Annex 2
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Expressed insofar as WFP is released from any liability incurred by Subgrantee and/or third party. Also, provisions outlined in event of Force Majure. Risks and mitigation thereof could be more collectively defined and expressed.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	N/A	Agreement largely based on funding of project and grantee's provision of deliverables. Decisions and parameters relating to partnership therefore pre-set in agreement.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	Defined in terms of Subgrantee obligations for narrative, quantitative and financial reporting. This is not particularly collaborative in nature.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	4	Outside of reporting mechanisms not well defined or collaborative.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	6	Defined insofar as logos, seals, etc of WFP and UN... are not to be used.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	8	Defined insofar as there will be limited public profile of relationship.

COMMUNICATION		
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	6	With limited exception, largely defined in terms of protecting WFP intellectual property and confidentiality; not particularly collaborative.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	6	Defined insofar as partnership is to be confidential and not disclosed to third parties except potentially WFP donors. Protocols favour WFP.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	6	Defined in terms of final narrative/financial reports at conclusion of project and also defined in event of premature termination.

TOTAL SCORE: 202 out of 280

3.21 TA – WFP/DENMARK 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/Denmark (1996)		N.B. Redactions made throughout this document are not initialled by the signatories.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Identified, not described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	2	Vague
Shared objectives	7	Outlined in appendices, objectives would be more effectively positioned at front of document.
Individual partner objectives	2	Largely focused on WFP objectives.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Well defined, but poorly organized; follows the Agreement in appendices.
Outline work plan	5	Plan and operational execution could be more clearly stated in body of agreement as opposed to appendices.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Mainly expressed in terms of donor commitments.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Defined, but could be more clearly stated and organized within body of Agreement; follows the Agreement in appendices.
Performance indicators	7	Generally defined through review, consultation and reporting mechanisms.
Sustainability strategy	7	As above.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Not well defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Generally defined. Could be more clearly organized and expressed.
Milestones	7	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Generally defined throughout; could be more clearly expressed and organized.
Governance arrangements	7	As above.
Decision-making procedures	7	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Well defined.

HOW?		
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Only defined in terms of providing UN security arrangements to personnel contracted through this agreement.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Generally assumed through review, consultation and reporting mechanisms.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	Specific metrics outside of financial reporting not outlined; generally assumed through review and consultation and reporting mechanisms.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	5	Expressed insofar as WFP commitment to public tenders for Danish goods and services.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	3	Not well defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	7	Defined in terms of WFP commitment to hiring Danish personnel or through pursuing tendered purchase of Danish equipment, etc...

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	8	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	8	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	7	Generally described in terms of accommodations to parties at termination of agreement.

TOTAL SCORE: 173 out of 280

3.22 TA – WFP/ECOWAS 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/ECOWAS (2010)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.
WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners’ individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.

WHAT?		
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and <i>Force Majeure</i>)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.

COMMUNICATION		
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 158 out of 260

3.23 TA – WFP/GERMAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANT 1998

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/German Technical Assistance Grant (1998)		N.B. This document is neither signed nor dated. Also, this is a one-year grant for expert technical assistance. It is presided by an earlier agreement which is appended to document.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Identified and GTAG briefly described.
Identification of representatives and their status	4	Signatories absent from document. However, points of contact identified.

WHY?		
Vision statement	7	Generally defined.
Shared objectives	7	Generally described.
Individual partner objectives	5	Vaguely defined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined. However defined more thoroughly in appendix which is the presiding agreement upon which this document is based.
Outline work plan	6	Generally defined.
Resource commitments from each partner	4	Donor commitments defined. Partner commitments more thoroughly defined in appendix. Should be articulated in present agreement.
Roles and responsibilities	6	Generally defined.
Performance indicators	5	Generally defined through Expert reports at conclusion of assignment.
Sustainability strategy	2	Poorly defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	As above.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Defined.
Milestones	2	Poorly defined.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	6	Generally described in agreement, although more fully described in appended presiding agreement.
Governance arrangements	6	As above.
Decision-making procedures	6	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	3	Vaguely defined in terms of “protection” for personnel.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	2	Poorly defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners’ objectives & shared objectives	2	As above.
Health check / review procedures	2	As above.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	4	Vague.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	6	Defined in appendix.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	2	Poorly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	5	Defined in appendix. Should be included in body of agreement.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	5	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	2	Defined only in terms of expert report to WFP at conclusion of assignment.

TOTAL SCORE: 130 out of 280

3.24 TA – WFP/IRISH AID 2006

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood

- 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/Irish Aid (2006)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Parties identified, not described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners' individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and <i>Force Majure</i>)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.

WHEN?		
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 154 out of 260

3.25 TA – WFP/SRSA 2006

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/SRSA (2006)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.

WHY?		
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners' individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and <i>Force Majeure</i>)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 158 out of 260

4. UN BODIES

4.1 COOPERATION FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT – WFP/UNDP 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Cooperation Framework Agreement – WFP/UNDP (2010)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	
Shared objectives	9	
Individual partner objectives	9	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	Identifies activities for future collaboration.
Outline work plan	7	Generally outlines work plan. More specific detailing would be beneficial in terms of understanding overall operationalization of projects/activities.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Vague.
Roles and responsibilities	5	Broadly described in terms of parties' relative strengths vis-à-vis the projects in question. This could be more fully developed.
Performance indicators	5	Assumed to be assessed under senior advisor group.
Sustainability strategy	5	Broadly defined, could be more thoroughly outlined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Vaguely defined; given activities outlined in agreement, risk assessment in terms of both liability and human security should be undertaken.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	7	General timeframe agreements.
Milestones	3	Vague. Milestones should be clearly understood by both party and plainly stated in MOU.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	8	
Governance arrangements	9	
Decision-making procedures	8	
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	7	Generally outlined. Funding details should be more fully specified.
Measures to mitigate risks	2	Vaguely defined.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	4	Specific metrics not detailed. Partnership to be qualitatively evaluated by Senior Advisory Group.
Health check / review procedures	0	Not defined.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	9	
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	

COMMUNICATION		
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	8	
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	6	Generally defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	5	Vague.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	7	Generally defined in terms of prompt cessation of activities defined in agreement upon termination.

TOTAL SCORE: 203 out of 300

4.2 LETTER OF INTENT – WFP/WHO 2001

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague, non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10 = Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Letter of Intent – WFP/WHO (2001)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partners identified, generally described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	8	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	As this is a letter of intent, it remains quite general. Proposed activities consider opportunities for future collaboration in areas of mutual interest/activities. It should be noted that this Letter authorizes the commencement of collaborations.
Outline work plan	7	Generally defined in advance of the establishment of a formal MOU.
Resource commitments from each partner	4	Vague. Even projected commitments should be provided.
Roles and responsibilities	6	Generally defined insofar as the intentions outlined in document.
Performance indicators	N/A	N/A – Would be more appropriate for this to be determined through formal MOU negotiations.
Sustainability strategy	3	Strategy should be outlined even in nascent stages.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not evident. Risk projections should be provided in advance of the formal MOU.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	3	Not well established (e.g. deadline for formal MOU)
Milestones	2	Milestones, even potential milestones should be outlined in early development.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	3	Vague. Should be sketched for consideration during formal MOU negotiations.
Governance arrangements	3	As above.
Decision-making procedures	3	As above.

HOW?		
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	3	As above. Estimates would be useful as parties prepare MOU.
Measures to mitigate risks	0	Should be sketched or approximated in advance of MOU.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Outlines areas/activities for future collaboration.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	N/A	N/A - Would be more appropriate for this to be determined through formal MOU negotiations.
Health check / review procedures	0	Not defined. Would be useful to consider such procedures given the potential areas of collaboration.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	2	Poorly detailed.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	0	Not defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	0	Not defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	0	Not defined; as Letter of Intent authorizes the commencement of partnership, mechanism should be in place.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	N/A	N/A – More appropriately considered during negotiation of MOU.

TOTAL SCORE: 105 out of 270

4.3 LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING ON TECHNICAL COOPERATION – WFP/ICAO 2001

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
Letter of Understanding on Technical Cooperation – WFP/ICAO (2001)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	7	Implied throughout.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	
Outline work plan	6	Could be defined in greater detail.
Resource commitments from each partner	4	Vague. Partnership is asymmetrical in the sense that much of the work and resources outlined in agreement is to be provided by ICAO.
Roles and responsibilities	4	As above.
Performance indicators	4	Vague; assumed in annual review.
Sustainability strategy	2	Poorly defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not identified.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	3	Vague
Milestones	3	As above; agreement should contain a more concrete schedule of activities, etc...

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	3	Poorly defined.
Governance arrangements	3	As above.
Decision-making procedures	4	Vague, assumed TBD at annual review.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	2	Vaguely referenced in terms of cost recovery. Funding arrangements require greater detail.
Measures to mitigate risks	0	Risk assessment or mitigation not detailed.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	3	Vague, assumed TBD at annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	3	No metrics specified; annual review mechanism assumed to provide qualitative evaluation.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Focal points established.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A – Partnership is not public in nature.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A – As above.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A – Largely pertains to training and other technical information and assistance pertinent to WFP operations.
WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	6	Present, but vague in detail in comparison to other agreements.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 119 out of 260

4.4 MOU – WFP/FAO 1999

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be

split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/FAO (1999)		N.B. MOU is not signed.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	WFP described; FAO identified, not described.
Identification of representatives and their status	5	Representatives are not named; statuses are identified.

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	
Shared objectives	9	
Individual partner objectives	7	Generally stated.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	
Outline work plan	4	Vague on specifics; Work plan should detail how proposed project/activities will be operationalized by partners.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	Generally defined in terms of already established activities/operations.
Roles and responsibilities	7	
Performance indicators	5	Vague. Assumed in annual review.

WHAT?		
Sustainability strategy	2	Vague. Strategy for sustainability needs greater detail.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not identified.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	3	Vague
Milestones	3	Specific scheduling should be included in MOU to ensure accountability of partnership.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	4	Not well established.
Governance arrangements	4	Governance of partnership needs more specific detail.
Decision-making procedures	3	Vague.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	4	Vague; funding earmarked, but arrangements need to be more concretely detailed.
Measures to mitigate risks	0	Not considered.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Generally defined in scope of project.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	3	No metrics specified. Annual review assumed to provide qualitative evaluation of partnership.
Health check / review procedures	0	Not identified.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Generally defined through annual review.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not considered.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	0	As above.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	As above.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	8	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	0	Not included.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not considered.

TOTAL SCORE: 125 out of 300

4.5 MOU – WFP/UN DHA 1995

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UN DHA (1995)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	8	
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	8	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	
Outline work plan	7	
Resource commitments from each partner	7	
Roles and responsibilities	9	Well described.

WHAT?		
Performance indicators	2	Not thoroughly developed.
Sustainability strategy	3	As above.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	3	Vaguely defined: WFP responsible for insuring its emergency stock.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	3	Vague
Milestones	3	As above; scheduling should be more thoroughly developed and possibly appended to agreement.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	6	Generally defined.
Governance arrangements	8	
Decision-making procedures	6	Generally described.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	7	
Measures to mitigate risks	2	Risk assessment and mitigation thereof needs greater attention.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	6	Generally provided through annual review.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	3	No specific metrics outlined. Review assumed to perform this function.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	7	Generally defined through annual reviews.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A – Agreement mainly infrastructural in nature.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A – As above.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	None specified.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	5	Briefly defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	

TOTAL SCORE: 159 out of 270

4.6 MOU – WFP/UNDP

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UNDP		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	6	Partners identified, not described.
Identification of representatives and their status	8	Status of WFP rep. not identified.

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Described in preamble; agreement is largely infrastructural in nature.
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	7	As above.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined.
Outline work plan	9	Well defined.
Resource commitments from each partner	9	Well defined.

WHAT?		
Roles and responsibilities	9	Well defined.
Performance indicators	7	Implied through outline of services/obligations
Sustainability strategy	5	Implied as above. Could be more directly stated.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	9	Outlined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and <i>Force Majeure</i>)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	9	Well defined.
Milestones	2	Specific milestones should be developed so that partnership expectations and performance may be more thoroughly evaluated.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	7	Well defined. However, Annex 3 re: SOP is missing.
Decision-making procedures	7	Implied throughout.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	9	Well defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	9	Covered esp. under liability section.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	Annual review mechanism; commitments to share logistics-related information, etc...
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	4	No specific metrics detailed. Partnership evaluation to occur through review mechanism.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	Well defined
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	

WHAT IF?		
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	7	Insofar as obligations in MOU shall survive termination of MOU so that accounts and contractual liabilities may be settled.

TOTAL SCORE: 194 out of 260

4.7 MOU – WFP/UNDRO 1976

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UNDRO (1976)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	7	Reasonably defined in preamble.
Shared objectives	8	
Individual partner objectives	8	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	8	
Outline work plan	6	Could be better described in terms of proposed activities. However, this MOU is concerned with establishing a more coordinated response to disaster/relief operations and is primarily concerned with defining the protocols under which such operations will be assessed, lines of communication, focal points, etc...
Resource commitments from each partner	6	Should be more fully defined.
Roles and responsibilities	8	
Performance indicators	2	More detail required.
Sustainability strategy	6	Implied in establishment of disaster/relief response protocols between parties in the interests of greater mutual and individual efficiencies.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	1	Ill defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	
Milestones	3	Scheduling (Timeframes and Milestones) should be further specified.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	
Governance arrangements	8	
Decision-making procedures	7	It is implied throughout that in comprehensive disaster relief coordination, UNDRO will have final say.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	
Measures to mitigate risks	0	
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No metrics outlined; provision for periodic reviews to consult between parties.
Health check / review procedures	0	

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	8	
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A – This MOU was written in 1976.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A – Partnership is not public in nature.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	2	Not adequately defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	8	

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	0	Absent.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 156 out of 280

4.8 MOU – WFP/UNEP 2011

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UNEP (2011)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	
Shared objectives	9	
Individual partner objectives	9	

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	7	Generally defined; MOU provides framework for future collaboration.
Outline work plan	7	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	4	Vaguely described in this MOU; resource commitments TBD in later agreements.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Generally described. R & R to be firmly outlined in subsequent agreements.
Performance indicators	5	As no specific projects, operations detailed, performance indicators assumed TBD through future agreements and in annual reviews.
Sustainability strategy	4	Should be more thoroughly defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	6	Generally described in liability section.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	5	General; MOU is based on a fixed five-year term with provisions for annual review.
Milestones	2	Milestones and timeframes could be more thoroughly defined and a detailed schedule could be appended to MOU

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	8	Detailed throughout.
Governance arrangements	8	Defined esp. in Focal Point Article.
Decision-making procedures	5	Not thoroughly detailed.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	4	Not specified (TBD case-by-case).

HOW?		
Measures to mitigate risks	5	Covered in liability, but does not address risks to personnel, or organizations outside of liability considerations.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	Generally defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	No metrics specified. Provisions made for monitoring partnership.
Health check / review procedures	0	None specified.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	7	Generally defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	7	Generally defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	10	Well defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	4	Protocols need to be more fully defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	8	A rare clause (judged against other MOUs) stipulating the continuance of any provision contemplated beyond agreement in the event of termination or expiration (barring a written agreement between partners terminating the provision).

TOTAL SCORE: 201 out of 300

4.9 MOU – WFP/UNFPA 2010

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UNFPA (2010)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	As above.
Individual partner objectives	9	As above.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	7	Generally described.
Outline work plan	7	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	5	Could be more thoroughly defined.
Roles and responsibilities	7	Generally defined.
Performance indicators	9	Well defined.
Sustainability strategy	8	Defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not identified.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Duration of agreement specified; broader schedule of activities not well defined outside of joint reviews.
Milestones	6	Milestones and timeframe schedule should be detailed and possibly compiled in an appendix to MOUs.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	
Governance arrangements	9	
Decision-making procedures	9	
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	4	Needs clearer detail.
Measures to mitigate risks	0	Not identified.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	Defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	5	Metrics not defined. However, mechanisms in place for monitoring and evaluation partnership.
Health check / review procedures	6	In terms of personnel, poorly defined. Broadly defined in terms of larger health mandate envisioned in MOU.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	2	Poorly defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	8	Defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	7	Generally defined, but stresses collaborative imperative for joint-communication.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	As above.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 200 out of 300

4.10 MOU – WFP/UNHCR 2011

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UNHCR (2011)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	As above.
Individual partner objectives	9	As above.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined.
Outline work plan	9	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	9	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	9	As above.

WHAT?		
Performance indicators	9	As above.
Sustainability strategy	9	Well defined.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	2	Not well detailed.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Defined. A separate and detailed schedule of timeframes and milestones would be useful.
Milestones	8	As above.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Well defined.
Governance arrangements	9	As above.
Decision-making procedures	9	Defined and highly collaborative.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	2	Not extensively detailed.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	8	Defined.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	7	Actual metrics not defined. However mechanisms in place to monitor and measure partnership.
Health check / review procedures	8	Defined

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	Well defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	2	Not well defined in despite considerable attention paid to public profile of individual organs. the partnership and donor importance.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	Well defined.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	8	Defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	9	Well defined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	9	Well defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	0	Not defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 225

300

4.11 MOU – WFP/UNICEF 2011

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
MOU – WFP/UNICEF 2011		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	8	Partner orgs. identified, but not greatly described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	10	Clearly expressed
Shared objectives	10	Clearly expressed
Individual partner objectives	5	Largely focuses on common/shared objectives

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	10	Clearly expressed
Outline work plan	9	Well defined
Resource commitments from each partner	7	Greater input on specific resource commitments.

WHAT?		
Roles and responsibilities	8	Well defined in terms of partnership goals, but more general in terms of individual roles and responsibilities.
Performance indicators	7	Discernable throughout text, but not discretely expressed.
Sustainability strategy	3	Not clearly discernable.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not clearly identified.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	10	Clearly stated.
Milestones	3	Commitment to 6 mo. reviews, but no specific milestones outlined.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	9	Managed through 6 mo reviews.
Governance arrangements	9	As above.
Decision-making procedures	9	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	4	Commitment to resource sharing and combined lobbying, but no specific figures outlined.
Measures to mitigate risks	4	Assumed in 6 mo. reviews.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	9	Outlines partnership goals/objectives with various orgs/national/regional/continental bodies and private sector. Also, 6 mo review mechanism.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	0	No metrics outlined.
Health check / review procedures	0	None specified.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	9	6 mo. review.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	7	Generally defined in terms of respecting mutual visibility to media and general public in the interests of donor support. Not specifically defined in terms of actual brand signifiers (e.g. logos, wordmarks, etc.)
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	9	As above, consideration of respecting mutual visibility of partners.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	7	General commitment to lobby/communicate with regional/continental partners; NGO cluster groups and the solicitation of private sector partnerships. However no specific protocols outlined.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	o	Not defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	o	Not defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	o	Not stated.

TOTAL SCORE: 176 out of 300

4.12 TA – WFP/FAO 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/FAO (2007)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners' individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and Force Majeure)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 158 out of 260

4.13 TA – WFP/UNV 1996

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner’s perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/UNV (1996)		

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	7	Partners identified; UNV but not WFP described.
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	9	Well defined.
Shared objectives	9	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Defined more in terms of individual UNV objectives.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	9	Well defined.
Outline work plan	7	Generally described.
Resource commitments from each partner	3	Not well defined. Resource commitments from WFP not specified.

WHAT?		
Roles and responsibilities	6	UNV roles and responsibilities outlined, WFPs are not.
Performance indicators	2	Ill defined.
Sustainability strategy	2	As above.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	0	Not defined.

WHEN?		
Timeframes	8	Timeframes in place.
Milestones	5	Vaguely defined; Rapid deployment mechanism would continue should initial project prove successful at its 18 mo. conclusion.
HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	3	Vague.
Governance arrangements	3	As above.
Decision-making procedures	3	As above.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	0	Not defined.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	5	Vaguely defined; Rapid deployment mechanism would continue should initial project prove successful at its 18 mo. conclusion.
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	1	Ill defined.
Health check / review procedures	3	Generally outlined in cover letter. Absent from agreement.

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	3	Poorly defined.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	0	Not defined.
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/B Partnership not defined as public in nature, although relies on donor participation.
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	Not defined.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	5	Vaguely defined in terms of individual meetings with donors.

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	0	Not defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	0	Not defined.

WHAT IF?		
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	3	Insofar as should project not prove successful, it will not continue.

TOTAL SCORE: 119 out of 290

4.14 TA – WFP/WHO 2007

The ideal partnering agreement is designed to capture an agreed collaboration that has been co-created (not imposed by one or other partner). Often such an agreement can be split into an over-arching partnering MoU alongside other forms of agreement or contract for the delivery of specific activities or transfer of resources. Ideally the agreement becomes an expression of the vision, aspirations, hoped-for results of the partnership both from each partner's perspective, and collectively, rather than simply a means of control.

By attempting to embed the core partnering principles of equity, mutual benefit and transparency into the agreement, the process itself can help push a transactional relationship towards being more of a partnership.

This scorecard was modified from one developed by the Partnering Initiative of London England. WFP gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

Scoring Methodology

- Review the attached “Essential Elements” to identify the factors
- Some questions may not be applicable, if so identify same in the “comments
- Rate each of the questions on a 0-10 scale as follows:
 - 0 = No reference to the issue at hand
 - 1-3 = Minimal and short references
 - 4-5 = Vague , non-specific references
 - 6-7 = Incomplete, but generally descriptive, able to be generally understood
 - 8-10= Complete, detailed descriptions, able to be well understood

Ingredient	Score (0-10) or n/a	Comments (e.g. what could be adapted to make it more appropriate to a partnership?)
TA – WFP/WHO (2007)		N.B. TA follows basic WFP template outlining terms, conditions, services and obligations associated with participation in HRD Network. In this sense, the TA resembles more a leasing and service arrangement than a partnership agreement. Moreover, the generic composure of TA stifles opportunities to explore possibilities for collaborative relationships between parties and within the larger framework of the HRD Network. Additionally, SOPs were missing from Annex 2 and therefore could not be included in this evaluation.

WHO?		
Description of partner organizations (inc. mission)	10	
Identification of representatives and their status	10	

WHY?		
Vision statement	5	Generically defined as per basic TA model.
Shared objectives	5	As above.
Individual partner objectives	5	Individual objectives relating to agreement should be more thoroughly outlined.

WHAT?		
Proposed project / activities	6	Defined as per basic TA model. Could be brought more in line with partners' individual needs and/or objectives.
Outline work plan	6	As above.
Resource commitments from each partner	6	As above.
Roles and responsibilities	6	As above.
Performance indicators	6	As above.
Sustainability strategy	5	Should be more fully developed through consultation i.e. unique to each agreement.
Risks (collective and to each partner)	7	Generally defined in sections 8 & 11 (Liability and <i>Force Majeure</i>)

WHEN?		
Timeframes	6	Defined as per basic TA model.
Milestones	7	Generally defined in terms of 6 mo. initial review followed by annual review between parties. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives.

HOW?		
Relationship management protocols	7	Defined as per WFP's TA model.
Governance arrangements	4	Defined as above in main body of agreement. However, SOPs which also govern agreement have not been included in Annex 2.
Decision-making procedures	7	Generally defined as per TA model.
Funding arrangements (possibly covered by further contracts)	8	Defined.
Measures to mitigate risks	7	Generic to TA model.
Measures to strengthen partnering capacity	7	As above.

HOW?		
Metrics for monitoring & measuring partnership performance against each partners' objectives & shared objectives	2	No specific metrics detailed. Generic (to agreement) evaluative measures contained within TA. Could be brought more in line to reflect partners' individual needs and/or objectives vis-à-vis the partnership.
Health check / review procedures	N/A	N/A

COMMUNICATION		
Procedures for on-going partner communications	6	Defined within TA model. Does not reflect individual requirements and special considerations.
Rules for branding (using own, each others)	N/A	N/A
Rules for the public profile of the partnership	N/A	N/A
Intellectual property and confidentiality rules	0	While intellectual property may not apply, confidentiality rules (if required) relating to, e.g. materials, supplies, equipment and operations of partners not protected (or waived) within this agreement model.
Protocols for communicating with constituents and other interested parties	N/A	N/A

WHAT IF?		
Grievance mechanism to resolve differences	10	Defined.
Rules for individual partners to leave or join	10	Defined.
Exit ('moving on') strategy for partnership as a whole (in particular to ensure sustainability of outcomes)	0	Not defined.

TOTAL SCORE: 158 out of 260

Rome, January 2012, OE/2012/003

Office of Evaluation
www.wfp.org/evaluation



World Food Programme