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Purpose and Content

As part of a new series of operation evaluations launched in 2013, the Office of Evaluation of the World Food Programme (WFP) developed this Orientation Guide on WFP and its operations. This guide is primarily intended for independent evaluation companies, with whom WFP has established long-term agreements. However, as this guide is relevant and comprehensive, it will benefit new WFP Employees.

This Orientation Guide provides a quick summary of WFP, its Mission Statement, Strategic Objectives, programme categories and activities. It draws on existing WFP policies and guidelines, and provides references to the official sources for each topic without replacing them. Given that WFP policies, guidance and lessons learned from past operations are regularly revised and updated, this guide will require periodic updating.

The guide is divided in three sections: Section 1 provides an overview of the organization. Section 2 describes the overall framework under which WFP operations are designed and implemented, followed by Section 3, which gives an outline of WFP’s project cycle.

Contact info

WFP Office of Evaluation:  WFP.Evaluation@wfp.org
For requests to update:  Julie.Thoulouzan@wfp.org
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1. Overview

1. This section provides a broad overview of the World Food Programme, including its Mission Statement, governance and structure, as well as its overall budget and funding sources.

1.1 Introduction

2. The World Food Programme (WFP) was established in 1963 by the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) as the food assistance branch of the United Nations. WFP is the largest humanitarian agency with an annual budget, which averaged US$7.28 billion in the last three years (2012–2014). On average, WFP aims to reach more than 90 million people with food assistance in about 80 countries. About 12,000 people work for the organization, most of them in the field.

1.2 Mission Statement

3. As stipulated in the WFP Mission Statement, WFP’s mandate is to design and implement strategies, policies and activities related to food assistance, with the aim to:

- Save lives in refugee and other emergency situations.
- Improve the nutrition and quality of life of the most vulnerable people at critical times in their lives when they are unable to produce enough food or do not have the resources to obtain the food that they and their households require for active and healthy lives.
- Help build assets and promote the self-reliance of poor people and communities.
- Promote world food security in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations and FAO.

1.3 Governance and Structure

4. WFP is governed by the Executive Board, consisting of 36 State Members of the United Nations or Member Nations of FAO who are elected for three years on a rotational basis. Eighteen members are elected by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC) and the other eighteen by the FAO Council. The Executive Board’s main functions include: (i) evolving and coordinating short-term and longer-term food assistance policies; (ii) providing intergovernmental supervision and direction to WFP management; (iii) reviewing, modifying as necessary, and approving WFP operations;\(^1\) and (iv) reporting annually on WFP’s programmes, projects and activities to ECOSOC and the FAO Council.

\(^1\) Not all WFP operations fall under the approval authority of the Executive Board. For more information see Annex I.
5. WFP is headed by an **Executive Director** who is responsible for the administration of WFP and the implementation of its programmes, projects and other activities. The current Executive Director, Ertharin Cousin, was appointed in 2012 for five years.

6. The WFP Headquarters in Rome, Italy, focuses on the development of policies, approaches, standards, oversight and initiatives to ensure accountability and the provision of corporate services. In the light of lessons learned from the Fit for Purpose initiative, the Executive Director has made organizational adjustments. This initiative aims to empower country offices and regional bureaux, and ensure that WFP has in place the people, partnerships and policies to meet food-assistance needs.

7. The Executive Director supported by the Chief of Staff will directly oversee the regional bureaux to enhance accountability. The Office of the Ombudsman, the Human Resources Division, an Innovation and Change Management Division, the Legal Office, the Inspector General and Oversight Office, the Office of Evaluation, the Ethics Office and the Regional Bureaux Support Office will also have a direct reporting line to the Executive Director.

8. The Deputy Executive Director (DED) has moved temporarily to New York to ensure that WFP is effectively represented at the United Nations. The DED oversees WFP’s New York and Geneva offices, which will become a platform for full engagement in major events in 2015 and 2016, including the World Humanitarian Summit, and for WFP’s representation in United Nations coherence initiatives and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Transformative Agenda. The Addis Ababa office also reports to the DED to ensure that WFP’s engagement in international policy dialogue is closely aligned with that of African Union (AU) members positions, in particular with respect to the implementation of Agenda 2030.

9. WFP headquarters consists of the following departments:
   - **Operations Services Department (OS)** directly supports Country Offices, includes Policy and Programme (OSZ), Emergency Preparedness and Response (OSE), Gender (GEN), Nutrition (OSN), Supply Chain (OSC) and Common Logistics Services (OSX) such as the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service (UNHAS), the United Nations Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD) and the logistics cluster.
   - **Resource Management Department** headed by the Assistant Executive Director who is also WFP’s Chief Financial Officer, responsible for keeping a separation of duties between budgetary approval, financial oversight and expenditure management, and representing WFP to external stakeholders for accountability purposes. The department looks after resource allocation (including budgeting and contribution programming); financial management; and systems for external and internal accountability, as well as information technology, field security, facilities management and staff medical and counselling.

Read more:
- WFP General Regulations and General Rules
- EB Briefing Materials
• **Partnership and Governance Services** takes care of communications and WFP’s relations with the Executive Board and partners such as government donors, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector.

10. The six regional bureaux are the primary platform for supporting, managing and overseeing 80 country offices, as follows:

- **OMB-Asia & the Pacific** (based in Bangkok and covers 14 country offices)
- **OMC-Middle East, North Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia** (based in Cairo and covers 15 country offices)
- **OMD-West Africa** (based in Dakar and covers 19 country offices)
- **OMN-East and Central Africa** (based in Nairobi and covers 9 country offices)
- **OMJ-Southern Africa** (based in Johannesburg and covers 12 country offices)
- **OMP-Latin America and Caribbean** (based in Panama City and covers 11 country offices)

11. Table 1 summarizes the respective functions of country offices and regional bureaux.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Offices</th>
<th>Regional Bureaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design and implement operations;</td>
<td>• Implement the Strategic Plan and provide guidance and policy support for operations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mobilize resources</td>
<td>• Support management and supervision of country offices’ programmes of work;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manage in-country resources;</td>
<td>• Monitor programme performance and be accountable for the achievement of objectives in country offices; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan and implement new initiatives and tools;</td>
<td>• Enable country offices to maintain required technical and operational capacities and facilitate sharing of technical resources in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop partnerships with national authorities, NGOs, civil-society groups,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donor representatives, the private sector and financial and research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions with a view to increasing programme effectiveness;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manage human resources; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate staff safety and security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


12. Figure 1 highlights countries where WFP is present.
Figure 1: WFP Global Presence
The Office of Evaluation (OEV) supports WFP in its efforts to achieve its strategic objectives through evaluation. Evaluations inform all stakeholders about the quality and effectiveness of policies, strategies and operations, and the efficiency of their implementation. Evaluations:

- inform debate of strategic issues;
- contribute to actions that replicate success and correct mistakes; and
- serve accountability and learning.

These principles and WFP’s means to institutionalize them are explained in the evaluation policy. WFP’s Executive Board provides strategic guidance to OEV through the Annual Consultation on Evaluation and considers the Annual Evaluation Report at its annual session. The Director of Evaluation reports to the Executive Director of WFP, but issues evaluation reports directly to the Executive Board without prior clearance from WFP.
Management. In this way and others, OEV is independent from those directly responsible for designing and managing policies, strategies and operations. Following the peer review of WFP’s evaluation function by the United Nations Evaluation Group and Development Assistance Committee, a revised evaluation policy was approved by the Board in November 2015. The new 2016-2021 Evaluation Policy sets the strategic vision and direction for embedding evaluation into WFP’s culture beyond the Office of Evaluation to strengthen evidence-based policy and programming across WFP’s work and help maximize its impact. In line with Agenda 2030, WFP’s evaluation function will be built out beyond the current central function. The evaluation function model designed for the new policy will combine centralized and demand-led decentralized evaluations.

14. In 2012, WFP embarked on an organizational strengthening effort known as the Framework for Action, which aims to:

- enhance the capacity of country offices to design and implement country programmes and operations;
- increase the capacity of regional bureaux to provide the policy, management and front-line support for country offices; and
- ensure that Headquarters operates as an efficient field-oriented organization that establishes policies, strategies and standards, provides oversight, supports innovation and facilitates optimum accountability, performance monitoring and reporting.

The organizational realignment is expected to improve WFP’s ability to adapt and respond to changing needs in the coming years by allocating resources that will enable country offices and regional bureaux to implement the Strategic Plan more effectively. Figure 2 shows WFP current organigram.
Figure 2: WFP Organigram

15. **Structure of a WFP country office.** At a minimum, a country office is made up of a country director, administration, finance, logistics and programme staff. The number of staff and their individual duties will vary according to the size and nature of the WFP intervention, which is itself dependent on local circumstances and the amount of funding available to the country office. A more complex operation may also include the following staff: a deputy country director; a head of programme, a vulnerability analysis and mapping officer, a nutritionist, a monitoring and evaluation officer, a logistics officer, a procurement officer, a field security officer, an ICT officer and a communications officer; and a variety of field operations services staff with specific responsibilities for air operations, monitoring, radio operations, site operations, warehouse management and/or workshop/fleet operations. Generally, a country office is made up of a main office, usually in the capital of the country where WFP is providing assistance, and a number of sub-offices located at strategic positions across the country to implement and monitor the interventions.

1.4 **Budget and Donors**

16. Unlike several other United Nations agencies, WFP is funded entirely by voluntary contributions and does not receive a core budget from United Nations Headquarters. Contributions are received from governments, inter-governmental organizations/inter-agency arrangements, pooled funds, private companies and individuals. WFP produces each year on a rolling basis a Management Plan, which is a three-year comprehensive plan of work, inclusive of planned outcomes and indicators of achievements, together with the annual WFP budget. The Management Plan is submitted to the Executive Board for approval but this does not imply that all resources required will be available. The WFP annual budget averaged US$7.28 billion in the last three years (2012–2014). Funding levels over the last three years averaged US$4.6 billion, representing 64 percent of the total requirements. Funding comes from over 100 different sources, with the bulk covered by government donors. Figure 3 shows the level of contributions received between 2002 and 2015.
Figure 3: Contributions from 2002 to 2015 (US$ million)

Source: Data as of 15 Nov 2015 provided by WFP Government Partnerships Division.

17. **Governments** are the principal source of funding for WFP, contributing to more than 93 percent of all funds received in 2014.
OECD-DAC countries: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) donors typically provide 80 to 90 percent of WFP’s overall funding and are considered its primary funding base of support. The United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, the European Commission, Germany, Japan, and Australia have been among WFP’s top ten donors every year from 2010 to 2014.

BRIC (Brazil, Russian Federation, India and China), the Middle East and other non-traditional donors: In recent years, WFP has received increasingly broad and stronger support from other sources such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates and the Russian Federation, which are among the top donors within this group.

Host governments: Some national governments support WFP projects, often through in-kind donations or programme support.

Source: WFP Government Partnerships Division.

18. Pooled funds. Thematic or multi-donor trust funds provide a centralized fund allocation mechanism in support of a theme or a specific country and account for about 5 percent of all contributions to WFP. The United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and the United Nations Common Humanitarian Funds (CHF) provide the bulk of the support. Figure 4 shows the ten main donors in 2014.

19. Private donors. WFP has a distinct complementary strategy for private-sector partnerships, which aims to raise US$92 million of sustainable funding per year by 2017. Following an evaluation of its Private Sector Partnership and Fundraising Strategy in 2012, WFP adopted in May 2013 a new strategy covering the period 2014-2017. Private donors include for-profit corporations and business associations, foundations, trusts, educational or service organizations, NGOs and individuals. Examples of partnerships with foundations and private companies include the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Howard G. Buffett Foundation (for the Purchase for Progress project), Royal DSM (for nutrition activities),
UPS Worldwide Courier Delivery Service (for logistics) and MasterCard (for Cash-Based Transfers\(^2\)).

Framework for Action at Operational Level

20. This section focuses on the overall framework under which operations are being implemented, namely:

- Strategic Plan, Strategic Results Framework and corporate policies;
- Types of operations (or programme categories);
- The toolbox of activities that are implemented; and
- Financial framework.

2.1. Strategies and Policies Governing WFP’s Work

2.1.1 Millennium Development Goals and Sustainable Development Goals

21. The results achieved since the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were launched at the start of the century have been remarkable. In 1990, 43% of people in developing countries lived in extreme poverty. With this figure projected to fall to 13.4% by the end of 2015, the MDG goal of halving the number of people living in poverty will be achieved. Significant progress has also been achieved in reducing global hunger. The number of undernourished people has declined by 216 million people since 1990. The percentage of undernourished people in the world has decreased from 23.3% to 12.9%, narrowly missing the MDG target. Significant progress has also been made in reducing infant mortality and tackling diseases, such as HIV, Tuberculosis, and Polio.

22. The MDGs were essential for catalyzing actions by governments and the wider international community in support of poverty eradication and social development. In spite of these successes, the MDGs had shortcomings in several important areas:

- The emphasis of the MDGs on social targets and indicators was not balanced with attention to the economic and environmental concerns that provide the foundation for sustainable development.
- Measurement of average progress at the national level disguised significant levels of inequality within countries.
- The structure of the MDGs represented an approach that did not consider the relationship of interdependence and reciprocity between the various goals and targets. The linkages between malnutrition and disease, water, and sanitation were not explicit, while the importance of agriculture and employment to food security was largely absent.
- The developmental orientation of the MDGs did not address the importance of emergency preparedness and response, disaster risk reduction, and resilience building to protecting and promoting

\(^2\) Cash-Based Transfer (CBTs) refer to unrestricted cash transfers as well as restricted cash transfers (Value Vouchers).
progress against long-term goals. This narrow focus on development in more stable countries reduced the relevance of the MDGs in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.

- The MDGs did not provide sufficient recognition of the fact that nutrition requires a broader set of multi-sectoral interventions that are not covered within the scope of target on poverty and hunger.

- The UN-led monitoring framework and its nearly exclusive application to developing countries led to perceptions by many member states that the MDGs were a top down and donor-driven mechanism for reviewing performance at national level.

23. The development of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aims to address those shortcomings, consolidating 17 goals and 169 targets under the ‘5 Ps’: people, planet, prosperity, peace, and partnership. The increased scale and diversity of goals and targets as well as the sheer complexity of the new development agenda represents a significant challenge for implementation. At the same time, however, the comprehensive and interdependent nature of the agenda addresses some of the more important limitations of the MDGs and clearly points to the global transformations that will be required to achieve sustainable development and eradicate poverty and hunger. The SDGs expand upon the MDGs in several important ways:

- The three dimensions of sustainable development. Social, economic and environmental concerns represent the broader focus of the new agenda.

- The reduction of inequality is critical for achieving the SDGs. The new agenda recognizes that achieving zero-based targets, such as the eradication of poverty and hunger, means that we can leave no one behind.

- The Agenda 2030 is integrated, interdependent and indivisible. The comprehensive framework of goals and targets is intended to be mutually reinforcing and complementary, reflecting recognition that the achievement of any individual goal is dependent on progress in other aspects of the agenda.

- Conflict and humanitarian crises are a threat to sustainable development. The Agenda 2030 acknowledges the potential for conflict, displacement, natural disasters, environmental degradation, and pandemics to reverse developmental progress.

- The new agenda is universal and applies to all countries. Importantly, this will ensure a focus on poor people – no matter where they reside – as opposed to poor countries.
24. The SDGs represent an integrated and comprehensive approach to sustainable development that place the eradication of hunger, malnutrition and poverty at the core of the agenda. SDG2 calls on member states to: ‘End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture’. Four of the five targets under SDG2 are derived from the pillars of the Secretary General’s Zero Hunger Challenge and of direct relevance to WFP’s mandate. The 2030 agenda expands on previous efforts to address the underlying causes of hunger and malnutrition and recognizes that ending hunger means ensuring access to nutritious food for the most vulnerable, tackling the multi-dimensional causes of malnutrition, including health and sanitation; and increasing agricultural production through sustainable and resilient food systems.

2.1.2 Strategic Plans

25. WFP Strategic Plans outline a strategic direction around which all WFP operations are designed. They are currently still based on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which represent the impacts to which WFP and the broader United Nations country programming must contribute. WFP conducts mid-term reviews and updates its Strategic Plan every five years to adapt constantly to the global context in which it operates – the rapid globalization of hunger challenges, including market shocks and climate change (see Box 2 for more details on the most recent mid-term review).

26. The Strategic Plan (2008–2013) marked a historic shift from WFP as a food aid agency to WFP as a food assistance agency. This was necessary to underline that WFP does not only delivers food – it delivers hunger solutions. This historical shift has positioned WFP as a catalyst of practical hunger innovations and introduced a more nuanced set of tools to respond to critical hunger needs (see Box 1). Strategic Plan 2008-2013 includes five Strategic Objectives (see Table 2).

Box 1: WFP’s shift from Food Aid to Food Assistance: what does it entail at operational level?

The Strategic Plan (2008–2013) called for enhanced partnerships with governments, United Nations agencies, international organizations, NGOs and the private sector, where applicable, and for enhanced analysis to improve the understanding of hunger contexts. This implied the following four transitions, moving:

1. From a “food aid” to a “food assistance” organization – meaning that WFP programme responses are focused on actions that contribute to strengthening the food security of the beneficiaries even when “food” is not the primary or only tool that WFP will use.

2. From planning by project to planning based on more strategic, comprehensive approaches – meaning that before determining which specific activities and
operations WFP will support in a country, the country office first looks at the bigger picture over a longer timeframe (through the country strategies).

3. From implementing to enabling government ownership, capacity and accountability – meaning that WFP acknowledges that the Government is in the driver's seat and moves into a supporting role working in service of national priorities to fight hunger. At the same time, WFP should advocate to ensure that hunger, food security and nutrition are on the national agenda.

4. From working with partners to working more effectively in synergy with strategic partners – meaning that WFP moves beyond purely operational implementing partnerships to working in strategic partnerships with others to achieve a shared objective of tackling hunger and food insecurity. For more information see Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance – Innovations in Overcoming Hunger [here](#).

The Four Strategic Evaluations on the Transition from Food Aid to Food Assistance: A Synthesis was published in 2012. It captures common messages about how WFP is progressing in the transition from “food aid” to “food assistance” that was called for in WFP’s 2008–2013 Strategic Plan. The evaluations covered aspects of how WFP puts that transition into practice (working in partnerships); WFP’s responsiveness to the changing environment (how country offices adapt to change); and effectiveness (WFP’s role in social protection and safety nets and in ending long-term hunger). See synthesis report (short version) [here](#).

27. The Strategic Plan (2014–2017) continues WFP’s focus on food assistance for the poorest and most vulnerable, but responds also to an evolving external operating environment and to lessons learned from the 2008–2013 cycle. It sets out what WFP will do to contribute to the broader global goals of reducing risk and vulnerability to shocks, breaking the cycle of hunger, and achieving sustainable food security and nutrition through food assistance while protecting vulnerable people, building lasting resilience and promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment. Capacity development efforts are strengthened across all Strategic Objectives.

28. Both Strategic Plans stress the importance of partnerships to enhance coherence – with national governments, other United Nations organizations, NGOs, regional institutions, international financial institutions, academia/think tanks and the private sector – to achieve success. Table 2 outlines the Strategic Objectives (S.O.) of both Strategic Plans.

Table 2: WFP Strategic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2008–2013</th>
<th>Strategic Plan 2014–2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 1.</strong> Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 1.</strong> Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 2.</strong> Prevent acute hunger and invest in disaster preparedness and mitigation measures.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 2.</strong> Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 3.</strong> Restore and rebuild</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lives and livelihoods in post-conflict, post-disaster or transition situations.

**Strategic Objective 4.** Reduce chronic hunger and undernutrition.

**Strategic Objective 5.** Strengthen the capacities of countries to reduce hunger, including through hand-over strategies and local purchase.

---

**Strategic Objective 3.** Reduce risk and enable people, communities and countries to meet their own food and nutrition needs.

**Strategic Objective 4.** Reduce undernutrition and break the intergenerational cycle of hunger.

Capacity development (previously under Strategic Objective 5) is mainstreamed into the four Strategic Objectives.

---

29. Figure 5 highlights that Strategic Objective 1 (Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies) and Strategic Objective 4 (Reduce undernutrition and break the intergenerational cycle of hunger) are the main Strategic Objectives pursued by WFP at operational level under the Strategic Plan (2014–2017).

**Figure 5: 2014 outputs by Strategic Objective**

![Chart](chart.png)

*Source: 2014 WFP Annual Performance Report*

30. As indicated above, WFP conducts mid-term reviews and updates its Strategic Plan every five years to reflect changes in the global context. Box 2 lists the main recommendations of the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan (2008–2013).

**Box 2: Main Recommendations of the Strategic Plan (2008–2013) Mid-term Review**

- maintain and enhance staff skill profiles, particularly in country offices;
- assess the organizational structure of WFP;
- enhance and increase partnerships at every level;
- continue to pursue financial reforms, focusing on country-level needs;
- improve reporting on impact, efficiency and results;
- improve capacity development;
- address the constraints of the funding model;
- address the challenges of short project duration by integrating WFP programmes into national plans and strategies; and

---

3 Strategic Objective: S.O.
improve the roll-out, communications, change processes and accountability.

See summary report here.

31. The Strategic Plan (2014–2017) renewed WFP’s commitment to contribute to protection and gender equity, by stating “WFP will work to strengthen protection through its operations by conducting gender and protection analysis, engaging beneficiaries in project design and reducing women’s and children’s exposure to violence”. Boxes 3 and 4 outline the practical steps that can be taken by country offices in that respect.
Box 3: Gender Equality for Quality Programming

Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) is a corporate priority for WFP’s programmes and operations. A world with zero hunger can be achieved only when everyone has equal opportunities, equal access to resources, and equal voice in the decisions that shape their households, communities and societies. Everyone’s sex and age influence their visibility and voice. Sex and age issues, combined with individually specific diversity characteristics (including disability, HIV/AIDS, mental health, ethnicity, class and creed), result in different people having very different experiences of crises and varying levels of access to assistance. This is why applying a gender lens to the food security and nutritional work of WFP adds value to the efficiency and effectiveness of our work and its impact on the lives and wellbeing of those we assist.

WFP’s work is and always will be about food and nutrition security. We cannot deliver good food assistance if we do not understand who is affected by food insecurity and malnutrition, what makes them vulnerable and why. Sex and age disaggregated data collection, analysis and use informs the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the impact of our interventions on the lives of the women, girls, boys and men targeted by WFP. This process is reinforced by the use of a corporate gender marker that codes a project’s success in mainstreaming gender on a scale of 0-2. All WFP projects are assigned a gender marker code based on the degree of gender analysis in the project documents prepared.

Often in humanitarian settings, the inequality of the roles and responsibilities assigned to men, women, boys and girls in all communities globally, becomes even more pronounced during a crisis as people seek stability through tradition and custom. This understanding should inform how we design and deliver services. Having a good understanding of how women and men manage their relationships and social roles during, before and after crisis is critical to providing the bridge between relief and development programming and ways forward for WFP to improve the results and impact of its interventions on the food and nutrition security of the people we assist.

WFP’s strategies are manifold: good maternal nutrition (beginning at adolescence and throughout pregnancy and lactation) ensures that children are born healthy; school feeding ensures that girls and boys attend school and complete it, all the while having access to nutritious meals, avoiding early marriage and other negative coping strategies that continue the inter-generational cycle of poverty. For more details see WFP Guidance for the Gender Marker here as well as WFP Gender-Sensitive Social Protection here.

In line with WFP’s renewed commitment to gender equality, a new WFP Gender Policy was developed and approved by the Board in May 2015. The new policy was informed by an evaluation of the previous policy, (see here for the summary report) and covers the period 2015-20 and is based on a consultative process. Regional bureaux will develop a regional Strategy that will lead to Country Office action that directly translates the four objectives of the policy and contribute to ‘zero hunger’. See table 3 below for further details on the goal and objectives of the WFP gender Policy.

Box 4: Protection and Accountability to Affected Population

While WFP is not a protection-mandated agency, WFP is committed to protection as is outlined in its policy on Humanitarian Protection (2012). The Policy guides WFP activities to contribute to humanitarian protection by designing and carrying out food assistance in ways that do not increase the protection risks that crisis-affected populations are exposed to, but rather, contribute to their safety, dignity and integrity.

Protection is intrinsically linked to food security. The most food insecure are frequently also those who are most vulnerable to protection risks, and food insecurity can cause and exacerbate existing risks. At the same time, the access to food and assistance can be hampered by protection risks people are confronted with. Therefore, programming in a
way that is sensitive to protection needs of beneficiaries is key to effective assistance and can be a powerful tool to keep people safe and maintain their dignity.

All offices are encouraged to undertake protection analyses (for more details see WFP Protection Analysis here), as part of, or in addition to food security analyses, to inform programming and devise protection strategies.

Protection Advisors are based in WFP headquarters and within some Regional Bureaux and Country Offices to support the implementation of the protection policy with a particular emphasis on building staff awareness and protection-related skills.

In line with the Protection Policy, in 2012, WFP endorsed the five IASC commitments to ensuring accountability to affected populations (AAP). WFP’s commitment to accountability to affected population is not new. WFP’s policy on participatory approaches dates back to 2000 and already then envisaged the importance of a two-way communication, as well as people’s engagement in the decision-making process affecting their lives. Operationally, WFP focuses on three core aspects of AAP: (i) strengthening transparent information provision, (ii) enabling people to participate in programme design, implementation and monitoring, and (iii) establishing complaints and feedback mechanisms.

WFP believes that the application of AAP and protection not only protects people’s rights, but also improves the quality, effectiveness, and durability of its assistance. Cross-cutting corporate indicators on protection and AAP are included in WFP’s Strategic Results Framework 2014-2017 and country offices are required to report against these, annually.

32. Following the adoption of Agenda 2030, WFP has already opened a dialogue with member states on a new Strategic Plan (2017-2021) and an integrated results framework aligned with the SDGs. The new Strategic Plan will cut the cycle of the current Strategic Plan 2014-2017 with one year to enable the organization to align itself as quickly as possible with the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDG 2. It is envisaged that WFP's new Strategic Objectives will directly respond to the targets under SDG 2 to ensure that WFP programmes contribute to the achievement of the new agenda in a comprehensive manner.

33. WFP will implement Agenda 2030 at the country level through its new approach to Country Strategic Plans (CSP). The objectives of this approach are to (i) support countries to make progress toward achieving ‘zero hunger’; (ii) improve WFP’s strategic positioning at national and global levels; and (iii) operationalize WFP’s corporate Strategic Plan at the country level. The CSP approach will operationalize WFP's Strategic Plan by linking country-level planning and operations to national and global zero hunger targets. The integration of WFP programmes into national food security and nutrition frameworks will help ensure that the organization is well-positioned, in order to deliver a coherent and focused portfolio of assistance.

Read more:
- WFP Performance Management Policy (2014)
- Strategic Results Framework (2008-2013)
- Strategic Results Framework (2014-2017)
2.1.3 Strategic and Management Results Frameworks

34. The Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and the Management Results Framework (MRF) are the principal results frameworks that WFP uses to plan, measure and monitor, review, report against the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2014–2017 and learn from results. They are WFP's key tools for translating the Strategic Plan into concrete outcomes, outputs, measurements and targets.

35. While the SRF is WFP’s normative instrument for project design, monitoring and reporting, the MRF articulates WFP’s internal management approach to planning, measuring and reviewing organizational effectiveness and efficiency, and overall effectiveness beyond the level of individual projects.

36. The new Strategic Plan 2017-2021 will have an integrated Corporate Results Framework (CRF) that will include both SRF and MRF. The CRF will be different from WFP’s current Strategic Results Framework and Management Results Framework in several ways. First, it will be a single, comprehensive framework providing a complete picture of WFP’s expected results and metrics for the 2017-2021 period. Second, the CRF will, for the first time, include impact level statements and indicators. Thirdly, the top of the CRF results hierarchy will be aligned with those SDG goals and targets of relevance to WFP’s vision of zero hunger (especially SDG2). Finally, the CRF will be a key instrument to help guide planning, budgeting, monitoring, performance management and reporting at HQ, regional and country level.

2.1.4 Corporate policies

37. Country offices should follow WFP policies when formulating and implementing an operation, although not all of them may be applicable in every context. WFP updates every year a compendium summarizing current policies and identifying policy gaps and policies that need updating (see here for more details). Table 3 summarizes the most recent policies.

Table 3: Summary of WFP policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Policy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>In a world of global transparency, national leadership and mutual accountability, the capacity to provide independent and credible evaluation at all organizational levels is a necessity and no longer an option. The new 2016-2021 Evaluation Policy sets the strategic vision and direction for embedding evaluation into WFP’s culture beyond the Office of Evaluation to strengthen evidence-based policy and programming across WFP’s work, to help maximize its impact - crucial in the complex challenges the world and WFP face. In line with Agenda 2030, WFP's evaluation function will be built out beyond the current central function. The evaluation function model designed for the new policy will combine centralized and demand-led decentralized evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Gender Policy**                                        | 2015 | This new policy supercedes the 2009 Gender Policy. Its goal is to enable WFP to integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment into all of its work and activities, to ensure that the different food security and nutrition needs of women, men, girls and boys are met. To achieve this goal, the policy establishes four objectives:   
  i) Food assistance adapted to different needs. Women, men, girls and boys benefit from food assistance programmes and activities that are adapted to their different needs and capacities.  
  ii) Equal participation. Women and men participate equally in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of gender transformative food security and nutrition programmes and policies.  
  iii) Decision-making by women and girls. Women and girls have increased power in decision-making regarding food security and nutrition in households, communities and societies.  
  iv) Gender and protection. Food assistance does no harm to the safety, dignity and integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it, and is provided in ways that respect their rights.  
  Collecting, analysing and using sex- and age-disaggregated data is the first step in designing sound food assistance programmes and policies. Once this data has been analysed, gender can then be mainstreamed into all phases of the programme cycle. When gender and age analysis indicates that one population group is particularly vulnerable or at risk, actions targeting that group can be implemented. |
| **Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition**   | 2015 | This policy guides WFP in enhancing its contribution to building resilience to shocks and stressors and to achieving zero hunger. A resilience-building approach starts with the way strategies and programmes are conceived, with resilience at the centre of the programme cycle. Enhancing capacities to absorb, adapt and transform in the face of shocks and stressors requires a significant level of collaboration over a prolonged period. WFP will support resilience-building by aligning its activities with the plans and actions of governments and partners. The implications for future WFP engagement are described in the areas of: i) strategy and programme planning; ii) programme design and implementation; iii) programme support; and iv) strategic partnerships. |
| **South-South and Triangular Cooperation Policy**         | 2015 | South-South and Triangular Cooperation is crucial for supporting the transfer of technology, capacity and knowledge that is necessary to implement the Agenda 2030. WFP’s contribution to achieving SDG2 on Ending Hunger depends for a large part on its ability to support governments in designing and managing nationally owned hunger solutions and in enabling governments to support and share food security and nutrition solutions and expertise with other developing countries. This policy is based on the following guiding principles:  
  - focus on the most vulnerable;  
  - promote local ownership;  
  - ensure inclusiveness and balance;  
  - facilitate learning and innovation;  
  - strengthen country systems and capacities;  
  - emphasize complementarity; and  
  - add value and build on existing structures. |
**Policy title**  |  **Date**  |  **Focus**
--- | --- | ---
**Corporate partnership strategy**  | 2014  | WFP’s corporate partnership strategy (2014-2017) provides a high-level framework for identifying, and guiding the development of effective partnerships. Improved partnering will increase the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of WFP operations and enhance the beneficial impact on the people they serve. The strategy supports rather than supersedes other partner-specific policies.

WFP defines partnerships as collaborative relationships between actors that achieve better outcomes for the people they serve by: i) combining and leveraging complementary resources; ii) sharing risks, responsibilities and accountability; and iii) working together in a transparent, equitable and mutually beneficial way. With partnerships, WFP can achieve objectives more efficiently, effectively or innovatively when the value created is greater than the transaction costs involved.

The overarching message of the strategy is that WFP takes a “partnering approach” to all its relationships and is guided by principles that are strategic, precautionary and prescriptive. WFP will ensure that the partnerships it engages in:

- contribute to the achievement of WFP’s Strategic Objectives;
- are cost-effective;
- reflect international priorities in food security and nutrition;
- confirm and enhance WFP’s standing as an ethical operator; and
- are properly resourced by all parties.

**School Feeding Policy**  | 2013  | Following an evaluation of the 2009 School Feeding Policy (see here for the summary report), a revised School Feeding Policy was approved by the Executive Board in November 2013. WFP’s overarching vision is to continue advocating for the universal adoption of school feeding programmes as a safety net that helps increase children’s access to education and learning opportunities and strengthens their health and nutrition status by reducing micronutrient deficiencies. It recommends that WFP focuses on helping countries to establish and maintain well-funded nationally owned and managed programmes linked to local agricultural production. In countries still requiring WFP’s operational support, WFP is to implement school feeding programmes with clear handover strategies, where appropriate. Building on the System Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) assessment framework which was led by the World Bank in collaboration with WFP and Partnership for Child Development (PCD), the policy replaces the quality standards for school feeding by the following five policy goals: (i) policy frameworks; (ii) financial capacity; (iii) institutional capacity and coordination; (iv) design and implementation; and (v) Community roles – reaching beyond schools. The policy introduces two new requirements: all new project documents should include the SABER and the planned cost per child per year.

**WFP’s Role in Peacebuilding in Transition Settings**  | 2013  | This policy sets the parameters for WFP’s engagement in peacebuilding activities as part of larger United Nations efforts to transition towards peace in countries emerging from conflict. It proposes eight key principles to guide WFP’s work in these difficult settings: i) understand the context; ii) maintain a hunger focus; iii) support national priorities where possible, but follow humanitarian principles where conflict continues; iv) support United Nations coherence; v) at a minimum avoid doing harm; vi) be responsive to a
Based on these principles, WFP will: (i) enhance its ability to conduct risk analysis in transition settings; (ii) pursue conflict-sensitive programming with options that can be selected to fit the context; and (iii) explore new opportunities to work with partners on peacebuilding to ensure a consistent and coherent approach to its work in transition settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Safety Nets Policy**     | 2004 (updated in 2012) | The policy update outlines WFP roles and comparative advantages in supporting national safety nets, clarifies key social protection and safety net concepts and their relevance to WFP’s activities, identifies emerging issues and sets out priorities, opportunities and challenges for the future. The update of the policy recommends that WFP:  
  ➢ focus social protection and safety-net interventions on its comparative advantages;  
  ➢ develop internal capacities for social protection and safety-net interventions;  
  ➢ take account of local conditions when establishing social protection and safety-net projects;  
  ➢ contribute to the development of national social-protection systems; and  
  ➢ improve adherence to appropriate standards in social-protection interventions. |
| **Nutrition Policy**       | 2012          | Acknowledging the importance of adequate nutrition during the first 1,000 days of a child’s life and lessons learned from scaling up nutrition interventions in emergencies, the WFP Nutrition Policy prioritizes:  
  ➢ treating moderate acute malnutrition (wasting);  
  ➢ preventing acute malnutrition (wasting);  
  ➢ preventing chronic malnutrition (stunting) supporting women during pregnancy and lactation, children 6-23 months of age and adolescent girls;  
  ➢ addressing micronutrient deficiencies among vulnerable people, particularly to reduce the risk of mortality during emergencies and to improve health; and  
  ➢ strengthening the focus on nutrition results in programmes without a primary nutrition objective and, where possible, linking vulnerable groups to these programmes (nutrition sensitive programming).  
  The nutrition policy was evaluated in 2015 (see here for the summary report). |
| **Humanitarian Protection Policy** | 2012      | The policy makes humanitarian protection an integral element of WFP’s work in conflict situations and disasters with a view to protect people’s safety, dignity, integrity and, ultimately, their rights as enshrined in international law. By doing so, the policy also contributes to improving the quality, effectiveness and durability of food assistance programs. The policy calls for:  
  ➢ investing in institutional capacity for context and risk analysis; |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>It focuses on building resilience and capacity among the most vulnerable people, communities and countries by ensuring food and nutrition security, reducing the risk of disaster, and protecting and enhancing lives and livelihoods. The policy emphasizes that disaster risk reduction involves complementing emergency responses with targeted prevention, mitigation and preparedness activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV and AIDS Policy</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>It recommends that WFP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP’s Role in the Humanitarian Assistance System</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>It describes WFP’s engagement in humanitarian system and reforms, particularly with respect to the Transformative Agenda of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee. Annual updates are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development and Hand-Over</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>WFP’s 2009 policy on capacity development has been supplemented by an action plan that reflects the shift from the food aid approach to food assistance. It outlines a new vision for WFP, and recognizes that WFP must work as a partner with communities and countries to reduce hunger. This requirement is met by: (i) providing direct capacity when necessary to respond to hunger; and (ii) facilitating the development of national capacities to reduce hunger and improve food security by supporting anti-hunger policies, institutions and programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Vouchers and Cash Transfers as Food Assistance Instruments | 2008   | Cash-based transfers (CBT) provide beneficiaries with monetary assistance that enables them to obtain food of a predefined value or quantity from identified marketing outlets. CBT can be central elements of responses to emergencies and protracted crises, development programmes and national social protection and safety net systems. Under this policy and WFP’s Strategic Plan (2014–2017), WFP can scale up cash and voucher transfers, where feasible and appropriate, supported by changes in its financial framework that increase transparency and enhance the accountability for such programming. An evaluation of the policy was presented to the Board in 2015 (see
The evaluation found that although the policy does not represent WFP’s current best practice for policies, it served its purpose in establishing the basis for authorizing use of cash-based transfers within WFP’s mandate.

**Humanitarian Principles** 2004

It provides a statement of WFP’s core humanitarian principles (humanity, impartiality and neutrality), as well as foundations for effective humanitarian action (respect, self-reliance, capacity development, participation, coordination, accountability and professionalism).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Policies</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeting in Emergencies</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian Access and its Implications for WFP</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Procurement in Developing Countries</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Role and Application of Economic Analysis in WFP</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of Emergencies</strong></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Emergencies</strong></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programming Food Aid in Urban Areas (Operational Guidelines)</strong></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Needs Assessment</strong></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Aid and Livelihoods in Emergencies: Strategies for WFP</strong></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Food Insecurity: Strategies for WFP</strong></td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WFP and the Environment</strong></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Types of operations

38. For years and until 2016, a country office needs an operation to be approved before it can begin to operate. WFP can intervene through four different types of operations (also called programme categories), including emergency operations, protracted relief and recovery operations, country programmes/development projects and special operations. The choice of the programme category will depend on the context as well as the scope and objectives of the operation. Country offices can have multiple operations running at the same time. WFP’s planned programme of work for 2016 includes a total of 142 operations in about 80 countries. In 2010, WFP made a commitment to ensure greater uniformity in the application of programme categories and distinguish more clearly between humanitarian and development activities.

39. Figure 6 shows WFP’s 2016 programme of work by programme category both in terms of operational requirements and in number of operations.

Figure 6: 2016 Planned proportion of operation types in terms of operational requirements and number of operations

Source: Data supporting WFP Management Plan (2016–2018)

2.2.1 Emergency operations

40. Context: Emergency operations (EMOPs) are the principal means by which WFP responds to new emergency needs. EMOPs are designed for responding to natural and human-induced disasters that threaten people’s lives and livelihoods and disrupt the socio-economic fabric and infrastructure of affected communities. EMOPs entail assisting those experiencing: (i) severe decline in food consumption; (ii) extremely high increase, or risk of increase in malnutrition and mortality; (iii) sharply curtailed purchasing power or

Read more:
Programme Category Review
terms of trade; and (iv) excessive use of destructive coping strategies. Emergency situations are typically fluid and characterized by high levels of unpredictability and instability.

41. **Objectives:** The emphasis of EMOPs is to save lives, reduce malnutrition and protect livelihoods (Strategic Objective 1). Assistance to restore livelihoods and food supply systems, and otherwise contribute to recovery, is begun as soon as possible.

42. **Duration:** The response has to be quick, yet flexible so as to adjust to the changing conditions on the ground. This uncertainty necessitates that EMOPs maintain a relatively short operational cycle (up to one year).

43. **Approval authority:** Depending on their costs, EMOPs can be approved either by WFP Deputy Executive Director, or jointly by the Executive Director and FAO Director General. See Annex I for information on approval authority.

### 2.2.2 IR EMOP and IR Preparedness

44. IR EMOPs and IR Preparedness are distinct from the regular EMOPs described in the previous section in several ways mainly their approval authority and process, funding source and duration. When rapid assessments have determined that immediate WFP food assistance is needed and that such assistance cannot be provided through any other resource already available (and that the regular EMOP procedure cannot apply because of the level of urgency), an IR-EMOP can be launched. When there is an imminent threat of a new crisis (or worsening of a current crisis), an IR Preparedness can be launched to implement ad hoc preparedness activities and limited purchase of durable and consumable (non food) goods at field level. It should not be used to move and preposition food stocks, nor to cover staff costs.

45. **Budget and Approval authority:** IR EMOPs and IR Preparedness are approved by their budget, which does not exceed US$ 2,000,000 and can be approved by the Country Director/Regional Director/ Director of Emergencies or the Deputy Executive Director/Chief of Staff (see Annex I for more information). They do not require a P Programme Review Process.

46. **Funding source:** IR EMOPs and IR Preparedness are funded by the Immediate Response Account (IRA), a flexible funding facility that allows WFP to respond quickly to emergencies without waiting for the confirmation of donor funding. It is replenished through donor contributions and with unspent balances from EMOPs, PRROs, and SOs.

47. **Duration:** The duration of IR-EMOP does not exceed three months. In exceptional cases, when there are undistributed commodities, an
extension in time of up to 45 days to complete the implementation can be requested. If further needs arise, a regular EMOP would need to follow.

2.2.3 Protracted relief and recovery operations

48. Context: Protracted relief and recovery operations (PRROs) are the means by which WFP responds to protracted relief and recovery needs, especially during and in the aftermath of complex emergencies and long-term droughts, and for long-term support to refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). While PRROs are traditionally implemented in situations where conditions on the ground may have improved beyond emergency thresholds, many people may still be in life-threatening situations owing to a prolonged conflict, and others may have just begun to recover, although from a threshold of very low resiliency. Economic activity could be starting up again, but availability and economic access to food for many shock-affected people may still be extremely poor. The recovery process may be delayed especially in situations where national authorities lack the capacity to attend to the basic needs of those affected.

49. Objectives: PRROs focus on helping re-establish and stabilize livelihoods and food security, as well as to stabilize or prevent malnutrition, to the extent that the circumstances allow it, while continuing to provide relief where necessary. Their flexibility allows adapting the balance between relief and recovery during implementation in response to changes in the situation.

50. Duration: PRROs are designed for a period ranging between two and three years. As opportunities to pursue longer-term objectives become apparent, PRRO activities will end, taken on by other partners, or end up becoming part of a country programme or development project.

51. Approval authority: Depending on their costs, PRROs can be approved either by the Deputy Executive Director, the Executive Director or the Executive Board. See Annex I for more information on approval authority.

2.2.4 Country programmes and development projects

52. Context: WFP’s development food assistance is provided at the request of the host government under a country programme (CP) or development project (DEV). These interventions are intended to assist marginalized population groups that encounter sustained socio-economic disparities that result in chronic problems, such as persistently high levels of undernutrition and low food consumption.

53. Objectives: Development food assistance is designed to enable the poorest people to meet their short-term food needs in ways that build longer-term human and physical assets. Food assistance is only provided where lasting physical assets or human capital will be created and where these assets will benefit poor, food-insecure households and their
communities. Development programmes are the appropriate instrument for tackling chronic food insecurity and undernutrition which requires sustained interventions over longer periods. They are embedded in national food security policies, frameworks and priorities. Development programmes should be based on any of WFP’s five priorities for development food assistance:

- Enable young children and pregnant and lactating women to meet their special nutritional and nutrition-related health needs.
- Enable poor households to invest in human capital through education and training.
- Help poor families to gain and preserve assets.
- Mitigate the effects of recurring natural disasters in vulnerable areas.
- Help households that depend on degraded natural resources to shift to more sustainable livelihoods, improve productivity and prevent further degradation of the natural resource base.

54. **Duration:** CPs last normally for five years but the duration of development projects can be shorter.

55. **Approval authority:** Depending on their costs, DEV projects can be approved either by the Deputy Executive Director, the Executive Director or the Executive Board. CPs are approved by the Executive Board. See Annex I for information on approval authority.

56. Table 4 summarizes the main differences and commonalities between country programmes and development projects.

### Table 4: Differences and commonalities between country programmes and development projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Development Projects</th>
<th>Country Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Limited to a single development activity and/or component.</td>
<td>Include several development components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>In countries with long, complex emergencies, where they complement emergency operations or protracted relief and recovery operations. DEV projects support longer-term objectives in a more stable area of the country. Can also be approved where WFP's intervention is limited to a single activity or where the level of WFP development assistance is so low that it does not justify the effort of preparing a country programme.</td>
<td>Normally require relatively secure and politically stable contexts for success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Normally five years, but can be shorter - for example, to bridge the period until the start of the next United Nations Development</td>
<td>Are, in principle, aligned with the UNDAF cycle (five years).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assistance Framework (UNDAF) cycle.

| Approval procedure | Development projects below US$3 million food value are approved by the Executive Director. Development projects above US$3 million food value require the Executive Board’s approval (with one submission only). | Country programmes are approved by the Executive Board. |

**Commonalities**

| Overall framework | Country programmes and development projects are developed on the basis of the common country assessment, UNDAF, or poverty reduction strategy for the country. |
| Country programme approach | Country programmes and development projects follow the country programme approach as mandated by the United Nations General Assembly, which requires that assistance to each country be provided in a way that is:  
- integrated with the priorities and other activities of the country itself, as well as those of the United Nations system and other donors;  
- coherent, so that elements of the WFP sub-programmes in each country relate closely  
- to each other to achieve a clear purpose;  
- focused on those geographical areas and households that represent WFP’s target groups; and  
- flexible, so that activities may be adjusted within the programme period in line with changing circumstances. |
| Resource-based | The scope of country programmes and development projects should be defined based on a realistic funding forecast (unlike EMOPs and PRROs, which are essentially needs-based). |

### 2.2.5 Special operations

57. The last programme category – special operations (SOs) – is not food-based, but can be either in support of a WFP operation (e.g. EMOP/PRRO) or serves the humanitarian community at large. WFP launches SOs to address specific project requirements, such as logistics capacity development, and transport infrastructure construction or rehabilitation. SOs are also the funding mechanism for designated common services provided to the humanitarian community by WFP, including those provided by UNHAS, the Logistics Cluster, Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC) and the Food Security Cluster.

58. WFP implements four main types of SOs:

- Logistics augmentation — road construction, port rehabilitation, etc.;
- UNHAS — common air passenger services for the humanitarian community;
- Cluster — common services or coordination for partners, via the Logistics Cluster, ETC, and Food Security Cluster; or
- a mixture of two or more of the above.

59. The number and types of SO have grown considerably in the past decade, and funding contributions have been steady. In 2013 there were a
total of 38 projects with a combined annual value of US$336 million. Of these, 88% (US$296 million) were funded, including cost recovery. Figure 7 below shows 2013 SOs by project type.

Figure 7: Special Operations in 2013, by project type (US$ million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Value (US$)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Augmentation</td>
<td>68,172,467</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>57,880,995</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHAS</td>
<td>207,530,795</td>
<td>61.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>2,110,634</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Country Strategic Plans

60. To address the currently fragmented project approach that WFP utilizes at the country level, a new approach to country strategic and programmatic planning is being designed and will submitted to the Executive Board for its approval in November 2016. Under this new approach, Country Strategic Plans (CSP) will operationalize WFP Strategic Plan 2017-2021, and WFP’s contribution to Agenda 2030 at the country level. CSP will be the sole country-level strategic, programmatic and governance document for a country, in lieu of the current set of operations, although emergencies will continue to be handled through EMOPs.

61. Country Strategic Plans: i) define WFP’s position and role based on country needs and WFP’s comparative advantage; ii) specify the government-determined or jointly-defined targets - “strategic results”- to which WFP will contribute during a four- or five-year period; iii) identify the strategic, resourcing and technical support actions that will be taken to maximize WFP’s contributions to these strategic results; iv) facilitate effective humanitarian and development action; v) promote internal focus, coherence and prioritization; vi) facilitate better alignment and integration of WFP’s portfolio with national and United Nations priorities, particularly those of the other Rome-based agencies; vii) build recognition of WFP as the food assistance partner of choice; and viii) support advocacy and fundraising for food security and nutrition. The fundamental shift of this
new approach is in how programmes are designed, which leads to better performance and financial reporting.

62. The process consists of a strategic review followed by the drafting of a Country Strategic Plan. The strategic review is an independent, consultative analysis of the context that identifies the challenges a country faces in achieving zero hunger – such as gaps in the national policy framework and programmes, public and private funding of the food security and nutrition sector and implementation capacities of government institutions – with proposals on how WFP and its partners can support the country in making progress towards zero hunger. The review uses the analytical framework provided by SDG 2, and frames each country’s food security and nutrition issues in a manner in line with Agenda 2030.

63. The strategic reviews inform the WFP Country Strategic Plans, along with national and United Nations system planning in the country. The evidence they provide enables WFP and other actors to position their assistance portfolios in support of nationally owned and nationally-led agendas in line with international mandates; and supports consultations on WFP’s portfolio, activities, resourcing and staffing arrangements in the country.

64. Country Strategic Plans seek to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of WFP assistance to governments and people in need, including those affected by conflict. The analytical, consultative process they use, enhances WFP’s added value, fosters engagement with governments and convenes partners around a common approach to eliminating hunger. They translate WFP’s Strategic Plan and SDG 2 on ending hunger into actions at the country level, align WFP operations with national and United Nations plans, and facilitate better framing of food security and nutrition issues in such plans and programmes.

65. The CSP-approach will also contribute to an enhanced strategic role and efficiency of the Board. The Board will be better placed to provide strategic oversight and guidance through Country Strategic Plans that: i) present a comprehensive picture of WFP’s role in a country rather than the fragmented view obtained from reviewing individual project documents; and ii) reduce the number of Board documents to be discussed, resulting in time and cost savings.

66. As of end-2015, WFP had facilitated strategic reviews in Cambodia, China, Ecuador, India, Indonesia and Zimbabwe. Country Strategic Plans for Indonesia and Zimbabwe have been endorsed by WFP’s Programme Review Process; and others are under development. Governments, humanitarian and development partners, country offices, regional bureaux and Headquarters divisions have all contributed to the strategic reviews and Country Strategic Plans, enabling refinement of the new approach to country strategic and programmatic planning. A final proposal for endorsement/approval of Country Strategic Plans will be taken by the Executive Board during its second regular session in November 2016.
1.5 The Toolbox of Activities

67. In order to reach the Strategic Objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan, country offices can select one or several programme activities from WFP’s toolbox. These can be broadly categorized in three main groups: (i) *direct assistance* such as transfer-based activities where WFP provides food assistance directly to its beneficiaries; (ii) *technical assistance*, which comprises capacity, technology and knowledge transfers from WFP to governments; and iii) *enabling assistance*, which includes actions enhancing operational efficiency and effectiveness, such as South-South and Triangular Cooperation, UNHAS, Common Logistics Services. There is no “one size fits all” approach, so the choice of activities varies from one country to another based on a country’s context, capacity gaps and needs assessment for WFP to deploy the right tools.

1.5.1 Direct Assistance

68. Main activities under this category are: (i) general food distributions and cash-based transfers; (ii) food assistance for assets; (iii) school feeding; (iv) purchase for progress; (v) R4; (vi) nutrition interventions; and (vii) HIV and tuberculosis (TB) programmes.

69. All activities mentioned above include technical assistance components (although to a lesser extent for general food distributions). For example, WFP is increasingly supporting national social safety net schemes falling within larger social protection systems. Importantly, social safety nets are among the main instruments for building resilience and protecting the poor in fragile, conflict- and violence-affected situations and can include conditional and unconditional in-kind, cash and/or voucher transfer programmes including, among others, school feeding, home-grown school feeding, asset creation programmes and even nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions.

70. Transfer modality: Under the category of Direct Assistance, WFP food assistance can be provided through one or a combination of the main transfer modalities: in-kind food or Cash-Based Transfers. Although the provision of in-kind food remains the largest assistance modality, WFP has been increasingly expanding the use of Cash-Based Transfers over the last few years and food-based interventions should no longer be seen as the default intervention. As seen in Figures 8 and 9, projected requirements for Cash-Based Transfers and number of targeted beneficiaries have increased steadily since 2010. In 2014, WFP provided cash-based transfers with a total value of US$845.6 million, reaching 8.9 million people in 71 operations and 52 countries.
Figure 8: Share of Cash-Based Transfers in WFP’s Food Assistance Portfolio (in US$) 2010–2014

Source: Briefing on Cash-Based Transfer, 20 July 2015: available here.

Figure 9: Cash-Based transfers beneficiaries 2009-2014
**Figure 10: 2015 Cash-Based Transfers of work by programme category**

![Pie chart showing cash-based transfers by programme category]

Source: Policy and Programme Division

**71.** The Directive on Cash and Voucher Programming states that country offices should use the transfer modality(ies) that best meets the needs of beneficiaries and serves the project objectives. The feasibility of Cash-Based Transfers should be determined based on a set of criteria, including: (i) food security context and market functioning; (ii) beneficiaries’ preferences; (iii) government policies and priorities; (iv) sectoral capacities (cooperating partners, local retail supply chain, financial sector, and the information technology and communications sector); and (v) security and operational risks. In selecting the most appropriate transfer modality, country offices should look at cost-efficiency and effectiveness in addressing the operation’s objective(s) and possibly its potential impact on nutrition. Box 5 below lists Cash-Based Transfers distribution models.

**Box 5: Cash-Based Transfers distribution models**

To ensure consistency in the corporate approach and a common understanding of the basic features of each intervention, WFP has established four core distribution models. This approach, ideally, should take into consideration nutrition impact; for example, cash transfers can be accompanied by behaviour change communication to encourage/raise awareness among beneficiaries to buy food that is nutrient-dense, while voucher transfers could include items that would contribute to the micronutrients intake.

**Model 1: Cash account**

Read more:
- [Our Work – Cash-Based transfers](#)
Cash is made available to beneficiaries via an account-based process (such as a bank account, post office account, or a mobile money transfer account). Beneficiaries access the cash using the standard methods associated with the financial service provider (ATM, bank or post office branch, mobile money transfer agent, etc.). Cash can be distributed through accounts that beneficiaries have opened in a selected bank, money transfer or other financial institution. There can be as many accounts as the number of beneficiaries, or in other circumstances one account can be used by a group of beneficiaries. In both cases, individuals will have several alternatives to access cash, such as at the bank counter, with ATM cards and mobile phone.

Model 2: Immediate cash
Cash is made immediately available to beneficiaries via direct delivery (e.g. cash in envelopes) or via collection from a money transfer agent or bank counter. In both cases, beneficiaries are not required to open an account.

Model 3: Paper voucher
The entitlement is transferred to the targeted recipient with a paper document stating the entitlement. A voucher is a redemption slip that can be exchanged in preselected shops, with specified traders/service providers, or at specifically organized fairs. Beneficiaries receive one or more paper coupons carrying either a monetary or a commodity value. Both cash and commodity vouchers can be exchanged for items or services but not for cash. They must be reprinted prior to any distribution and their validity is determined by some unique features.

Model 4: Electronic voucher (e-Voucher)
The entitlement is transferred to the targeted recipient through electronic or digital technologies. Like paper vouchers, electronic vouchers carry information on the items and/or quantities they can be exchanged for. This information is stored on a barcode, a magnetic band or a microchip of a plastic card. In some cases, electronic vouchers are provided through cell phones. To redeem electronic vouchers, beneficiaries have to use unique PIN codes provided individually. Electronic vouchers are issued to beneficiaries only once, whereas their redemption value or quantity is credited remotely at predefined temporal intervals.

72. General food distributions: General food distributions (GFDs) consist in the provision of unconditional food and/or cash assistance to households to make up for household food access shortfalls, i.e. the difference between their food consumption requirements and what they are able to provide for themselves without adopting negative coping strategies. GFD should be:

- **Introduced only when absolutely necessary** to save lives and/or protect livelihoods (if a large part of the population is cut off from its normal sources of food forcing people to adopt distress strategies that would undermine their future livelihoods; faces an imminent acute food crisis; or needs help while re-establishing livelihoods immediately after a crisis).

- **Targeted** to specific geographic areas where a shock and/or crisis have disrupted people’s normal means of access to food and to specific population subgroups or types of household within the defined area(s). Exceptionally, GFD may be provided for an entire population, especially during the first few days following a major disaster or population displacement, or for an extended period in the.
case of refugees or IDPs who have little or no access to land or employment and markets.

- **Provided in the form of dry rations** (when food-based), which enable households to prepare meals at home. Exceptionally, cooked meals or other ready-to-eat foods may be provided for a short, initial period during an acute emergency. Ideally, the food ration has to take into consideration the nutrient needs of the targeted beneficiaries.
- **Phased out** as soon as possible, i.e. when people re-establish their self-reliance or can be helped to access adequate food through other assistance interventions.

73. Of particular relevance to nutrition is the ration design. The ration has nutritional value for beneficiaries if they eat some or all of it, and economic value if the ration can be traded or enables use of available resources for other needs. The objectives of WFP’s assistance, the food security situation, the nutritional status of the target groups, and the expected beneficiary use of food assistance determine the importance to be given to nutritional and/or economic values in designing a ration. The GFD ration should be equivalent to 2,100 kcal per person per day if the population is fully dependent on food assistance. Ideally, the food basket should be fortified and/or diverse enough to contribute to nutrient needs of the beneficiaries. Otherwise, the GFD should supplement the diet accordingly, based on an understanding of households’ access to food (i.e. their ability to obtain food on their own).

**Food Assistance for Assets**

74. Food assistance (i.e. food, cash, voucher or a mix of transfer modalities) provided through Food assistance For Assets (FFA) activities enable participants from food insecure households to contribute to meeting their households' short-term food needs while engaging in an activity that contributes to their longer-term food security or to the restoration of community services. This is a recent strategic shift away from using conditionality for beneficiaries to access assistance towards a greater focus on using time and labour to develop quality assets for the most vulnerable and food-insecure:

- FFA has replaced the former food for work, cash for work and food for recovery, etc. Any former food or cash for training (FFT/CFT) related to creation and maintenance of assets, or natural resource management, is now regarded as FFA.
Training related to vocational skills (e.g. numeracy, literacy) provided through FFT/CFT is guided by the relevant programme sectors (e.g. nutrition, education, health) and is not part of FFA.

FFA aims to establish or rehabilitate a livelihood asset (whether physical, natural and/or human), or build specific assets that reduce the impacts of shocks, reduce disaster risks and build community and household resilience to future shocks. As such, FFA programmes can be designed for multiple objectives.

FFA may be selected to rebuild community infrastructure, support physical access to markets and social services, restore the natural resource base, protect the environment, rehabilitate or restore the productive capacity of marginal and degraded lands for land-poor and food-insecure households; assist marginalized groups and women to reduce burden (e.g. building assets aiming to reduce the time needed to fetch water and firewood); improve and diversify income sources (e.g. nurseries development), and promote skills transfers.

FFA activities can deliver nutritional benefits when they increase incomes and provide access to more food of better quality or when the assets that are developed have a direct link to nutrition such as improved water sources or better sanitation or better markets.

School feeding

75. School feeding is defined as the provision of food to school children. There are many types of programmes but they can be classified into two main groups based on their modalities: in-school feeding, where children are fed in schools, and take-home rations, where families are given food if their children attend school. In-school feeding programmes can, in turn, be divided into two common categories: meals and snacks.

76. WFP's overarching vision is to continue advocating for the universal adoption of school feeding programmes as a safety net that helps increase children's access to education and learning opportunities and strengthens their health and nutrition status. WFP focuses increasingly on helping countries to establish and maintain nationally owned programmes linked to local agricultural production. In countries still requiring WFP's operational support, it implements school feeding programmes directly.

77. School feeding is now well recognised as a programme with multiple benefits. The 2013 School Feeding Policy has outlined five key objectives: 1) To provide a safety net for food-insecure households through income transfers; 2) To support children's education through enhanced learning ability and access to the education system; 3) To enhance...
children’s nutrition by reducing micronutrient deficiencies; 4) To strengthen national capacity for school feeding through policy support and technical assistance; and 5) To develop links between school feeding and local agricultural production where possible and feasible (Home Grown School Feeding - HGSF).

78. The particular objectives of each operation depend on national goals, the context, needs, and government capacity. A single programme may not achieve all the objectives, and the pursuit of each objective presents trade-offs against the others. The objectives must take into account the conditions on the ground and the availability and capacity of partners.

79. Depending on the country, WFP plays one or both of the following roles:

(i) **Service delivery:** WFP operates school feeding programmes directly, working with children and their families, government counterparts, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and, increasingly, the private sector. WFP sub-offices, country offices, regional bureaux and Headquarters have expertise on appraisal, design, targeting, funding, management, logistics, procurement and monitoring.

(ii) **Capacity development and knowledge building:** Its experience has established WFP as a repository of global school feeding expertise. It analyses knowledge from countries and disseminates it among them, providing policy advice and technical support to low- and middle-income countries. The establishment of the Centre of Excellence Against Hunger has significantly enhanced WFP’s facilitation of South-South learning, policy dialogue and support to countries.

80. School feeding operations have now two requirements: 1) WFP committed to systematically assess progress in the transition to national ownership in all school feeding projects using the School Feeding Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SF-SABER). SF-SABER is currently being mainstreamed into the preparation of all SF projects starting in 2015 to systematically plan the transition to national ownership or assess the status of transition. 2) All new projects with a SF component are required to "report the cost (per-child per-year) of school feeding." The cost reporting requirement helps WFP monitor the costs of its SF operations and understands how SF costs compare across countries. The requirement also helps WFP identify projects with high costs and where programmatic changes can be introduced to increase efficiency.

**Purchase for Progress**
81. To explore the best ways of extending the economic benefits of WFP's local and regional procurement to small-scale farmers and their communities, WFP launched the Purchase for Progress (P4P) pilot in September 2008. The rationale behind P4P is to link WFP's demand for staple food commodities with the technical expertise of a wide range of partners. This collaboration provides smallholders with the skills and knowledge to improve their agricultural productivity, and an incentive to do so, as they have an assured market in which to sell their surplus crops. The pilot was implemented in 20 countries, of which 15 are in Africa, 4 in Central America and 1 in Afghanistan. While the pilot phase concluded in December 2013, efforts to support smallholders will continue as WFP mainstreams key innovations and best practices.

82. WFP's work to connect smallholder farmers to markets is becoming part of WFP's regular business and is incorporated into the Strategic Plan. With new insight into how to catalyze market development for smallholders, WFP will seek to involve the private sector. By linking farmers to agribusinesses and financial institutions for access to credit, equipment and inputs, WFP hopes to create a new platform for private-sector engagement with smallholder farmers. Based on lessons and models that emerge from the P4P pilot, WFP's goal is to mainstream pro-smallholder activities into its regular programmes and thereby scale up its pro-smallholder procurement to 10 percent of its annual purchases which would amount to around US$120 million. P4P Coordination Unit is in the process of finalizing guidance material that will support RB advisors with the mainstreaming of P4P in their regions. This guidance draws on the evaluation that was presented to the Board in February 2015 (see report here) and from WFP's own learning and the perspectives of key partners - asking how the demand-driven approach to smallholder market development could be broadened in years to come. The Global Learning Agenda for P4P will be completed in 2015, with expert bodies, including the African Economic Research Consortium, ensuring a strong evidence base.

R4 Rural Resilience Initiative

83. Working with governments, international partners and local communities, WFP has developed large-scale climate resilience innovations that help protect the livelihoods of the most food insecure households in rural areas from climate-related risks. These innovations build on WFP's experience in implementing safety net and disaster risk reduction activities, while supporting pioneering integrated approaches to rural risk management.

Read more:
- P4P - An overview
- WFP's reflections on the pilot experience
- Latest reports and country specific information
- Strategic evaluation of the P4P pilot initiative
84. The R4 Rural Resilience Initiative (R4) helps vulnerable households, whose livelihoods depend on agriculture, manage shocks to their lives and livelihoods in the context of increasing climate risks. The Initiative is built on a pioneering model that combines safety nets with four risk management strategies, including disaster risk reduction, risk transfer, risk reserves and risk-taking.

85. Through R4, farmers are not only provided with basic protection from seasonal and recurrent shocks, but can also access a set of climate and financial services that protect them from unexpected shocks and empower them to become resilient over time, including innovative insurance coverage against climate extremes.

86. WFP and Oxfam America launched R4 in 2011 in Ethiopia. Since then, R4 was scaled up with exceptional results (see also figure 11 below). R4 enables vulnerable rural households to increase their food and income security in the face of increasing climate risks. In 2014, R4 was operating in Ethiopia and Senegal, and in 2015 the initiative became active in Malawi and Zambia. The intent is to expand in Kenya and Uganda in 2016. Thanks to R4's comprehensive risk management scheme (a combination of four risk management strategies: improved resource management through asset creation (risk reduction); insurance (risk transfer), livelihoods diversification and microcredit (prudent risk-taking) and savings (risk reserves) - communities will become more resilient in the face of increasing climate variability and shocks.

**Figure 11: R4 Achievements**

*Source: R4 Rural Resilience Initiative, Annual Report, 2013*

**Nutrition interventions**

87. WFP’s nutrition response is based on a thorough understanding of the nutrition situation, including the availability and access to nutrients, in order to deliver the most appropriate response. This entails identifying who is at risk of malnutrition as well as who is already suffering from malnutrition; what type of malnutrition, when malnutrition is occurring, where malnutrition is occurring and why malnutrition is occurring. WFP uses an expanded version of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) conceptual framework on the causes of malnutrition (see Annex V) to guide information gathering, to facilitate identification of...
possible causes of the nutrition situation, to understand the relationship between immediate and underlying causes of malnutrition as well as basic determinants, and to design the most appropriate responses. The 2012 WFP Nutrition Policy demonstrates WFP’s commitment to addressing malnutrition both through nutrition specific interventions (see below) and by ensuring that other activities contribute to improved nutrition outcomes.

• **Treatment or management of moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) (moderate wasting):** Treatment of moderate acute malnutrition as part of the continuum of care aims to: (i) rehabilitate individuals with MAM; (ii) reduce mortality risk in children with MAM; (iii) to prevent deterioration to severe acute malnutrition (SAM); (iv) provide follow-up support for individuals who have been treated for severe acute malnutrition (SAM) to prevent relapse into SAM and (v) prevent deterioration of maternal nutritional status and subsequent poor birth outcomes. Targeted population groups include: children aged 6–59 months, pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and people receiving treatment for HIV and/or TB (see paragraph 57). Treatment of MAM can be implemented in emergency, transition and development contexts. They are commonly established in areas where global acute malnutrition (GAM) prevalence is at least 10 percent among children aged 6–59 months, or where GAM ranges between 5 and 9 percent but aggravating factors exist. MAM treatment programmes generally include the provision of a specialized nutritious food and other essential services to individuals with MAM based on pre-defined admission and discharge criteria. These specialised foods are to be consumed as a supplement to the usual diet, not to replace a normal diet. For children under two years of age, this includes the continuation of breastfeeding.

• **Prevention of acute malnutrition (wasting):** The aim of blanket supplementary feeding programmes is to prevent nutritional deterioration and related mortality in vulnerable populations and high-risk groups. Prevention of undernutrition can be implemented in both emergency and transition contexts and should be part of the standard response for young children, especially when emergencies impact on food availability or accessibility or where the prevalence of GAM, stunting and micronutrient deficiencies were already high prior to the emergency.

Both treatment and prevention of acute malnutrition (MAM) are components of Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM), the recommended response to acute malnutrition.

• **Prevention of chronic malnutrition (stunting):** The prevention of stunting requires interventions that ensure adequate nutrition during the first 1,000 days of a child’s life (from conception to the age of two). Activities focus on providing adequate nutrition during pregnancy, particularly the last trimester and ensuring children’s access to complementary fortified foods as part of a diversified diet from 6-23
months of age. Improved nutrient intake should be complemented by health, WASH (both of which are provided by partners) and improved feeding practices to address the multi-sectoral cause of stunting. Reaching adolescent girls with good nutrition is also an increasingly important component of stunting prevention programmes.

Complementary feeding programmes improve access to specialized nutritious food to children aged 6–23 months and to PLW irrespective of their nutritional status. Complementary feeding is not intended to replace a normal diet; the ration is intended to be consumed in addition to the usual diet. For children under two years of age, this includes the continuation of breastfeeding. Complementary feeding can be incorporated into PRRO, CP and DEV programmes. WFP has committed to initiating programmes to prevent stunting in countries, provinces, districts or communities where stunting prevalence is at least 30 percent – or at a lower threshold established in national policies or programmes – or in high-risk situations.

- **Addressing micronutrient deficiencies (MNDs):** WFP helps to ensure that vulnerable populations have access to diets that meet their micronutrient needs through nutrition-specific and nutrition sensitive-programmes. WFP addresses MNDs in several ways, through home fortification, use of fortified food commodities in its food security and livelihoods programmes, support to local fortification of staple foods and condiments as well as support to local production of fortified complementary foods. For children aged 6-23 months (or 6-59mths where there is a high prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies) WFP supports home fortification via the provision of micronutrient powders (MNPs) or small quantities of lipid-based nutrient supplements. Home fortification is recommended where the micronutrient requirements of children aged 6-23 months are not met in the typical diet, i.e. where appropriate complementary foods with sufficient macronutrients is locally available and affordable but lacking in micronutrients. Home fortification with MNPs should also be considered in GFD and school feeding programmes where school meals are predominantly composed of unprocessed locally available ingredients, as micronutrient content is almost always inadequate. Home fortification can be implemented in both emergencies and development contexts. Programmes are generally run year-round, though individuals only participate for a specific period of time. In emergencies where the GAM prevalence is low but household food security is affected, WFP may include home fortification for vulnerable groups (young children and PLW) as part of the emergency response, to ensure that the diet quality of these children is not compromised.
• **Support to therapeutic feeding programme (TFP):** While UNICEF and partners support management of severe acute malnutrition in children aged 6–59 months, WFP may provide food for the caregivers during the treatment. In addition, according to the global WFP-UNICEF Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), in case UNICEF is unable to implement TFP for children, WFP may provide direct support to implement SAM programming after discussion with UNICEF at country level (see Box 15 for more information).

**HIV and TB programmes**

88. As a co-sponsor of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), WFP helps people living with HIV to address nutrition and food security challenges. In line with the UNAIDS framework, WFP’s 2010 HIV and AIDS policy outlines the following two programme pillars:

- **Care and treatment:** Through the provision of a comprehensive care and treatment package, WFP aims to enhance the nutritional recovery and treatment success of ART and TB clients, as well as mothers admitted to prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) programmes. The package includes nutritional assessment, education and counselling for all clients, and the provision of specialized nutritious food (SNF) for those clients who are found to be clinically malnourished during the assessment. The provision of an SNF is sometimes referred to as Food by Prescription (FbP) and is provided until clients are discharged from the programme once they reach specific anthropometric measurements with a maximum duration of 6 months or 8 months for TB clients following the 8-month drug regimen. Where needed and resources allow, a household ration can be provided to clients on top of the individual ration. The household support is conditional to the individual ration and acts as an enabler for treatment adherence and the client’s survival. Care and treatment interventions can be implemented under EMOPs, PRROs, or CPs and/or DEVs.

- **Mitigation and safety nets:** WFP provides food assistance, including cash-based transfers, to food-insecure households of ART, PMTCT, directly observed treatment short course clients, and households hosting orphans and vulnerable children until indicators of food security and socio-economic assessments improve or for limited periods of time (usually no more than 6 or 12 months). With these types of interventions, WFP aims to mitigate the immediate
consequences of HIV and/or TB on both individuals and affected households that also show other signs of vulnerability – such as food insecurity – but they should not be expected to address the causes of poverty. They can protect individuals and households from further deterioration, help clients to regain strength and reduce the burden of family care, contribute to household activities, as well as prevent households from adopting negative coping behaviour. Mitigation and safety-net activities are most appropriate in development contexts (CP/DEV) and to some extent in transition contexts (PRRO).

89. Besides these short-term HIV and TB specific interventions, WFP supports governments and partners to refer food-insecure people living with HIV to broader social safety nets, which provide sustainable income-earning opportunities and support long-term adherence to treatment (see Box 6 on Safety Nets and Social Protection).

90. Figure 12 shows the proportion of beneficiary numbers by activity and gender in 2014.

Figure 12: Beneficiaries by activity and gender/age

Read more:
- WFP’s Response to HIV, AIDS and Tuberculosis
- Five Minutes to Learn About... Care and Treatment
- Five Minutes to Learn About... Mitigation and Safety Nets Programmes
- M&E Guide to HIV and TB Programming

Source: WFP Annual Performance Report for 2014

2.4.2 Technical Assistance
91. Technical assistance includes capacity, technology and knowledge transfers from WFP to governments. WFP has a comparative advantage in delivering tangible, innovative and practical solutions that target the poorest and most vulnerable segments of the population. As a result, WFP can help countries design and implement programs that would ensure access to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round. These comprise human capital development initiatives such as nutrition support and school feeding programmes. Key areas in which WFP has a comparative advantage in supporting governments include:

- Design and implementation of national social protection and safety nets (highlight below in more detail), including nutrition programmes, (home-grown) school feeding programmes, and productive safety nets that create productive assets, diversify livelihood strategies and rehabilitate natural resources;
- Supporting emergency response and preparedness;
- Implementing measures to support climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction;
- Linking smallholders to markets, and supporting efficient value chain approaches (such as reducing post-harvest losses);
- Food security and nutrition information management; including vulnerability analysis mapping; risk analysis and needs assessment, prediction and early warning systems; and
- Logistics and supply chain management for efficient food systems.

**Box 6: Measurement of Capacity Development**

The National Capacity Index (NCI) is a reporting tool to both assess and measure capacity development in a country. An initial assessment of national capacity (baseline NCI) allows the Government to decide on capacity development priority areas (defining capacity gaps), whereas measurement (successive NCIs) ensures that accountabilities from both WFP and the national government are being met.

Capacities are measured for institutional arrangements for Disaster Risk Management, Social Safety Nets and Productive Safety Nets with relevant policies/legislation, budgets, programme design and implementation capacity as well as sustained response capacity.

Establishing benchmarks of national capacity gaps, assets, and desired future capacity levels through a Capacity Gaps and Needs Assessment (CGNA) should be the starting point for considering investment in any technical assistance and capacity strengthening activities. This provides an opportunity to take stock of existing national capacities that can be built upon and/or strengthened through tailored capacity interventions. It requires a robust analysis of the country and political context, constraints faced by government and WFP, resourcing strategy, and supply of specialized technical personnel to execute capacity development and technical assistance activities.
92. WFP supports integrated social protection systems under national social protection policies, strategies and coordinating bodies. Together with other United Nations agencies, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other partners, WFP is a member of the Social Protection Floor Initiative (SPF-I), which was established in 2009 by the United Nations Chief Executives Board and is co-chaired by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the World Health Organisation (WHO). The SPF-I encourages all countries to establish a 'social protection floor' or a minimum of social protection coverage: ‘Social protection floors are nationally-defined sets of basic social security guarantees which secure protection aimed at preventing or alleviating poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion. These guarantees should ensure at a minimum that, over the life cycle, all those in need have access to essential health care and basic income security’. WFP’s safety nets and social protection agenda for the coming years will focus on strengthening country systems to decide, design, operationalize, and evaluate cost-effective food security and nutrition-sensitive safety net and social protection policies, programs, and interventions. WFP will continue to pay particular attention to supporting the development and implementation of ‘hunger smart’ social protection mechanisms for the most vulnerable populations in fragile and challenging operational contexts, but will also develop differentiated approaches to assist populations vulnerable to food and nutrition insecurity within more established social protection systems. In this context, WFP also works to increase efforts to leverage complementary organizational competence in cash-based transfers, risk management instruments, and value chains for nutrition through a pool of standby partners and external international expertise to so as to maximize the human and technical resources and perspectives available.

93. The conduct of Strategic Review at country level and the formulation of Country Strategic Plans will foster engagement with governments and convene partners around a common approach to eliminating hunger. Importantly, CSPs identify the challenges a country faces in achieving zero hunger such as gaps in the national policy framework and programmes, public and private funding of the food security and nutrition sector as well as the implementation capacities of government institutions. As such, country strategic plans will determine the demand for technical assistance in a given country.

94. WFP’s capacity development interventions help strengthen government institutions in the design and implementation of national policies and programmes that contribute to Zero Hunger. Specific capacity development activities include:

- Trainings (public, customized or on-line)
- (Secondments to) Conduct joint research and assessments

Read more:
WFP Safety Nets Guidelines:
- Introduction
- Module A
- Module B
- Module C
- Knowledge sharing: providing access to repositories of information and resources (for example, databases, libraries and web sites)
- Providing policy and/or programmatic advice in the design of national policies and programmes to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture
- (Secondments to) help/coach implementing national policies and programmes to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture

2.4.3 Enabling Assistance

95. South-South and triangular Cooperation which enrols the expertise, skills and solutions that have proven effective in other countries is included under the section Enabling Assistance, but can form part of WFP’s technical assistance, when governments approach WFP for support in jointly implementing their South-South projects through direct WFP technical assistance. This form of support is usually requested when countries lack institutional capacities or operational systems that are needed to implement South-South projects by themselves.

96. Enabling assistance concerns actions for operational efficiency and effectiveness that facilitate other stakeholders, or WFP, to support a country in achieving Zero Hunger. Enabling assistance can either be external, i.e. for other stakeholders, or/and internal, for WFP. Examples of external enabling assistance activities include Common Logistics Services, Emergency Cluster Services, Cash-Based Platforms, South-South and Triangular Cooperation and Data Analysis. Examples of internal enabling assistance activities are Procurement, ICT, Logistics, and also Data Analysis. Some of these examples are expanded on below, whereas other activities are mentioned in different parts of the document.

South-South and Triangular Cooperation

97. By connecting two or more developing countries when there is a demand and supply of a solution for achieving zero hunger, by enabling countries to work together on a solution to a shared problem, and by providing countries with access to relevant expertise, skills or resources from other developing countries, WFP takes on the role of a facilitator and enabler, rather than a direct implementer. This activity includes the promotion and deployment of technical assistance or capacity building through another developing country, for example through the WFP Centres of Excellence, and also the sharing of country experiences or technologies, support to regional integration mechanisms (e.g. AU/NEPAD, SADC, ECOWAS, ASEAN, etc.) or the forging of
partnerships with southern academia and research institutes. This activity supports advocacy for Zero Hunger by showcasing the innovations and solutions of developing countries in the fight against hunger and malnutrition.

98. South-South Cooperation, which is supported by WFP, upon request of the “host country”, addresses a gap in technical expertise, knowledge, skills, practices, technologies, in-kind or financial resources or regional coordination in order to overcome a specific food security or nutrition challenge. WFP helps countries to identify relevant “solutions” which have proven effective in other developing countries to address these gaps. Once identified and “packaged”, WFP helps countries to facilitate the transfer of the solutions for adaptation in the host country. This happens through “modalities” of South-South Cooperation which include (but are not limited to): study visits, trainings, deployment of experts – for example through WFP Centres of Excellence- peer learning events and peer review exercises, deployment of in-kind resources through twinning or transfer of financial resources, strengthening operational capacities of regional integration bodies. South-South solutions exchange usually serves the purpose to enhance capacities at the host country level to achieve progress towards zero hunger.

Assisting the Humanitarian Community with Logistics Services

99. In special circumstances, where the delivery of assistance is impeded by logistics bottlenecks, activities can be implemented to overcome this for WFP and/or the humanitarian community’s benefit. These activities usually take place in the context of a special operation.

Transport and storage infrastructure rehabilitation

100. In certain cases where the delivery of assistance is impeded by poor infrastructure and when: (i) the Government is unable to carry out or rehabilitate it; (ii) there is no other appropriate actor able to do so; and (iii) donors support it, WFP may carry out emergency infrastructure rehabilitation on an exceptional basis and for a limited duration. Examples of infrastructure being rehabilitated include roads, rail networks, port equipment and storage facilities.

Logistics augmentation

101. Normally, operational support equipment would be budgeted under an EMOP and/or PRRO. However, based upon the requirement for a timely response to a large-scale emergency, the following are examples of types of operational support that might be activated through an SO:

- WFP might set up its own dedicated fleet through an SO or an EMOP/PRRO: (i) to fill critical gaps in the local transport capacity; (ii) to stabilize transport rates in the event of increased insecurity and/or sudden growth in demand; or (iii) to pioneer new routes that, due to prevailing insecurity would remain inaccessible indefinitely to
local transporters without the assistance of dedicated convoys spearheaded by WFP’s own truck fleet.
• Specialized stocks from regional reserves or technical assistance from the Fast Information Technology and Telecommunications Emergency Support Team (FITTEST).
• Service packages through standby arrangements.
• Rapid response equipment through the United Nations Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD), (for more info on UNHRD see Box 8).

**Provision of common services to humanitarian partners**

102. WFP provides common logistics services through a number of inter-agency mechanisms, such as:
• The Emergency Telecommunications Cluster
• The Food Security Cluster
• The Logistics Cluster
• The United Nations Humanitarian Air Services (for more info see Box 7)
• The UNHRD (for more info see Box 8).

103. In addition, WFP provides bilateral logistics services to humanitarian partners such as UN agencies, governments and NGOs, delivering aid and relief on behalf of partners. This is made possible due to WFP’s extensive experience in humanitarian logistics and more than 2,500 skilled staff with in-depth local knowledge. WFP’s range of logistics services spans the entire supply chain, and includes shipping, land transport and aviation. In 2013, WFP completed its first service provision catalogue, outlining all of the services that can be provided to partners upon request. These include:
• innovative shipping and chartering solutions;
• land transport, storage and handling;
• fleet and workshop management;
• fuel provision;
• management of complex logistics operations, covering the entire supply chain; and
• a range of air services that includes third-party services, airfreight and executive passenger services, and medical/security evacuations.

104. In 2013, WFP provided logistics services in 20 countries. The number of WFP’s customers rose from 80 from the previous year’s 63, and included DFS, MSF, Mercy Corps, UNDSS, UNHCR and UNICEF.
Box 7: United Nations Humanitarian Air Service (UNHAS)

The WFP-managed United Nations Humanitarian Air Service (UNHAS) provides common air services to some of the world’s most remote and challenging locations. UNHAS makes up approximately 80 per cent of WFP Aviation’s core activities. Where access is limited by insecurity, poor infrastructure, long distances and a lack of safe, reliable commercial air service providers, UNHAS conducts flights at the request of the UN Country Team or the Humanitarian Coordinator. Non-governmental organizations, United Nations agencies, donor representatives, the diplomatic community and humanitarian implementing partners can rely on UNHAS to facilitate access, helping them to reach beneficiaries promptly and carry out their life-saving work. What sets UNHAS apart from any other commercial airline is its mission: to fly to remote destinations where others do not usually go.

Box 8: United Nations Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD)

The UN Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD) is a network of depots around the world that buys, stores and sends emergency items for the humanitarian community, including UN agencies, governmental and non-governmental organisations. It is a logistics common service and supports the strategic stockpiling efforts of approximately 70 humanitarian partners to ensure a faster and more efficient emergency response. The six depots are located near disaster-prone areas which helps deliver relief items (like blankets, tents, ready-to-eat-food and medical kits) and operational support items (like generators, mobile storage units and ICT equipment) within the first 24-48 hours of a disaster striking. In 2014, the UNHRD Network dispatched US$50 million worth of emergency items to over 100 countries, on behalf of 37 humanitarian Partners. Learn more about UNHRD here.

Emergency preparedness and response

105. Effective response to emergencies is a critical element of WFP’s first Strategic Objective. Among other factors, this effectiveness is underpinned by: a predictable level of preparedness and awareness; enhanced readiness to meet specific emergency situations; and a clear understanding of functions and tasks in response, especially in the initial stages of an emergency. The focal point for EPR in WFP is the Emergency Preparedness and Support Response Division (OSE), led by the Director of Emergencies (DoE).

Preparedness

106. To enhance predictability and accountability, WFP has developed an Emergency Preparedness and Response Package (EPRP), which is now being implemented in all country offices. The overall aim of the EPRP implementation is to guarantee adequate preparedness and response capacity for WFP country offices in the event of any emergency.

107. The EPRP guides WFP country offices in progressively matching emergency response capabilities to risk. It merges various aspects of WFP’s contingency and business continuity planning, pandemic preparedness, security risk assessment and risk management in a holistic
approach. The EPRP is also applicable for area and sub-offices, and can be easily tailored to their varying structure and functions. The EPRP consists of three parts:

- A risk assessment section guiding staff in assessing contextual risks and their impacts on WFP’s internal environment (e.g. WFP staff, assets, processes and operations), on the external environment and on WFP operations (e.g. food security, infrastructure and partnerships).
- A template for emergency preparedness, readiness, and response actions for Country Offices; it also includes a concept of operations and standard operating procedures for the initial stages of a response.
- Guidance for Regional Bureaux on emergency preparedness and response in countries where WFP is not present.

108. WFP also has an Early Warning system which allows the Analysis and Early Warning team to process both external and internal information on trends in order to assess the likelihood of new developments which could impact the need for WFP’s assistance.

Response


110. Emergency Response Activation Protocol: This Protocol describes the procedures which WFP follows for Level 1 (Country), Level 2 (Regional) and Level 3 (Corporate) emergencies. It sets out the criteria for the activation of the 3 different emergency response levels as well as outlining the accountability and responsibilities through the chain of command. The Protocol also defines the procedures for convening the two principal emergency response corporate coordination bodies: the Strategic Task Force (STF), which addresses strategic issues and is chaired by the ED, and the Operational Task Force (OTF), which addresses the main operational challenges and ensures coordination and is chaired by the Chief of Staff for Level 3s and the Regional Director for Level 2s.

111. Operational Information Management and the OPSCEN: The OPSCEN of the Division of Emergencies performs secretariat functions to the STF and OTF to facilitate strategic and operational info flows, and coordinate with various functional areas in order to ensure that WFP’s decision makers have access to the best possible common operational picture available at any given time. The OPweb where WFP staff can find all the latest information on ongoing and potential crises has been conceived as the main operational info system. The Division of Emergencies also provides oversight of operational reporting of WFP, including guiding field focal points, providing templates and standards, quality assurance and staff capacity building initiatives (training) and
managing WFP Emergency Response Roster. The Emergency Preparedness and Response Support Division also provides GIS (mapping) services in support of emergency coordination and GIS training to the field.

112. **EPR Knowledge Management:** WFP Lessons Learned Exercises aim to identify the successes and areas for improvement of WFP emergency operations, in order to facilitate the continuous improvement of WFP emergency response. They are ‘listening exercises’ that record input from WFP individuals and units involved in the response to an emergency, and then link that feedback to WFP corporate review and action to address systemic issues. WFP Lessons Learned exercises are not evaluations or performance reviews. Rather, they are a systematic approach that enables WFP as an organization to listen to, learn from, and act upon the feedback of its emergency responders.

113. This new systematic approach was implemented to ensure that WFP as an organization does ‘learn its lessons’ in emergencies. Recommendations from Lessons Learned Exercises are assigned to division “owners” responsible for acting upon them. Tailor-made products detailing lessons for earlier responses are pushed out to managers when an emergency strikes, so that learning can be applied from the outset. Where recommendations relate to inter-divisional or corporate issues, they are taken up by the WFP Director of Emergencies, who convenes relevant stakeholders within WFP in order to address major issues impacting WFP’s emergency response.

**EPR at Inter Agency Level**

114. **Transformative Agenda:** WFP adheres to the principles of the Inter Agency Standing committee (IASC) Transformative Agenda (TA), which was agreed by the Principals of IASC (including WFP) in 2011. The TA builds on the wider Humanitarian Reform process and was established to help improve the timeliness and effectiveness of collective humanitarian response through 5 main strategic priorities: a) Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), b) Preparedness and Resilience, c) Protection in Humanitarian Crises, d) Humanitarian Financing and e) Revitalising Principled Humanitarian Action. WFP is currently finishing to align with and operationalize the TA guidance.

115. **Emergency Directors Group:** The Emergency Preparedness and Response Support Division (OSE) also acts as one of WFP’s main venues for engagement with the broader inter-agency
community, specifically regarding strengthening of system-wide early warning, emergency preparedness and emergency response. This is primarily achieved through OSE’s participation in the key IASC fora, including the Emergency Directors Group and the Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team. In addition, OSE co-leads the IASC Task Team on Preparedness and Resilience (TTPR).

116. Civil Military Coordination: OSE is responsible for coordinating, as well as strengthening, WFP’s Civil Military Coordination (CMC) capacity. OSE collaborates with key functional areas and Cluster focal points to ensure that, at the strategic and operational levels, WFP is well prepared to engage with military actors in a predictable and effective way, while also respecting the humanitarian principles. This is done by focusing on long-term strategic relationships and dialogue building between WFP and Governmental/Military/UN/NGO partners at the global level. OSE is coordinating the CMC-focused work of individual units within WFP, through the CMC Working Group, which is chaired by the Director of Emergencies.
1.6 Financial Framework

117. Because WFP is voluntarily funded, the scale of operations depends on the level of funding received. The Management Plan – one of WFP’s principal governance documents – outlines the resources needed to implement approved and foreseen operations and support activities planned for the following year. Every year, it is submitted to the Executive Board for approval. The Programme Support and Administrative (PSA) budget, which is funded from indirect support costs (ISC) recoveries, covers programme support costs at regional bureau, country office and Headquarters levels and management/administration in Headquarters. However, the PSA represents only a small portion of the country offices’ resources and normally covers the costs of the country director’s post. For small country offices, it also covers additional posts as well as limited local operating costs.

1.6.1 Types of contributions

118. Contributions to WFP can be classified in various types depending on whether: (i) they are flexible or directed to a specific operation or country; (ii) they are cash or in-kind; and (iii) they have particular restrictions on how the cash can be used.

119. Multilateral versus directed multilateral contributions

- **Multilateral contributions.** These represented 9 percent of all contributions in 2013. These contributions allow WFP to determine the countries, operations and activities in which the contribution will be used while donors accept reports submitted to the Executive Board as the sole reporting mechanism. This is the most flexible source of funding as it gives WFP the flexibility to allocate funds where they are most needed while keeping reporting levels at a minimum.

- **Directed multilateral contributions.** These represented about 91 percent of all contributions in 2013. These contributions are “directed” or earmarked by donors to a specific operation, activity or commodity.

120. Cash versus in-kind contributions. Contributions can be either in cash (75 percent in 2013) or in-kind food, goods or services (25 percent in 2013).

121. Tied versus untied cash contributions. Cash contributions can be:

- untied and used to purchase food anywhere without restriction;
- partially untied and used only to purchase food locally, regionally or in developing countries;
• tied and used only to purchase food in countries specified by the donor; and
• to be used for a specific activity, geographical area or beneficiary group.

122. WFP’s strategy is to negotiate multi-year donations in order to increase predictability of funding and advocate for receiving contributions that are flexible to avoid imbalances between well-funded and underfunded operations and/or countries.

2.5.2 Cost components of an operation’s budget

123. In November 2010, the Executive Board approved two modifications to the WFP financial framework. These modifications were fully integrated into corporate tools and systems as of November 2013 and include:

• The segregation of food in-kind-based activities from cash activities (cash-based transfers and capacity development and augmentation) and to exceptionally allow separate funding streams.
• Funding DSC on a percentage of direct operational costs (DOC) rather than a rate per metric ton.

124. These modifications have led to a revision of all of WFP operations’ budget structure. The budget of an operation consists of 3 main elements:

• **Direct operational costs (DOC)**
• **Direct support costs (DSC):** Costs directly linked with the provision of support to an operation and that would not be incurred should the activity cease. Cost items include staff salaries, travel and training, office rent and running costs, communication, vehicles, etc.
• **Indirect support costs (ISC):** Costs that arise in the support of projects and activities, but cannot be directly linked with their implementation. Indirect support costs finances all costs associated with Headquarters, regional bureaux and a basic country office structure.

The main change introduced by the new financial framework is the split of the direct operational costs (DOC) into three categories, while direct support costs (DSC) and indirect support costs (ISC) remain budgeted at a project level:

• Food Distribution tool: Activities which use food transfers to beneficiaries;
- Cash-Based Transfers (CBT) tool: Activities which use Cash-Based transfers to beneficiaries; and
- Capacity Development and Augmentation tool: Integrated activities which establish strengthen or augment the institutions, infrastructure and processes necessary to manage food security operations. Figure 13 shows WFP’s operations new budget structure. Table 5 defines budget cost components.

**Figure 13: WFP Operations’ New Budget Structure**

**Table 5: Budget cost components definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost components</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Transfer</td>
<td>Costs of the food transferred to beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External transport</td>
<td>Any transport undertaken between the country where WFP takes possession of donated or purchased commodities and the recipient country or a recipient’s neighbouring country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landside transport, storage and handling</td>
<td>Costs arising from the reception of commodities in the nearest port and delivery to the final distribution point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOC Food</td>
<td>Costs of all activity inputs provided to beneficiaries in conjunction with food activities or utilized by host governments or cooperating partners to implement food-based activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-Based Transfers</td>
<td>Value of the Cash-Based Transfers transferred to beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-Based transfers Related Costs</td>
<td>Costs directly related to the delivery mechanism adopted to Cash-based transfers from WFP to the beneficiaries as well as costs of all activity inputs provided to beneficiaries in conjunction with Cash-Based Transfer activities or utilized by host governments, cooperating partners or service providers to implement cash and voucher activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity Development & Augmentation Transfers

The cost of activities or items which are: (a) Capacity Development aimed at establishing or improving full national managerial ownership of a food security programme; (b) Technical assistance to national government to enhance/improve an on-going national food and nutrition security programme, EPR, home grown school feeding, and other related activities; or (c) Capacity Augmentation to provide goods and services in the absence of national capacity or ownership (Special Operations).

125. Recognizing the need for continued improvement in transparency and accountability with regard to resource allocation and demonstrated value for money, and building to the extent possible on the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review and the business models of other United Nations organizations, WFP is undertaking a Financial Framework Review to restructure its financial framework during 2015 and 2016 to better align resources and results that will improve decision-making, especially at the field level, and ensure optimum use of resources. The work streams comprise standardization of resource-based plans at the country office level to improve planning (Resource-based planning); aggregation of budget authority for country offices at the beginning of the financial period to reduce the impact of fragmented funding streams, increase the predictability of resources and enhance efficiency and effectiveness (Macro advance financing); and revision of WFP’s budget structure to reduce internal fragmentation, simplify processes and maximize transparency and accountability in alignment with the Country Strategic Plan approach (Budgeting for operational effectiveness).

2.5.3 Operations funding mechanisms

126. Given that WFP is entirely voluntarily funded through contributions to its operations, any contribution must adhere to the full-cost recovery principle, i.e. pay for the full associated operational, direct and indirect support costs.\(^4\) As donor contributions are confirmed, they are centrally “programmed” in the WFP financial system (WINGS). Taking into consideration the donor restrictions and the operation’s pipeline needs, the country office determines whether the contribution should be used for: (i) in-kind food; (ii) cash-based transfers; or (iii) capacity development and augmentation (or a combination). If the country office opts for in-kind food, the approximate quantity of food that can be purchased is estimated using recent commodity and external transport prices. In line with the principle of full-cost recovery, the landside transport, storage and handling (LTSH), ODOC and DSC rates (which are specific to each operation) will be applied to each contribution and the contribution will be programmed to all of the applicable cost components. In addition, a standard 7 percent levy (ISC) to finance the WFP Headquarters and regional bureaux will be applied.

---

\(^4\) For emerging donors who do not have the capacity to meet full-cost recovery, twinning opportunities to match donor funds with in-kind contributions from host governments and emerging donors can exceptionally be sought.
Box 9: Implications of the Financial Resources Management for Operations

1. An operation’s budget is a plan!

An operation’s budget plan presents the estimated costs of the inputs needed to implement the operation as described in the project document. The approval of a budget plan authorizes WFP to raise funds for the project; the approval is not an allocation of funding. The timing and level of actual implementation is dependent upon the timing and level of contributions confirmed to a project. Funding shortfalls – the difference between the contributions and the budget plan – vary from project to project; on a global basis, the funding shortfalls have been approximately 40 percent for the past few years, which mirrors our global level of project implementation against plan.

Funding shortfalls inevitably lead to pipeline (food and cash-based transfers) shortfalls. The impact of funding shortfalls can be mitigated in two ways: (i) advances and loans to cover shortfalls related to the timing of confirmed contributions; and (ii) reduction in rations, feeding days and/or beneficiaries for overall funding shortfalls. Projects may receive advances from the Working Capital Financing Facility and Immediate Response Account or borrow commodity from other projects; these advances and loans are repaid when contributions are confirmed. The reduction in the implementation will be based on prioritization of regions, activities or beneficiary groups.

2. Implications of the full cost recovery model and project funding shortfalls

Lack of funding may result in shortfalls of associated costs. The funding of associated costs is proportional to what is resourced for food/cash-based transfers (LTSH and ODOC are based on rates per metric ton; C&V related costs are based a percentage of the C&V transfer value; DSC is based on the percentage of the overall direct operating costs using the budget plan to establish the proportions. If a project has high fixed costs within the associated costs and actual funding levels are much lower than anticipated when the budget plan was prepared, the country office will be expected to review its costs and make cuts where possible (close sub-offices, reduce staffing, etc.) and may need to revise its budget plan to increase the associated costs in proportion to food/cash-based transfers to increase the revenue for associated costs generated against future contributions.

Project Cycle

127. This section describes the various steps that a WFP operation follows, starting from an analysis of the local context and an initial government request to the final evaluation. For each phase, this section lists key operational documents that are being prepared by country offices from which the evaluation teams will be able to extract relevant information. Figure 14 shows the phases of the WFP current project cycle. This process will change significantly following the endorsement of the CSP-Approach by the Executive Board in November 2016.
3.1 **Context Analysis**

**128.** WFP operations are typically established within the following frameworks:

(i) At global level, international hunger targets, including those of Sustainable Development Goal 2.

(ii) At WFP corporate level, WFP Strategic Plan

(iii) At national level, a national poverty reduction plan complemented with national policies, strategies and targets;

Following the roll-out of the CSP-Approach, the context analysis will increasingly be facilitated through the Strategic Review process that was highlighted in section 2.4. This process reflects the importance of high-level engagement with governments by partners, and close alignment of their strategies such as UNDAFs and Strategic Response Plans with national policies, strategies and targets, and international hunger targets, including those of Sustainable Development Goal 2 (SDG 2). Indeed, the focus of strategic reviews and the orientation of Country Strategic Plans are consistent with the proposed revision of the Strategic Plan (2017–2021) to orient WFP’s strategic vision around zero hunger. Greater coherence between the Strategic Plan, international goals and country-led zero hunger targets, is expected to bring about significant improvements in WFP programming and strategic positioning in countries. Such coherence will help WFP forge deeper partnerships with governments, donors, the private sector, civil society and other Country Strategic Plans informed by a Strategic Review.

Box 10: Implications for operations

1. Not all Strategic Objectives apply to all operations. In some situations, WFP’s engagement may be needed in several Strategic Objectives. In others, one or two Strategic Objectives would be relevant. When designing a new operation, country offices must select the relevant Strategic Objective(s) on the basis of the needs in the country, the added value of WFP in a given context, the presence and capabilities of other actors and the scope of the operation.

2. Operations’ logical frameworks (logframes) must show the expected contribution of the operation to the chosen Strategic Objective(s) and use the Strategic Results Framework corporate indicators for monitoring and reporting on results.

3.1.1 UNDAF and Strategic response plans

129. To enhance the collaboration of United Nations agencies in support of sustainable development, an UNDAF is normally defined by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) under the supervision of the resident coordinator for a five-year period. The UNCT is required to apply five programming principles (the human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management and capacity development) tailored to the country context when formulating the UNDAF. The UNDAF outlines jointly defined long- and medium-term objectives and related indicators that United Nations agencies in a given country, align selected core activities with.

130. In emergency or transition contexts, the UNCT follows different processes that are mainly coordinated by the United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and supported by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). In line with the IASC
Transformative Agenda, the newly-introduced Humanitarian Programme Cycle consists of five steps: i) needs assessment and analysis; ii) strategic response planning; iii) resource mobilization; iv) implementation and monitoring; v) operational review and evaluation. The strategic response plan has replaced the Common Humanitarian Appeal (CAP).

3.2 Request

131. WFP provides food assistance in development and emergency contexts in response to the Government’s formal request for WFP assistance. In an emergency context, the request can also come from the United Nations Secretary-General. Requests for assistance are then evaluated based on WFP General Regulations and Rules and based on the findings of needs assessments.

3.3 Needs Assessment

132. Prior to the design of operations in any country, WFP undertakes an analysis of the food security situation to answer critical questions (see Table 6).

**Table 6: Purpose of Food Security Analysis and Key Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of food security analyses</th>
<th>Critical questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the most food-insecure people to ensure the most effective targeting.</td>
<td>Who is food-insecure or vulnerable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the most appropriate transfer modality, activity type and scale of food assistance.</td>
<td>How many are there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the most efficient use of humanitarian resources by allocating funding according to needs.</td>
<td>Where do they live?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why are they food-insecure or vulnerable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is the situation likely to evolve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the risks threatening them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What should be done to save their lives and livelihoods?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

133. WFP has several assessment tools that it applies during the programme cycle to analyse the food security situation and provide appropriate timely information. The choice of the assessment tool in each country will depend on the context and country office’s capacity. These assessments provide updates on the current situation to inform immediate/short term programming and make projections on what may change for medium term planning.

134. A **comprehensive food security and vulnerability analysis (CFSVA)**, also referred to as pre-crisis baseline study, provides an in-depth picture of the food

---

5 The food security analysis function is commonly referred to as VAM (vulnerability analysis and mapping). Food security analysts in the field are commonly known as VAM officers.
security situation during a non-crisis year (at normal times). A CFSVA contains a breadth of information (food consumption patterns, education, markets, livelihoods), and in particular, profiles of the food insecure, an analysis of risks, vulnerability and the underlying causes. Depending on whether separate nutrition surveys have been undertaken, a CFSVA may or may not include the collection of nutrition data. It usually covers an entire country and is valid for up to five years. The baseline study provides information to design PRROs, DEV projects and country programmes. It is used as a benchmark against which to measure change after a crisis, as well as informing contingency planning and preparedness.

135. An Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) is undertaken following a disaster or a shock. It covers affected geographic areas to determine the impact on households and their livelihoods and to provide response recommendations on food and non-food assistance options. It serves as the basis for the design of EMOPs and PRROs as it identifies the number of people in need and the appropriate type and duration of assistance. The EFSA can be in the form of an initial, rapid or in-depth assessment.

136. Joint Assessment Missions are conducted in collaboration with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to understand the situation, needs, risks, capacities and vulnerabilities of refugees or IDPs (and host populations) regarding food and nutritional needs.

137. Crop and Food Security Assessment Missions (CFSAMs) are conducted jointly with FAO, usually for emergencies related to agricultural production or overall food availability problems and always in response to a government request. The mission analyses the supply and demand for staple foods, estimates any uncovered staple food import requirement for the coming year and analyses households’ access to food.

138. A Food Security Monitoring System (FSMS) is an ongoing activity to track changes in food security conditions. In particular, it provides advance information of deterioration of a situation. It triggers an EFSA when the situation deteriorates progressively to ensure that assistance can be provided in a timely and appropriate way. It provides information to adjust contingency plans and supports programme monitoring by providing food security information about areas with and without assistance.

139. Market analysis is undertaken to provide critical information on food availability and on the functioning of markets that households depend upon to acquire food. While major emphasis is placed on integrating market analysis in EFSA, CFSVA, FSMS, CFSAM, the ongoing effort aims at expanding the analysis to support market-based interventions. Following WFP’s corporate strategic shift from food aid to food assistance and recent economic crises (e.g. global food, fuel and...
financial crises in 2008 and 2009), the importance of market analysis in support of food security analysis has gained prominence. Several market-based programmes (e.g. cash-based transfer modalities and local procurement) depend on market information to achieve effective results.

140. In addition to the food security assessments described, WFP and other food security partners may be called on to participate in multisectoral assessments. See Box 11.
Box 11: Other United Nations Agency – or National Joint Assessments

- United Nations Country Team and United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination-assisted inter-agency assessments of major natural disasters.

- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Multi-Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessments (MIRA) are lead by OCHA. They use a rapid needs assessment methodology which is carried out by key stakeholders during the first weeks following a new and sudden disaster. The MIRA is part of the larger frame of humanitarian assessments and covers the first two phases of the IASC Assessment Framework.

- United Nations-World Bank Post-Conflict and Post-Disaster Assessments (PCNA and PDNA respectively), are multilateral needs assessment in post-conflict or post disaster situations.

- Common country assessment: an inter-agency analysis of the development situation in a country. WFP (with or without FAO) provides an assessment of the food security situation in the country for the common country assessment

- National assessments: WFP is working more and more with government systems to try to insert the WFP food consumption module in national surveys (i.e. LSMS, DHS, and HH budget surveys).

3.4 Operation Design, Review and Approval

141. Partner consultation. When designing a new operation, country offices should engage in extensive consultations at country level with the host government, cluster partners, other United Nations agencies, NGOs, beneficiaries and local donor representatives to make a response plan and clarify who is doing what and where.

142. Operation design. Based on assessed needs and partners’ consultations, country offices define the elements outlined below and draft a project document using standard templates. Through the operation formulation, country offices define:

- The operations’ objectives. These will relate to those of the Strategic Objectives relevant according to the local needs, country-level priorities and the WFP comparative advantage.

- The activities appropriate to meet the objectives from the toolbox of WFP activities (see Section 2.4). Attention should also be placed on cross-cutting issues (see Boxes 3 and 4 on gender and protection).

- The transfer modalities (food or cash-based transfers). The rationale for the choice of one or a combination of the three main transfer modalities must be clearly outlined and consistent with: (i) the needs identified through the food security and market assessments; (ii) the macro risk analysis; (iii) government policies;
(iv) sectoral capacities; and (v) cost-efficiency and effectiveness in addressing the programme objective(s). The transfer modality should be the most appropriate and effective alternative; all major assumptions should be outlined.

- **The project category** appropriate to the context and plans (see Section 2.2).
- **The operations’ logical framework** (logframe).
- **The estimated budget** by cost component (see Section 2.5).
- **An implementation plan** including initial partner arrangements.

143. A programme design framework guides WFP staff involved in programme design about the key principles and building blocks that combined with the relevant thematic areas, inform project formulation. The framework places more emphasis on:

- trend analysis and historical perspective, in addition to results from a wide range of assessments;
- consultative process at all stages;
- cross-functional teamwork;
- different ways to engage the Government; and
- learning from evolving innovations (different transfer modalities, nutritious foods and lessons from the P4P).

For more information, see [here](#).
Figure 15: WFP Programme Design Framework
A practical example of the application of a resilience lens to programme design is the three-pronged approach. The approach has been applied where the context allows, along with other tools. It is made up of three distinct but interrelated processes that take place at three different levels:

- **Integrated Context Analysis (ICA)** at the national level combines historical trends of food security (including from IPC and other joint assessments and monitoring systems), nutrition, and shocks and stressors with analysis of risks such as land degradation, other environmental factors to find sub-national areas where these indicators converge, to inform where different programmatic strategies may be required.

- **Seasonal Livelihood Programming (SLP)** is a multi-stakeholder participatory tool that fosters coordination and partnership at the subnational level under the leadership of local government and with partners on the ground. It is a process to design, prioritize and target an integrated multi-year, multi-sectorial resilience building operational plan using seasonal and gender programme lenses.

- **Community Based Participatory Planning (CBPP)** is a community-level participatory exercise that identifies needs and tailors responses to local requirements through prioritisation and ownership of programmes by communities.

The 3-Pronged Approach places people and partners at the centre of planning through consultative processes and consensus building. The actions required at these three levels provides the thread that links the three main dimensions targeted for resilience building, i.e. individuals, communities and national institutions/systems.

144. **Operation review.** Country Strategic Plans as well as project documents for new operations are submitted by the country office through the regional bureau to undergo a Programme Review Process (PRP). The PRP is a central quality control mechanism responsible for ensuring that operations adhere to the WFP strategic and normative guidance and that
WFP operations worldwide are consistent. The PRP overarching objectives are to:

- make recommendations to regional bureaux and country offices on the policy, design, strategy and implementation of Country Strategic Plans, Concept Notes and operations;
- ensure compliance with the WFP Strategic Plan, policies and directives;
- ensure the selection of the right project modality;
- ensure that technical units review draft project documents to ensure that appropriate guidance is used; and
- ensure that evaluation recommendations are taken into consideration.

145. In terms of content, the PRP ensures that the operation:

- is targeted at beneficiaries most in need;
- generates consensus internally and externally;
- is aligned to existing policies and strategies in technical areas;
- has technical components based on local contexts and livelihoods;
- is informed by best practices and lessons learned;
- has done the necessary analysis in order to select the most appropriate intervention modality;
- is able to ensure the measurement of outputs and outcomes;
- is based on realistic capacity levels (WFP country office, partners and Government);
- is based on realistic funding projections (for CPs/DEVs and PRROs to a lesser extent); and
- ensures that technical and quality control standards are met.

146. The PRP process is guided by an Executive Director Circular. The PRP has two pillars: 1) meeting at director level (s-PRP) focusing on a strategic review of a country strategic plan, or a concept note (for PRROs and CP/DEV projects) or a project document (for EMOPs); and 2) review of the project document by the technical units conducted electronically (e-PRP) through the System for Project Approval (SPA). New country programmes, DEV projects, PRROs, special operations of a strategic nature as well as budget revisions requiring Executive Board approval require the two pillars process. All new EMOPs as well as their budget revisions require an e-PRP, followed by an S-PRP, where the actual
project document is reviewed. Budget revisions to projects not requiring EB approval, as well as new common service special operations, Trust Funds and any revision of their ceiling, require an e-PRP only. All Country Strategic Plans require an s-PRP only and all operations developed within the scope and timeline of an approved Country Strategic Plan may be processed through an e-PRP only. Projects within the delegated authority of the Regional or Country Director, as well as technical adjustments, do not require the PRP.

147. In case of sudden-onset, large-scale emergencies, the Corporate Response EMOP (CR-EMOP) facility allows WFP to respond within 72h, increasing its organisational efficiency. The CR-EMOP follows a two-step process:

• An initial EMOP is released in WFP financial system (WINGS) as soon as possible after the onset to trigger the immediate operational response; and

• A mandatory revision to the EMOP is conducted within the first 30 days of the response, as the situation becomes clearer through more detailed assessment information, allowing for a more specific targeting and implementation strategy.

148. CSP and operations Approval. Following the s-PRP either the Concept Note or the Country Strategic Plan or the draft EMOP is reviewed based on the outcomes of the meeting as reflected in the Note for the Record, and submitted for ED approval. For those operations requiring both an s-PRP and an e-PRP, the country office and the Regional Bureau review the draft project document and budget to reflect the s-PRP and e-PRP inputs and submit the document for final approval. The final approval authority varies according to the programme category and food costs as per the delegations of authority agreed by the Executive Board. New operations can be approved by the Deputy Executive Director/Chief of Staff, Executive Director, jointly by the Executive Director and FAO Director General or the Executive Board. See Annex I for more information on approval authority. Because WFP relies entirely on voluntary contributions, the approval of an operation does not automatically imply that it will be funded. The country office with the support of Headquarters still needs to mobilize the resources to implement the operation.

3.5 Implementation

149. The implementation of an operation entails a number of complex steps, including: (i) an active participation in coordination efforts and the establishment of partnerships with various actors; (ii) resource mobilization; (iii) supply chain management; (iv) targeting and registration
of beneficiaries; (v) distribution of food and nutrition assistance; and (vi) possible adjustments to the implementation strategy.

### 3.5.1 Coordination and partnerships

**150.** Partnership is a key element in WFP’s Strategic Plan and is essential for effective international humanitarian and development assistance. The Corporate Partnership Strategy 2014-2017 (CPS) provides the overarching vision and corporate approach for WFP’s work in partnerships. It describes what WFP needs to reach excellence in partnering and highlights the importance of having a consistent approach guided by the partnership principles. The guiding principles for all WFP partnerships are of three types: strategic principles- the framework within which all WFP partnerships have to operate; precautionary principles-limit risk and exclude partnerships that maybe be detrimental to WFP; and prescriptive principles- establish the rules of good practice for all partnership work.

**151.** While the host government is WFP’s main partner at country level, WFP also collaborates closely with other United Nations agencies and NGOs.

**Host government:** In principle (see also section on “Request”), WFP provides food assistance in in response to the Government’s formal request for WFP assistance. As such, the host government is WFP’s main partner in all WFP operations, and close collaboration, and national ownership of WFP programmes is ensured as much as possible depending on the country context. Normally, WFP will be closely engaged with one or more relevant ministries who inform and coordinate with their local representatives the agreements and responsibilities that the Government has accepted in relation to WFP. Ideally, local government structures play a key part in facilitating beneficiary selection, providing technical support to WFP, as well as facilitating the implementation of WFP activities. The precise division of responsibilities between WFP and the Government vis-à-vis WFP’s programmes is set out in the Letter of Understanding (LOU). The LOU sets out the terms and conditions by which the country office will implement its operations, specifying the responsibilities of the host government and WFP. The WFP country office should strive for an open and honest relationship that exploits synergies. Establishing systematic lines of communication and engaging the local government in WFP activities is crucial to establishing a WFP operation. Building the relationship starts as early as making courtesy calls to local authorities when WFP establishes a new office or operation. Relationship building also includes sensitizing local authorities about WFP’s mission and their role in it. It may even be necessary to help build the local authorities’ capacity via training (see capacity development section). WFP must also be aware about the quality of relationship between the local government and its NGO partners and take measures to improve the relationship where necessary.
152. **United Nations agencies:** The United Nations Country Team is the main coordination body to ensure coherent programme delivery and information exchange among United Nations agencies. It should help to implement the United Nations maxim “Delivering as One”. In addition, WFP works closely with the designated United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator and OCHA in major or complex emergencies. Inter-agency coordination aims to: (i) avoid duplication of work or gap in assistance; (ii) design complementary programmes and exploit synergies; (iii) ensure common messaging; and (iv) exchange information (see Box 13). At global level, WFP has signed MOUs with various United Nations agencies that provide an overall framework for collaboration in the field. These include FAO, the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Population Fund, UNHCR and UNICEF (see Boxes 14 and 15). These agreements are critical for ensuring coordination and delineating clear operational roles and responsibilities.

153. In Delivering as One (DaO) countries, the UNCT has taken United Nations collaboration a step further and agreed on operationalizing either all or part of the UNDAF through the “One Programme”. This means that some of the WFP interventions in a Delivering as One country are designed in collaboration with other United Nations agencies and implemented through the One Programme instead of as individual WFP projects.
Box 13: Delivering As One Approach

The “Delivering as one” approach emerged from repeated calls from the General Assembly to the Secretary-General to further strengthen the management and coordination of United Nations operational activities. At the end of 2006, the Secretary-General formally announced that eight countries had volunteered to pilot the “Delivering as one” approach. WFP fully supported the piloting of the “Delivering as One” approach, particularly in the four pilot countries where WFP has country offices – Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda and Tanzania. Please click here for a list of countries that have adopted the Delivering as One Approach as of November 2015.

An independent evaluation of “Delivering as one” covering the period from 2006-2011 concluded that:

- “Voluntary adoption of pilot countries has greatly contributed to their ownership and leadership of the reform process. The ownership of “Delivering as one” by national Governments is a practical precondition to success of the initiatives.
- Given that each UN entity has its own governance structure, mandate and culture, individual organizations remain the primary units of account for performance and management, limiting what can be achieved with voluntary coordination at country level among very diverse existing systems.
- Since so many high level systemic elements have not been changed for “Delivering as one”, the marginal cost of enhanced country-level coordination is increasing.” The full report can be accessed here.

To address the evaluation recommendations, an integrated package of support comprising Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Countries Adopting the Delivering as One Approach (was elaborated. See here for further information. It is expected that the DaO Approach will increasingly become the standard for UN Development collaboration at the country level.

Box 14: WFP and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Memorandum of Understanding

WFP collaborates with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in providing food assistance to refugees, asylum seekers, returnees and, in specific situations, to other persons of concern when the total number of such beneficiaries in a country is more than 5,000. Below this figure, UNHCR takes full responsibility for food needs of persons of its concern unless agreed otherwise on a case-by-case basis. WFP-UNHCR collaboration is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed in 1997 and updated in 2002 and 2011. The MOU covers the following areas: preparedness planning, registration/verification, needs assessment, self-reliance/durable solutions, nutrition, HIV and AIDS, gender, age and diversity, education and Information management. The key points of the MOU are summarized below:

**Numbers:** The Government and UNHCR determine the number of refugees and organize registration. However, the number of refugees eligible for food assistance is jointly determined by WFP and UNHCR. WFP assistance to refugees (and returnees) is provided on the basis of food insecurity, not their status as “refugees” (or returnees).

**Plan of action:** A joint plan of action is prepared at field level setting out the agreed objectives and implementation arrangements for operations, including responsibilities for monitoring. It is developed at the onset of each joint operation and updated at least once a year.

---

6 Internally displaced persons are also of concern to UNHCR and dealt with according to the framework of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee cluster approach. See Figure 13 for more detail on cluster coordination.
Resource mobilization: WFP mobilizes resources to provide the food basket (cereals, vegetable oil, pulses, fortified blended foods, ready-to-use foods, salt, sugar and high-energy biscuits) for general, TFSP/BSFP and school feeding programmes. If jointly agreed, WFP may provide food assistance in the form of cash-based transfers. UNHCR mobilizes therapeutic milk and ready-to-use therapeutic foods for the treatment of severe acute malnutrition in selective feeding programmes. UNHCR is also responsible for providing complementary foods when recommended by the Joint Assessment Missions or health/nutritional assessments, particularly when refugees have limited access to fresh foods, spices and tea. UNHCR ensures adequate supplies of non-food items and services relevant to the safe and effective use of food, e.g. cooking utensils, fuel, water and sanitation, medicines, soap and shelter. WFP and UNHCR jointly facilitate the mobilization of seeds, tools and fertilizers in cooperation with the Government and other agencies, and promote nutritionally and environmentally sound practices and cooking techniques and technologies for saving fuel.

Delivery of food and non-food commodities: WFP transports the food it mobilizes to agreed extended delivery points (EDPs) and is responsible for storage and the management of storage facilities at those points. Unless otherwise agreed, UNHCR is responsible for the transportation of all WFP-resourced food commodities from the EDPs to the final delivery points and for their distribution. WFP and UNHCR keep each other informed of the in-country logistics arrangements made to implement the agreed programme and collaborate, as appropriate, on transport and logistics issues to ensure coordination and the best use of assets and resources. The 2011 MoU will eventually be reviewed to describe more in detail collaboration modalities for Cash-Based Transfers.

Nutrition: UNHCR, through its implementing partners, is responsible for monitoring the nutritional status of the refugees through regular surveys and an effective surveillance system for ensuring the nutritional needs of refugees are met. WFP participates in the planning and execution of nutritional surveys and in the analysis and dissemination of the results. Decisions to implement nutrition programmes are taken jointly by WFP, UNHCR and cooperating partners responsible for the targeted feeding programmes.

A series of four impact evaluations of the contribution of food assistance to refugees in protracted situations was completed in 2012. The evaluations were conducted jointly by WFP and UNHCR in Bangladesh, Chad, Ethiopia and Rwanda. This series concluded that the intended evolution towards self-reliance of refugees in protracted crises has not occurred and called for concerted action among all actors to resolve the issues blocking progress, backed by the political and financial will to enable refugees to make productive contributions to the countries where they live, and to support other long-term durable solutions where appropriate. Recognizing that WFP and UNHCR cannot solve this failure alone, the synthesis makes five strategic recommendations for various parties. See summary report here. WFP and UNHCR are working closely in addressing these recommendations, and aim to have a joint strategy on Self-Reliance for Refugees in Protracted Crisis in 2015.

Box 15: United Nations Children’s Fund and WFP

Memorandum of Understanding in Emergency and Rehabilitation Interventions

The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and WFP signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1998 and updated it in 2005 and 2011. The MOU covers the following areas: needs assessment, monitoring and evaluation of services in the areas of nutrition, education, health care, water, sanitation, child protection and other social services. Of particular relevance to nutritional emergencies, UNICEF is responsible for providing therapeutic preparations for the treatment of severe acute malnutrition and non-food items related to food preparation and consumption of therapeutic food as well as equipment and nutrition monitoring, whereas WFP is responsible for the provision of supplementary foods for the treatment and prevention of moderate acute malnutrition as
well as micronutrient supplementation for enhancing the quality of general rations.

A joint letter signed by WFP and UNICEF in September 2012 clarifies the following:

For the reduction of stunting, WFP’s entry point is food security, specifically improving access to adequate, nutritious food; supporting the development of associated policy; and supporting home-based and other fortification efforts. The entry point for UNICEF is health and caring practices, specifically improving maternal, infant and young child feeding, providing micronutrient supplements and food fortification, as well as supporting the development of relevant policy.

For acute malnutrition, WFP focuses on the prevention and treatment of moderate malnutrition, whereas UNICEF focuses on the treatment of severe acute malnutrition. Experience has shown that a close linkage of these programmes leads to improved prevention and treatment, reduced child mortality, and more cost-effective supply chain management.

154. **NGOs:** WFP works with over 1,000 international and national NGOs on average every year. In most cases, NGO partners - referred to as cooperating partners - conduct activities on WFP’s behalf, with financial support from WFP. In fact, most WFP programmes are implemented by NGOs. Nevertheless, partnerships can also entail collaborative programme design, joint advocacy, information exchange, complementary programming or other activities with no resource transfer between the partners. The selection and management of partnerships is done by country offices. The degree of NGO involvement in the implementation of the intervention and roles and responsibilities of WFP cooperating partners for each step in the food assistance delivery chain vary substantially from one NGO to another. WFP cooperating partners are a very diverse group ranging from community-based groups, such as local associations and local churches working in a specific area with few staff and limited resources, to large international NGOs employing thousands of staff and managing multimillion dollar budgets. Yet, WFP partnerships with NGOs should follow the same set of principles (see Box 17). For national NGOs and community-based groups with limited capacity, WFP can provide training or other support to help strengthen the organization. At the global level, WFP has signed MOUs with a number of major international NGOs. In addition, it has exchanged letters and established a memorandum with the International Committee of the Red Cross, which defines arrangements for mutual collaboration. Whenever an NGO implements activities on WFP’s behalf, field-level agreements using a standard WFP format are used to define the details of the operation, including the responsibilities, budget, and reporting and payment arrangements.

155. **Standby arrangements:** WFP also has standby arrangements with 20 government and organization partners. Standby partners are organizations, including government agencies, NGOs and foundations, who have signed an agreement with WFP to maintain a roster of rapidly deployable staff and equipment to support WFP emergency operations,
namely to meet surge capacity at the onset of an emergency. While nearly all skills and competencies related to WFP activities are available within WFP partners’ roster, the most frequently requested experts are in the areas of programme (cash-based transfers, emergency preparedness and response, protection, emergency management), logistics (aviation, fleet, warehouse, port), engineering (civil and electrical engineers) and ICT. The agreements also include service packages comprised of both staff and equipment, such as base camps, truck fleets, water purification plants and demining services. In recent years WFP has also used standby partners' expertise on protection in country offices and regional bureaux, which has been pivotal for a smooth roll out of the protection policy. See more information here.

156. **Clusters:** In 2006, clusters were established by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee as part of the Humanitarian Reform process, which aimed to improve the effectiveness of humanitarian response programmes by ensuring greater predictability, accountability and partnership in order to reach more beneficiaries, with more comprehensive, need-based relief in a more effective and timely manner. Clusters were created in eleven sectors as well as in cross-cutting areas of the humanitarian response, as shown Figure 16, in order to facilitate this process. They operate at both national and global levels. The cluster approach seeks to clarify the division of labour among organizations by better defining roles and responsibilities within the different technical sectors of the response. WFP is the cluster lead agency for emergency telecommunications and logistics and co-leads the food security cluster with FAO. See Figure 16 for more details on the various cluster lead agencies.

**Figure 16: Cluster coordination at the country level**
Box 16: Joint Strategic Evaluation of the Global Logistics Cluster

A Joint Strategic Evaluation of the Global Logistics Cluster was carried out in 2012 to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, utilization, results and satisfaction of the logistics cluster's products, services and activities at global and country levels. Overall, the evaluation found that under WFP's effective leadership the cluster strengthened partnerships and increased coordination in humanitarian logistics. WFP inputs of skilled staff, funding, back office systems and leadership enabled the cluster to undertake the expected global and country activities. At country level, the cluster's operations were found to be relevant, effective and provided value to participating organizations. While the ability of the cluster to learn and apply lessons was hindered by the lack of systematic approaches, the cluster demonstrated improvement over time. WFP's financial, reporting and tracking systems did not enable the level of transparency partners required. The recommendations seek to engage the Global Logistics Cluster, its partners and WFP management in designing a three-year strategic plan; strengthening financial and reporting systems; enhancing the organizational structure and decision-making; improving cluster human resource management; extending partnership outreach; and engaging in global policy and inter-cluster coordination. See summary report here.

Box 17: Implications of partnerships for operations

Partnerships are required throughout all stages of WFP operations:
Partnerships are required at different levels with different actors as they all have their unique comparative advantage: government, United Nations agencies, NGOs, International Financial Institutes, Regional bodies, Private sector, Research Institutes and Academia.

Partners have different value added:

**Resource partners** - provide human, financial and technical resources

**Knowledge Partners** - contribute information, evaluation and analysis.

**Policy/Governance Partners** - work on WFP’s own policies and governance, as well as regional and country hunger and nutrition policies, and hunger and institutional governance.

**Advocacy Partners** - support WFP’s work to advocate for food security and nutrition.

**Capability Partners** - support the design and implementation of programmes and operations

This should be well documented in project documents.

### 3.5.2 Resource mobilization

157. WFP’s goal is to secure the funding required to meet 100 percent of the assessed needs. The traditional channel for resource mobilization has been through ongoing consultations between WFP Headquarters, liaison offices, donor capitals and permanent missions. However, as some donors have shifted decision-making to their local missions in the field and as recipient governments have been encouraged to take more responsibility for coordinating development assistance, WFP has intensified its resource mobilization efforts at the country level. WFP country directors are therefore encouraged to:

- Develop a resourcing strategy that outlines where funding support will come from, at what level and for how long, and that also describes what needs to be done to achieve the results.
- Maintain regular communications with donors who have a local presence.
- Engage in inter-agency discussions on trust funds and pooled funds.
- Enhance joint programmatic initiatives with other United Nations agencies; and

#### Box 18: Advance financing mechanisms

Advance financing mechanisms improve WFP’s operational effectiveness and efficiency, particularly:

- The Working Capital Financing Facility provides advance funding for operations using forecasted income as collateral. It allows country offices to receive loans for food, transport and associated costs pending confirmation of high and medium probability forecasted contributions within established risk-management parameters.
- The Immediate Response Account (IRA) provides limited funds to country offices for immediate food, non-food and logistics assistance in life-threatening situations. IRA advances can be given to country offices even in the absence of high probability funding forecast. IRA advances may be recovered from future contributions but can, in certain circumstances, result in non-repayable loans.
• Work in partnership with recipient governments.

158. At the corporate level, WFP continues to explore innovative ways to increase its resources. WFP aims to increase the funding predictability via strategic partnership agreements and multi-year agreements, smooth out the resource pipeline by advance financing (see Box 18), front load the food pipeline by utilizing the Forward Purchase Facility (FPF) (see Box 19) and broaden the donor base through twinning arrangements, increase partnerships with host government and emerging economies.

**Box 19: Forward Purchase Facility**

The Forward Purchase Facility (FPF) is a mechanism to procure commodities based on the aggregated global demand and funding forecasts. FPF stocks are considered global WFP inventory and may only be released to a project against a confirmed contribution or an advance financing grant. The FPF enables WFP to:

(i) improve the on-time delivery of food by reducing supply lead times;

(ii) procure commodities at the best time or season; and

(iii) shorten response time (during emergency response).

The forward purchasing approach also allows WFP to buy when market conditions are likely to be more favourable, and it can support eventual emergency response with strategically located inventories to respond to situations requiring immediate food assistance. The approach also provides a more regular demand on the market to encourage farmers to scale up productions and processed/manufactured food suppliers to augment their equipment and capacity.

3.5.3 Supply chain management

159. Supply chain management is not a linear flow of processes, but rather a network of organizations, people, activities, information, and resources coordinating and collaborating together to provide food or access to food to beneficiaries. Once WFP has established that there is a need for food assistance and assessed the scale of the intervention, type of activities and transfer modalities, the supply chain kicks in to ensure that food assistance is provided efficiently, effectively and in a timely manner to the beneficiaries, as schematically represented in Figure 17.
Divisions involved in the supply chain are resource mobilization, Supply Chain (which includes food procurement and shipping) at global Headquarters in Rome; regional bureaux for regional pipeline planning; and country office logistics and programme for pipeline planning, inland transport, storage and distribution.

Planning

Planning and decision-making takes place at the country level. Once the country office Programme Unit has identified the need for a set of interventions and has estimated the total number of beneficiaries and appropriate transfer modalities to be used, these planning figures are translated into tonnages of food or amount of cash required for the duration of the operation. The requirements and planning of the operation should also be broken down by year and month.

Planning also often includes inputs and support from regional bureaux and Headquarters. Smooth and continuous information flow between departments and across geographic levels is a critical enabling factor for a functional supply chain. Information flow is not one way, as planning often needs to be refined to take into account shortfalls in funds, changes in context that impact transport and warehousing, as well as responding to the rapidly changing food security and nutrition situation.
Food procurement

163. WFP purchases food based on needs assessments and operational considerations. In some cases, donors set conditions on how and where WFP can purchase food. When this occurs, WFP will always purchase food in line with donor requirements.

164. Decisions as to where to buy are informed by the import parity tool, which compares the local, regional and global costs of purchase and delivery to final destinations, and WFP selects the best value option in terms of lead time and price. When conditions are equal, the preference is to purchase food in developing countries, in particular where WFP has programmes, this is referred to as local/regional procurement (LRP). WFP purchases and distributes 50% of its food within the countries and regions where it operates.

Delivering the Food: WFP’s Operational Capacity

Shipping

165. Depending on where WFP receives or buys the food, WFP may be responsible for shipping it to the recipient country. Over half of WFP’s food is transported by sea, making ocean transportation a crucial link in WFP’s supply chain operation. A dedicated ocean transport team in headquarters handles all international cargo movements by sea, and working with a specialized and reliable network of shipbrokers and freight forwarder. In shipping terms, “charter” vessels carry breakbulk or bulk commodities, which are loaded bagged (breakbulk) or unbagged (bulk) in large quantities into the holds of ships. WFP uses “liner” services when transporting food by containers. Using containers can prevent damage during transportation for commodities requiring special care such as nutritious and ready-to-use foods. Once discharged at the port, WFP transports the food overland to the extended delivery points.

Aviation

166. In the case of sudden-onset emergencies, a rapid response can save lives and air transport is often the only way to quickly move humanitarian supplies and personnel to where they are needed. Over the years, WFP Aviation has accrued vast experience and developed a comprehensive service provision portfolio.

167. In addition to managing the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service (UNHAS), WFP Aviation supports UN agencies, including WFP and other external clients on request. Services include: strategic airlifts of relief items and operational equipment in support of humanitarian interventions; airfreight services for the transportation of cargo; dedicated third party services (on a cost recovery basis); and bilateral passenger services not covered by UNHAS. As a last resort, airdrops for food delivery can be organized.
**Surface Transport**

168. The last leg of WFP’s supply chain usually consists of surface transport. About 95 percent of this “final mile” is done by road, using trucks. At times, it can also involve planes, helicopters, river barges, trains and animals in particularly remote areas.

169. In most countries where WFP operates, commercial transporters are used. Although in difficult operational environments, where security or lack of sufficient trucking capacity prevents this, WFP relies on its own fleet of nearly 700 heavy duty-trucks that are designed to cope with the toughest road conditions.

170. To enhance emergency response and bring down costs, WFP has created two regional truck fleets from under-utilized trucking assets in East and West Africa; 65 trucks can be deployed to assist emergency operations within five days from the country office’s request. Based in Accra, Ghana and Kampala, Uganda, the fleets enable WFP to rapidly deploy trucks to locations in which little or no local trucking capacity exists. In 2013, these fleets supported emergency responses in Central African Republic, DRC, Malawi and South Sudan.

171. With commercial transporters accounting for 95% of WFP’s food deliveries, strong oversight and focus on efficiency in contracting is essential. Surface transport alone includes not only transportation, but also landside logistics services such as warehousing, storage and fumigation.

**Compliance and oversight of transport contracting**

172. To ensure that staff resources and operational funding are appropriately allocated, WFP has in place strong global guidance and internal processes that serve as the foundation for all logistics contracting. To enable effectiveness and efficiency in deep-field and emergency contexts, surface transport contracting is delegated to country offices and WFP logisticians at the local level. Oversight is ensured through systematic quarterly reviews of contracts by the Committee on Commodities and Transport. Chaired by the Deputy Executive Director, these quarterly meetings review a randomly-drawn

---

**Box 20: Common Factors of high/low transport costs**

**High transport costs:**
- landlocked countries with long overland corridors;
- large territory and poor infrastructure;
- insufficient commercial transport capacity;
- limited scope for local food procurement; and unstable security situation.

**Low transport costs:**
- proximity to a sea port;
- infrastructure is well developed;
- adequate local transport capacity; and
- possibility to buy food locally or regionally.
sample of contracts, as well as cases of exceptional contracting. The Committee scrutinizes the agreements for compliance, and to detect any scope for further strengthening WFP’s policies and systems for transport management.

**Receipt/storage**

173. Once the food arrives at the extended delivery point, it is stored in a warehouse and inspected; any loss or damage is recorded. Existing stock figures are adjusted accordingly. Land transport instructions are issued, including loading instructions – and the food is ready to be transported to mutually agree delivery points with cooperating partners.
Delivery
174. The food arrives with all transport documents (e.g. waybills) to the mutually agreed delivery points, where WFP’s cooperating partner:
   • receives the food and records it on the waybill;
   • stores the food and transports it to distribution sites (if stored away from the distribution site); and
   • distributes the food to beneficiaries and monitors the distribution.

Commodity tracking
175. At the moment, the progress of food from donor to cooperating partners is tracked through WFP’s global Commodity Movement Processing and Analysis System (COMPAS). COMPAS is an electronic system that allows WFP staff to monitor the progress of commodities from the time they are first requested by the country office through their handover to the cooperating partners. However, a new system is set to replace COMPAS.

176. The Logistics Execution Support System (LESS) was successfully piloted in Liberia and Sierra Leone, and will be rolled out over the next three years for all of WFP’s operations around the world. As an integrated system for supply chain management, inventory accounting and real-time tracking, LESS will put WFP’s entire food supply chain online for the first time, meaning that all WFP offices will be connected and able to monitor commodity information in real-time. That includes port offices and warehouses, all the way up to headquarters.

177. In 2013, LESS received strong backing from an independent external evaluation, which concluded that the new system will yield a return of US$1.35 for every US$1 invested. Following this positive feedback, the Executive Director declared LESS a corporate priority, and WFP’s Executive Board approved an appropriate financing mechanism at its November 2013 session. Implementation began in 2014, and the global roll-out will take three years.

178. LESS is scheduled to be introduced in Afghanistan and Pakistan, starting in mid-2014. Other large and medium-scale operations, which account for more than 80% of WFP’s food commodity value, will be next on the list to receive the system. All country offices are expected to be supported by the end of 2016.

3.5.4 Targeting and registration
179. Targeting is the process by which specific areas and people are identified as needing assistance. WFP’s Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) team leads for WFP on all matters pertaining to targeting – this includes: methods and tools development, measurement, indicators, and related activities such as data collection, analysis, and reporting. Targeting is necessary to ensure the best use of limited resources and that assistance reaches those in need. Targeting depends on the knowledge of beneficiaries (situation, social status, whereabouts, possibility to reach,
options for assistance). Targeting criteria should be well defined, as objectively verifiable as possible, and transparently communicated and applied. The more precise and restrictive the screening criteria – and the more objectively verifiable they are – the more straightforward the identification of beneficiaries. When designing an intervention it is important to anticipate its effects both on the targeted groups themselves, and on the other people living in the same area. Targeting is generally based on proxy indicators for food insecurity.

180. There are two kinds of targeting: geographical targeting and household or individual targeting.

- **Geographical targeting** (the identification of geographical areas). Geographical targeting involves the identification of geographical areas where people need food, and deciding whether all people of that area need food or not. If not, a further level of targeting is necessary: household or individual targeting. Geographical targeting is normally carried out as part of the food-needs assessment.

- **Household or individual targeting** (the identification of specific beneficiaries). Household or individual targeting is usually undertaken as a separate activity. This is because needs assessments generally identify the category of people that needs assistance (for example, widows or landless labourers), but do not actually identify the people who fall into these categories. The aim of targeting is to have clear and justifiable criteria to prioritize assistance and to establish systems to identify who, among the population, falls into vulnerable categories.

**Targeting methods**

181. The targeting method is largely defined by the nature of the problem, and by the response option that is chosen to address the problem. There are three main options for targeting:

- **Attendance at an institution**: Anyone who is eligible to attend an institution (such as a school or antenatal class) receives assistance.

- **Nutritional status**: Assistance is given to those meeting certain anthropometric criteria (e.g. low weight-for-height, low mid-upper arm circumference). Targeting for nutrition programmes may also be based on age, physiological status, or other indicators of nutritional vulnerability.

- **Socio-economic status**: Assistance is given to those who fall into certain “vulnerable groups”. While WFP and partners establish the selection criteria (for example, women-headed households, unaccompanied children), communities themselves identify the specific individuals or households that will benefit from WFP assistance.

- **Community based targeting**: Assistance is given to those identified by the community as its most vulnerable members through a participatory process and based on pre-established criteria.
**Self Targeting:** given clear criteria, people or HHs that fulfil those criteria can come forward to receive assistance (like in FFW activities).

182. Finding the right balance between exclusion errors and inclusion errors is complex. In acute emergencies, inclusion errors may be more acceptable. As per the Sphere standards and principles, WFP aims to involve individuals/entities in the targeting based on their impartiality, capacity and accountability. Targeting approaches need to be clear and accepted by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary groups. Affected populations should be engaged in the targeting process.

**Registration**

183. For most interventions, WFP beneficiaries are formally registered to establish beneficiary lists and issued ration cards. In the absence of a formal registration process, WFP may use lists established by local authorities or the communities themselves. In such cases, WFP and cooperating partners should conduct spot-checks to ensure that the beneficiary selection is impartial and accurate and that targeting errors have been minimized. A new registration system is being piloted in 2013/2014 in view of a planned scale up of cash-based transfers (see Box 21).

**Box 21: The SCOPE solutions suite**

SCOPE is WFP’s beneficiary and transfer management platform that supports the WFP intervention cycle from beginning to end. The SCOPE platform is a web-based solution used for beneficiary registration, intervention setup, distribution cycle planning, releasing and approvals, transfer initiation, distribution reporting and retailer settlement. The platform can be used in many ways depending on the specific needs of a country and delivery mechanisms selected.

Registrations powered by SCOPE can be customized to capture specific targeting criteria, anthropometric data, languages, locations and photos or biometric finger prints if necessary. In remote locations without connectivity, field registrations can be conducted offline and synchronized back in the office.

How SCOPE supports various types of distributions will depend on a country’s programme, delivery mechanism and available local service providers in the intervention location. To date, SCOPE has powered WFP distributions that use both local service providers, and in cases where they do not exist, deployed WFP’s smartcard or barcode ID-based delivery mechanisms. WFP’s proprietary delivery mechanisms work offline, and use biometric verification where needed.

SCOPE was originally created to be the WFP system for cash operations to support the organization’s scale-up of market based responses to food insecurity. Since then, it has evolved into a platform for intervention management for cash-based transfers and in-kind transfer modalities.

Read more:

*Sphere Handbook 2011 – Minimum Standards in Food Security and Nutrition*
Privacy and personal data protection in WFP: WFP recognises that privacy and personal data protection are human rights that need to be safeguarded. Likewise, WFP acknowledges the inherent risks attached to personal data processing and any possible undue disclosure of it, which may expose people to harm and discrimination. In order to address and mitigate these concerns, corporate guidelines on privacy and personal data protection have been developed and will be finalised by the end of 2015.

**3.5.5 Distribution of food assistance**

In most situations, WFP relies on partners to help implementing its programmes. WFP will normally work with NGOs (cooperating partners). However, other partners such as the host government, United Nations agencies or other international organizations are possible partners. When considering cash-based transfer programmes, even commercial entities such as banks or mobile phone companies can become WFP’s partners. Exceptionally, WFP may directly carry out food distributions where there is a lack of capable partners on the ground. This happened, for example, in Sudan following the expulsion of major NGOs from Darfur in 2009/2010. In order to implement the entire food distribution process, WFP had to deploy a significant number of additional staff. More recently, WFP has directly implemented the voucher programme for Syrian refugees in Egypt.

**3.5.6 Adjustment to implementation strategy**

During the course of implementation, the country office may need to revise its implementation strategy through a budget revision in order to:

- **Scale up/down** an operation in response to additional/reduced needs.
- **Extend-in-time** an operation to ensure that continued WFP food assistance is provided, while a follow-up phase is being prepared and approved.
- **Remove or replace commodities** no longer required from an operation’s budget.
• **Adjust the response strategy** in line with new circumstances or a new policy.
• **Increase or decrease the operations’ associated costs** (non-food costs).

187. In all cases, the country office initiates the budget revision and submits it through the regional bureau. If the Deputy Executive Director’s clearance is necessary, the budget revision should be submitted to the PRP.

### 3.6 Monitoring

**Results/performance-based management in WFP**

188. WFP is committed to reporting on results and demonstrating evidence, to working in partnership, and explicitly articulating the value of every investment. High performance derives from an organizational culture committed to demonstrating results as well as one that is willing to learn and adapt.

189. WFP has invested in a strong performance management system to manage for results, invest in people and develop leaders who take timely decisions based on evidence and knowledge. Performance in WFP is recognized at four organizational levels:

   (i) corporate performance that demonstrates our contribution to global commitments and consistency of our organizational effectiveness;

   (ii) country portfolio performance to demonstrate our contribution to high-level impact indicators in each country;

   (iii) programme performance for designing, implementing, monitoring, adjusting and aligning projects; and

   (iv) people that demonstrate functional, managerial and leadership capabilities achieving stated results.

190. The new Strategic Plan 2017-2021 will have an integrated Corporate Results Framework (CRF) that will include both the SRF and MRF. The CRF will be different from WFP’s current Strategic Results Framework and Management Results Framework in several ways. First, it will be a single, comprehensive framework providing a complete picture of WFP’s expected results and metrics for the 2017-2021 period. Second, the CRF will, for the first time, include impact level statements and indicators. Thirdly, the top of the CRF results hierarchy will be aligned with those SDG goals and targets of relevance to WFP’s vision of zero hunger (especially SDG 2). Finally, the CRF will be a key instrument to help guide planning, budgeting, monitoring, performance management and reporting at headquarters, regional, and country level.

191. However, currently (in 2015), WFP is still operating under two separate Results Frameworks, the SRF and the Management Results Framework (MRF). The MRF (2014-2017) captures the five key
management priorities of WFP, namely, People, Partnerships, Processes and Systems, Programmes, Accountability and Funding (see Figure 18).

**Figure 18: Performance management dimensions (2014-2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRDs</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Processes &amp; Systems</th>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Accountability &amp; Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Effective staff learning and skills development</td>
<td>2.1 Strategic and operational partnerships fostered</td>
<td>3.1 High quality programme design and timely approval</td>
<td>4.1 Appropriate and evidence-based programme responses</td>
<td>5.1 Predictable, timely and flexible resources obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Engaged workforce supported by capable leaders promoting a culture of commitment, communication &amp; accountability</td>
<td>2.2 Partnership objectives achieved</td>
<td>3.2 Cost-efficient supply chain enable timely delivery of food assistance</td>
<td>4.2 Alignment with government priorities and strengthening national capacities</td>
<td>5.2 Strategic, transparent, and efficient allocation of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Appropriately planned workforce</td>
<td>2.3 U.N. System coherence and effectiveness improved</td>
<td>3.3 Streamlined &amp; effective business processes &amp; systems</td>
<td>4.3 Lessons learned and innovations mainstreamed</td>
<td>5.3 Accountability frameworks utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Effective talent acquisition and management (attract, recruit and deploy)</td>
<td>2.4 Effective governance of WFP is facilitated</td>
<td>3.4 Conducive platforms for learning, sharing and innovation</td>
<td>4.4 Effective communication of programme results and advocacy</td>
<td>5.4 Effective management of resources, demonstrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WFP’s Normative Framework For Monitoring**

In the first half of 2014, WFP completed work on a Normative Framework for Monitoring. The Normative Framework for Monitoring establishes a standardized system to guide WFP monitoring at all office locations (see figure 19). A central piece of the Normative Framework is the 2014-2017 Strategic Results Framework (SRF) which provides a standard compendium of corporate outcomes, outputs and indicators for each Strategic Objective included in the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan. A set of Business Rules accompanying the SRF serves to guide the selection of outcomes, outputs and indicators during project design and prescribe the norms and timelines for the establishment of baseline and target values. Standard Operating Procedures for project monitoring (SOPs) are another central piece of the Normative Framework. The SOPs describe standard process steps for the conduct of monitoring by country offices and facilitate clarification of roles and responsibilities for monitoring at country level. Finally, the Minimum Monitoring Requirements (MMRs) prescribe minimum coverage, frequency and statistical requirements for all outcomes, output, process and cross-cutting indicators.
193. Introduced in December 2013, the Standard Operating Procedures for project monitoring prescribe standard procedures for monitoring WFP projects, and suggest proposed timing and responsibilities for each of the eight steps included in the WFP project monitoring cycle described in Figure 20 below in the SOPs. Within each step of the monitoring cycle, the SOPs define standard practices and expectations for monitoring the processes, outputs and outcomes associated with WFP projects. The SOPs are organized in relation to this same cycle beginning with upstream preparation of project logframes and performance monitoring narratives, through to ensuring use is made of monitoring findings, including input to reviews and evaluations. While the SOPs are considered mandatory for the conduct of project level monitoring at all Country Offices, the proposed timelines and responsibilities listed under each SOP are indicative only as they will need to be reviewed and adjusted according to the country context.

194. Up-take and implementation by country offices of the Normative Framework for Monitoring at country level is supported by Regional M&E Advisors (RMEAs) in each Regional Bureau. This aspect of RMEA work involves promoting, guiding and providing technical support to COs to implement the Standard Operating Procedures, Minimum Monitoring Requirements and SRF Business Rules including through the conduct of country support missions. RMEAs are in turn supported by the Performance Management and Monitoring Division in headquarters. RMP
has developed a detailed SRF compendium, provided training on the SRF indicators, and delivered an M&E Learning Programme (MELP) which covers all four component elements of the Normative Framework.

**Figure 20: WFP’s Project Monitoring Cycle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of country-level performance monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195. Monitoring involves the regular collection and analysis of indicator achievement data to gauge the extent of operational progress and the achievement of results. As such, monitoring is a day-to-day managerial function including the collection and review of information to know how an operation is proceeding and what aspects of it require adjustment. Monitoring is an integral part of the overall performance management process in the office, reflected in the annual performance planning and review process, which allows offices to have a clear line of sight among results and an overall view of programme and process results. Touching upon two of the four organizational levels mentioned above, country and programme, it is the country offices’ responsibility to monitor the operation’s implementation, as well as the outputs and outcomes, according to the logical framework of each operation, the country operational plan and the annual performance plan. Performance monitoring serves multiple purposes, namely to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• assess progress towards achievement of planned results by measuring selected indicators;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• keep track of implementation and adjust programme if necessary;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• report to country office management, partners, donors, the regional bureau and WFP Headquarters on the use of resources, monitoring, programme performance and effectiveness;
• analyse, learn from and refine programme and implementation strategy to enhance effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability;
• take informed action on programmatic challenges and intended and unintended (positive and negative) effects; and
• generate data to inform evaluations and contribute to accountability and learning.

A Step by Step Approach to Designing a Monitoring System

196. Further to the development of the Normative Framework for Monitoring, a comprehensive set of monitoring guidances has been updated to assist country offices in: (1) integrating monitoring functions and tasks throughout the work stream; (2) supporting learning through the collection and analysis of data for performance monitoring; (3) facilitating reporting, sharing of lessons learned and enhancing decision-making through use of monitoring findings. They are meant to assist country office in the management of monitoring: 1. Logical framework; 2. Country Office Monitoring Strategy; 3. Data Collection, Processing and Analysis; 4. Process Monitoring; 5. Output Monitoring; 6. Outcome Monitoring; 7. Performance Reporting.

Logical framework

197. The development of the project logframe, at the project design stage is an important first step in conducting monitoring, as it establishes the intended results and accompanying indicators to be tracked during the course of the project. It also includes assumptions linked to the operation’s context. The logframe development is guided by the SRF, which provides a list of corporate outcomes and outputs and accompanying indicators. All projects ending beyond June 2014 have been re-aligned to the SRF (2014-2017). The logframe development is also guided by the business rules set out in the SRF, which, for example, stipulate that all operations must align with at least one corporate outcome and output and their related indicators as defined in the SRF. However, the indicators listed in the SRF are sometimes insufficient to fully reflect what the operation is trying to achieve. Hence, country offices
can select additional project-specific indicators from an indicator compendium, which provides a much wider list of indicators. When project-specific indicators are included in the logframe they are mandatory to report on.

198. In addition to output and outcome indicators articulated in the logframe, the country office will identify process indicators, which will be captured in the M&E plan.

199. Project target values must be defined and baselines must be established for all outcome indicators as part of the project development process, or where this is not possible, within three months of the commencement of implementation. All indicators included in the logframe and subsequently in the M&E plan must be monitored periodically, as described in the Indicator Compendium (the periodicity varies for each indicator).

Data sources and data collection tools

200. Data collected include both qualitative information and quantitative data. The former often informs immediate actions that cannot wait until analysis of quantitative data is finalised. Once quantitative data is compiled and validated, it has to be analysed to discern trends, achievements and challenges guided by the Analysis Plan. Such analysis should include consideration of the reasons for under-achievement of indicators and actions required to improve performance. Similarly, success factors contributing to good performance should be identified for dissemination to other staff. A key output of this analysis is the development of information products, which might include monitoring reports, public information materials, input for donor briefs, etc. These information products should be circulated internally for decision-making and learning purposes and externally for information sharing and accountability.

Data analysis and preparation of monitoring reports

201. In WFP, data collection can be undertaken by one unit (i.e. M&E Unit of the country office or sub-office field monitors), and the data analysis and/or preparation of information products by another unit (VAM Unit of the country office or head of sub-office). Once data is compiled and validated, analysis is conducted to identify trends, achievements and challenges. Information products such as monitoring reports are prepared and circulated internally for decision-making and learning purposes and externally for information-sharing and accountability.

Organization/structure of M&E at the country office level

202. The organization or structure of M&E at the country office level varies depending on the size of the country office and the operation-specific issues. In some countries, WFP field monitors who are responsible for data collection report to either a senior programme assistant or a national programme officer who is overall responsible for handling the
data. In other countries, different project activities (school feeding, nutrition, FFA) will have their monitoring arrangements within their teams, in which case there is no centralized M&E team.

203. In some countries, country offices tend to outsource parts of their outcome monitoring (baseline and endline studies) to external entities (research institutions, private firms, etc.). In other country offices, the first round of monitoring provides the baseline data. In highly insecure contexts, where access for United Nations staff is limited, WFP collaborates with partners responsible for third-party monitoring (Afghanistan, Somalia, Mali, etc.).

204. The synthesis of the operations evaluations commissioned in 2014-2015 noted that the availability of results data has improved over time, with improved monitoring systems enhancing the availability of output data and reducing under reporting. Outcome data still face challenges, particularly in terms of quality and under representation of WFP’s field-level achievements. See 2014-2015 Annual Synthesis of Operation Evaluations for more information.

Box 22: Linking food security, nutrition and programme monitoring

In some cases, it may be difficult to correlate food security or nutrition surveys with operational monitoring. However, there are good examples where VAM and M&E systems have been successfully integrated resulting in common data collection and analysis tools, such as the Community and Household Surveillance in close collaboration with national partners in Southern Africa. The system provides information on the food security and nutrition situation at critical times of the year, for example, between the harvest and onset of the lean season, which is helpful in updating the post-harvest findings. A specific feature of the system is that it systematically captures comparable data from beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The system is aligned to the national Vulnerability Assessment Committees covering some countries in the Southern Africa Development Community region, such as Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland and Zambia.  

3.7 Reporting

205. A number of reports are produced both at: (i) country; and (ii) corporate levels.

Country-level reports

206. On an annual basis, United Nations agencies report on progress towards the UNDAF long- and medium-term objectives to the Resident Coordinator’s office where they are consolidated into an UNDAF Annual Review Report. In line with the performance management framework (see Section 3.6), country offices have annual performance plans that are reviewed mid-year, and again at the end of the year and submitted to WFP Headquarters.
207. As per corporate and donor requirements, annual **Standard Project Reports** (SPRs) are prepared for all WFP operations. The SPR lays out the objectives of the project, the mode of implementation, the resources used for implementation and the results obtained by the project. SPR data feeds into the Annual Performance Report. Both reports cover the interventions implemented during the past calendar year. In addition, country offices may produce **additional reports for specific donors**. Some of these donors have online reporting systems, which country offices have to complete within agreed schedules.

208. Country offices also produce an **Executive Brief** and a **Country Brief** that give a general overview of the operational context. The Executive Brief provides WFP staff with concise, up-to-date operational and background information for each country where WFP operates. The Executive Brief is an internal document and is an important source of operational information that is used to feed into other internal reporting and decision-making products. It is updated once a month, providing a constant baseline of information that helps reduce information requests to country offices. The Country Brief provides donors and the humanitarian community with an overview of WFP’s operations in a given country. The Country Brief builds on information from existing reporting products, especially the internal Executive Brief, and is produced quarterly.

209. Within 24 hours of an emergency, country offices issue a **Situation Report** (SitRep) providing further in-depth information on an emergency operation usually on a weekly basis. A SitRep is a concise operational document that provides a factual and neutral account of the current needs, response and gaps in a given emergency. A SitRep should analyse and report on trends in the situation and the response. SitReps can be either internal or external. The internal SitRep is designed to support decision-making and coordination of emergency response, as well as being an important source of information for senior management. The external SitRep is mainly used for advocacy and resource mobilization. It helps other actors involved the emergency to be aware of WFP’s activities, and informs the wider humanitarian community and other interested stakeholders about WFP’s response.

**Corporate reports**

210. The **Annual Performance Report** (APR) provides an analysis of WFP’s achievements for the previous year, with respect to progress made under the WFP Strategic Plan. It also provides an account of progress with respect to WFP’s Management Results Framework. It is submitted to the Executive Board in June of every year, drawing the Board’s attention to the key issues faced by WFP in the previous 12 months.

211. **Daily ED Operational Brief**: The Operations Centre issues a "Daily ED Operational Brief" (DEDOB), which is a daily update of critical
operational information for senior management attention. The DEDOB addresses the most pressing issues by country, namely:

- situations that have occurred over the last 24 hours, including political context or analysis when meaningful, with particular emphasis on those situations that could potentially disrupt WFP operations;
- the immediate impact on WFP activities;
- what has been done so far by WFP to respond to or address the situation;
- plans to address the issue, either by WFP or other actors; and
- other issues that warrant leadership awareness.

212. Weekly Emergency Overview: The Weekly Emergency Overview is a weekly product prepared by Headquarters with inputs from country offices and regional bureaux. It provides information on the status of current Level 3 and Level 2 emergencies, as well as other areas/issues of concern. It raises awareness, improves understanding and anticipates likely developments. It also provides information on WFP preparedness and operations linked to the identified developments.

213. Senior Management Morning Brief: The Emergency Preparedness and Response Branch, in collaboration with the Field Security Division, issues a “Senior Management Morning Brief”, which is a daily e-mail update of critical operational information for senior management attention. The Morning Brief addresses the most pressing issues by country, namely:

- situations that have occurred over the last 24 hours, including political context or analysis when meaningful, with particular emphasis on those situations that could potentially disrupt WFP operations;
- the immediate impact on WFP activities;
- what has been done so far by WFP to respond to or address the situation;
- plans to address the issue, either by WFP or other actors; and
- other issues that warrant leadership awareness.
Box 23: Beneficiary counting

WFP uses beneficiary numbers mostly for reporting, advocacy and, increasingly, to define efficiencies. A WFP beneficiary is a targeted person who is provided with WFP food assistance. WFP defines beneficiaries as “targeted persons who are provided with WFP food assistance” regardless of the duration or type of programme. Output-level beneficiary reporting, typically based on monthly data provided by cooperating partners, is done at two levels: i) reporting by project or activity; and ii) reporting at the country level from aggregated project figures. Such data are disaggregated by age, sex, activity, category and special needs.

This definition is currently being reviewed to address the following limitations:

(i) It does not differentiate between a beneficiary assisted for one month and another supported throughout the year. Both count as one beneficiary.

(ii) It does not include the immediate benefits accruing to communities from assets built by WFP and from market-development and resilience-building activities.

(iii) It does not include people benefiting from wider food assistance interventions, such as capacity development and P4P.

Given the limitations of expressing WFP’s reach through a single beneficiary number, beneficiary-related metrics are expected to be replaced by daily rations. Reporting and information systems will be adapted to report on the actual distribution of rations in order to enable global analysis of rations planned versus rations distributed during a given year and enhance the understanding of the costs of providing beneficiaries with food or C&V.

Work is also under way to determine more accurately the reach of WFP’s programmes beyond direct beneficiaries receiving food assistance. WFP has categorized beneficiaries as: i) targeted people provided with food assistance; ii) people benefiting indirectly from asset creation and behaviour-change communication, and P4P smallholders; and iii)
3.8 Evaluations and Reviews

214. Monitoring systems should be complemented by evaluations and reviews to further inform the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the operations. Evaluation is the systematic and impartial, periodic assessment of the performance of WFP’s activities, operations, strategies and policies. Evaluation provides evidence on achievement of intended and unintended results, causal contributions and performance (accountability); and, helps to understand the reasons and factors affecting performance and results for continuous improvement (learning).

215. There are two categories of evaluations in WFP: centralised evaluations commissioned and managed by the Office of Evaluation and decentralized evaluations commissioned and managed by the Country Offices, Regional Bureaux and Headquarter-based Divisions. In order to embed evaluation into WFP's culture beyond the Office of Evaluation and strengthen evidence-based policy and programming across WFP's work, WFP has developed guidance for Country Office and Regional Bureaux staff to undertake decentralised evaluations as well as reviews. An Orientation note has been designed to facilitate the decision on which type of exercise to undertake and a step-by-step process guide along with templates and checklists have been prepared to inform decentralised evaluations and reviews process from planning to dissemination of results and follow-up actions. The draft guidance will be piloted in 2016 and final versions will be disseminated in 2017.

216. Evaluations should be planned to precede or coincide with the design of follow-up operations and Country Strategic Plans, and be part of the formulation of hand-over/exit strategies. Decentralised evaluation cover operations, activities, pilots, themes, transfer modalities or any other area of action at the sub-national, national or multi-country level. They follow OEV’s guidance - including impartiality safeguards - and quality assurance system. They can be done either at mid-term or at end of an operation/activity, or after completion. Evaluation findings are taken up in follow-up operations or in Country Strategic Plans. All evaluation reports are posted on WFP's public website.

217. UNDAF are also expected to be reviewed annually and evaluated towards the end of the cycle in order to determine whether the results made a worthwhile contribution to national development priorities and to assess the coherence of UNCT support. UNDAF evaluations assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of UNDAF results and strategies, as well as helping
identify alternatives that could have made a more effective use of UNCT resources and comparative advantages, particularly for capacity development.

Box 24: Implications of WFP M&E requirements for operations

1. All WFP operations should be regularly and systematically monitored and evaluated as per coverage norms defined in the 2016-2021 Evaluation Policy.
2. M&E must be built into the design of every operation.
3. Both monitoring and evaluation need to be responsive and appropriate to the situation and the operation undertaken.
4. M&E plans must reflect the information needs and approaches at all levels to provide data and results for local and corporate management information systems and must be evidence-based for independent evaluation.

Annexes

Annex I: Summary of Approval Authorities for New Operations and Budget Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme category</th>
<th>Approval authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New EMOP:          | • Under US$3 million (food value) + WFP operational presence: approval by the Chief of Staff  
                     • Under US$3 million (food value) + NO previous operational presence: approval by the Executive Director  
                     • Above US$3 million (food value): approval by the Executive Director and FAO Director General |
| Budget revision:   | • No cost: approved by the country director  
                     • Under US$3 million (food value) and under US$3 million in associated costs (excluding ISC): approved by regional director (RD)  
                     • Under US$3 million (food value) and above US$3 million in associated costs: approved by the Chief of Staff  
                     • Above US$3 million (food value): jointly approved by the Executive Director and FAO Director General |
| **IR EMOP**        | • Under US$ 500,000: approved by Country Director  
                     • Between US$500,001 and US$ 1,000,000: approved by the Regional Director  
                     • Between US$ 1,000,001 and US$ 1,500,000: approved by the Director of Emergencies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme category</th>
<th>Approval authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR Preparedness</td>
<td>• Each request cannot exceed US$ 300,00. Total amount requested per calendar year cannot exceed US$ 2,000,000: approved by the Deputy Executive Director/Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PRRO | **New PRRO:**  
• Under US$3 million (food value) + WFP operational presence: approval by the Chief of Staff  
• Under US$3 million (food value) + NO previous operational presence: approval by the Executive Director  
• Between US$3 million and US$20 million (food value): approval by the Executive Director  
• Above US$20 million (food value): approval by the Executive Board  

**Budget revision:**  
• No cost: approved by the country director  
• Under US$3 million (food value) and under US$3 million in associated costs (excluding ISC): approved by regional director (RD)  
• Under US$3 million (food value) and above US$3 million in associated costs: approved by the Chief of Staff  
• Between US$3 million and US$20 million (food value): approval by the Executive Director  
• Above US$20 million (food value): approval by the Executive Board |
| DEV | **New DEV:**  
• Under US$3 million (food value) + WFP operational presence: approval by the Chief of Staff  
• Under US$3 million (food value) + NO previous operational presence: approval by the Executive Board  
• Above US$3 million (food value): approval by Executive Board  
• Capacity development projects with no food component are not envisaged in current rules and regulations, which use food costs as a threshold. The practice has been as follows:  
  o Total costs excluding ISC below US$6 million: approval by the Deputy Executive Director  
  o Total costs excluding ISC above US$6 million: approval by the Executive Board  

**Budget revision:**  
• No cost: approved by the country director  
• Food value under US$3 million and associated costs (excluding ISC) under US$3 million, no change in orientation: approved by regional director  
• Food value under US$3 million and associated costs above US$3 million: approved by the Chief of Staff  
• Food value above US$3 million: approval by the Executive Board  
• Budget revision introducing a complex project OR project with innovative approaches OR two or more expansions have already been approved: approval by the Executive Board |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme category</th>
<th>Approval authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>New CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Always approved by Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Budget revision:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No cost: approved by the country director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food value under US$3 million and associated costs (excluding ISC) under US$3 million, no change in orientation: approved by regional director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food value under US$3 million and associated costs above US$3 million with no change in project orientation: approved by the Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food value under US$3 million and associated costs above US$3 million but change in project orientation: approved by the Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food value above US$3 million: approval by the Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>New SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Under US$3 million (total value): approval by the Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Above US$3 million (total value): approval by the Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Budget revision:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Under US$3 million (total value): approval by regional director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Above US$3 million (total value): approval by the Chief of Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex II: General Food Distribution Logic Model*

This logic model was developed as part of a joint WFP-UNHCR series of impact evaluations on the contribution of food assistance in protracted refugee situations. It does not purport to apply to all GFD interventions and is not official WFP policy. Read synthesis report here.

* This logic model was developed as part of a joint WFP-UNHCR series of impact evaluations on the contribution of food assistance in protracted refugee situations. It does not purport to apply to all GFD interventions and is not official WFP policy. Read synthesis report here.
### Annex III: Food Assistance for Assets Simplified Logic Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFA Asset Creation</th>
<th>Impact on Productivity</th>
<th>Impact on Livelihoods Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food or cash meet immediate food deficit and increase sense of confidence and independence of the most needy during periods of stress. Assets are appropriately selected, designed and implemented (fit-for-purpose) and in-line with community and government priorities and plans.</td>
<td>Geophysical changes have positive impacts on productivity (e.g., increased output per hectare, increased hectares under production, increased hectares irrigated, diversification to higher value crops, increased agricultural and forest biodiversity, etc.).</td>
<td>Increase in household production and consumption, livelihoods diversification, labor demand and asset accumulation and empowerment of most vulnerable. Reduction in food insecurity among the food insecure. Reduction in negative coping strategies during times of shock and stress. Reduction in negative impacts of subsequent disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets are maintained by community/district.</td>
<td>Geophysical changes reduce environmental vulnerability (e.g., increased access to water, reduced flood risk, reduced drought occurrence, etc.).</td>
<td>Employment and improvement in livelihood options improve the independence of vulnerable people and increase their influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This logic model was developed as part of a series of impact evaluations on food-assistance-for-assets interventions on livelihood resilience and has not been formally approved by WFP.
Annex IV: WFP School Feeding Logic Model

Source: WFP revised school feeding policy, November 2013.
Annex V: Food and Nutrition Security Conceptual Framework

Source: WFP Programming for Nutrition-Specific Interventions

Acronyms

ART: anti-retroviral treatment
BSFP: Blanket supplementary feeding programme
CAP: Consolidated Appeal Process
CBT: Cash-Based Transfers
CFSAM: Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission
CFSVA: comprehensive food security and vulnerability analysis
CHF: Common Humanitarian Fund
CP: country programme
CRF: Corporate Results Framework
CSP: Country Strategic Plan
DAC: Development Assistance Committee (of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)
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