

Grand Bargain annual self-reporting exercise:

WFP

Contents

Work stream 1 - Transparency	3
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	3
2. Progress to date	3
3. Planned next steps	3
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	4
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	4
Work stream 2 - Localization	5
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	5
2. Progress to date	5
3. Planned next steps	6
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	6
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	6
Work stream 3 - Cash	7
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	7
2. Progress to date	7
3. Planned next steps	8
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	8
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	8
Work stream 4 – Management costs	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	9
2. Progress to date	9
3. Planned next steps	10
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	10
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	10
Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment	9
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	11
2. Progress to date	11
3. Planned next steps	12
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	12
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	12
Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution	13
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	13
2. Progress to date	13
3. Planned next steps	13
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	14
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	14
Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding	15
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	15
2. Progress to date	15
3. Planned next steps	15
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	15
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	16

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility	17
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	17
2. Progress to date	17
3. Planned next steps	17
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	18
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	18
Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements	19
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	19
2. Progress to date	19
3. Planned next steps	19
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	19
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	19
Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement	20
1. Baseline (only in year 1)	20
2. Progress to date	20
3. Planned next steps	21
4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)	21
5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)	21

Work stream 1 - Transparency

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Provision through standardised reports of quality, comprehensive and timely data and information to WFP's partners and the public has been embedded in the WFP's operational frame for many years. At the signing of the Grand Bargain in May 2016, WFP had (and still has) a robust reporting framework providing granular information on its field operations through a public Operations Database and Standard Project Reports. WFP had (has) an effective internal control framework providing assurance to donors, partners and the public through its Annual Statement on Internal Control as well as through the publication of its corporate Annual Financial Statements and through internal audit reports which are made public within 30 days of their issuance. In August 2012, WFP became a member of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and has to date adhered to the reporting guidelines provided by the organisation. Since 2016, WFP ranks first of more than 500 organizations in the IATI transparency indicator.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

At the signing of the Grand Bargain in May 2016, WFP was in the process of developing a new organisational management framework known internally and by WFP's partners as the Integrated Road Map (IRM). The IRM was presented to WFP's Executive Board (EB) and approved in November 2016. Key transparency enhancement components embedded in the IRM are the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) Framework and Country Portfolio Budget (CPB) structure which will provide a holistic view of WFP's portfolio of work at the country level and ensure optimum use of resources. Although the overarching framework was in development prior to the signing of the GB, the IRM will be implemented starting in 2017 in 15 pilot countries and corporately as of 2018. In the IRM, the CSPs and CPBs will be underpinned by a new financial architecture which will support reporting and provision of granular information on costs and expenditures on every activity in a WFP's country operation. Visibility of WFP's resource management and activity outcomes is modelled through the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) which will support reporting on the ultimate results and outcomes of WFP's activities, thus providing a clear line of sight from resource mobilisation and allocation across WFP's areas of work, to outputs and outcomes resulting from the use of these resources in field operations and their link to SDG2 of ending hunger by 2030.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

[Linked to 1 and 2 above] The IRM will be fully implemented from 1 January 2018 and from the second quarter of 2018, the CSPs and CPBs will be made available to WFP's Member States through a web portal prior to their approval by the EB and throughout their operational phase. In line with the corporate changes in the IRM, WFP will move from reporting on individual projects to country portfolios and activities which will be tied to specific outcomes. These outcomes will in turn be directly linked to WFP's Strategic Plan (2017 – 2021) and the global goals on partnerships (SDG17) and ending hunger by 2030 (SDG2).

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 2 - Localization

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

WFP has a long history of partnering with local responders. In addition to working with national and local governments and the private sector, WFP has more than 1000 civil society partners engaged in 75 per cent of its programmes. Some eighty per cent of these partners are local as opposed to international. Through its co-leadership and training provided to food security cluster members, WFP works deliberately to prepare local NGOs for direct partnership with international donors. WFP's disbursements to local partners have increased steadily over the past five years. During the Grand Bargain negotiations, WFP successfully argued that the target for transfers to national and local responders should be raised from the 20 per cent suggested in the HLP report to 25 per cent. In anticipation of the World Humanitarian Summit and the emerging consensus on the merits of localising humanitarian preparedness and response, WFP commissioned a study by ODI/HPG on how the organisation could invest better in the capacity of local NGOs.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

WFP's 2017-2021 Strategic Plan commits WFP to "make(ing) strategic demand-side investments in the capacity strengthening of relevant national and local NGOs, farmers' organisations and other community-based organisations to help communities lead and sustain their own fight against hunger and achieve SDG2." The Strategic Plan also commits WFP to paying special attention to strengthening the performance capacity of local crisis responders.

WFP has aligned its strategic goals and actions to the SDG framework, which includes a "Whole of Society" approach to achieving SDG2 - Zero Hunger.

WFP has taken the following key steps to implement the commitments of this work stream:

- WFP applies a "Whole of Society" approach to the formulation and implementation of 3-5 year Country Strategic Plans. National and local responders are systematically included in the Country Strategic Plan processes at country level and their contribution to collective outcomes are agreed. Best practices of civil society engagement include Bangladesh, Lao PDR, Namibia and Sri Lanka. In Pakistan, the Food Security Cluster serves as the secretariat for a comprehensive Zero Hunger Strategic Review. As WFP puts into practice its new Country Strategic Plans in 2017, Zimbabwe and other countries have set targets for increasing the number of national partners and the volume of work carried out in collaboration with them.
- WFP has launched a pilot initiative with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) to jointly invest in the RC/RC National Societies in four countries: Burundi, Dominican Republic, Pakistan and Sudan. The pilot initiative will serve as a catalyst for further joint investments in the capacity of national and local responders.
- WFP is simplifying and harmonising partnership processes to facilitate both improved collaboration with established NGO partners and new opportunities for local actors. WFP is working with UNHCR and UNICEF to explore opportunities for improving processes for our operational partners. An inter-agency group is exploring the feasibility of a shared platform (or 'Partner Portal')

through which initial eligibility assessments (basic due diligence) could be performed and partner registration and profiles recorded. The group is also harmonising agreement templates and budget as well as reporting formats.

More detailed input on the harmonisation work has been provided under work stream 4 (reduce duplication) and 9 (simplify reporting requirements).

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

Operationalisation of the initiatives outlined above.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Too early to comment.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Too early to comment.

Work stream 3 - Cash

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

WFP had formally adopted cash-based transfers (CBT), which include restricted and unrestricted cash, in 2008 as the organisation shifted from food aid to food assistance thus marking the shift from delivering food to delivering hunger solutions. In the same year, WFP produced a CBT policy that outlined the rationale and comparative advantages of introducing cash and vouchers (C&V) in WFP projects and programmes. The policy highlighted opportunities and challenges and explained potential programming, capacity development and partnership implications. It foresaw outcomes and impact at beneficiary and country levels, and for WFP as an organisation. A unit was established in headquarters to consolidate policy implementation efforts related to learning, leadership and coordination across WFP functions. A CBT manual was disseminated in 2009 and updated in 2015. Extensive training was also conducted for over 3,000 field staff.

As such, at the time of Grand Bargain signature, WFP was already well on its way to using CBT in contexts that were appropriate for their application. The number of beneficiaries receiving CBT increased steadily, from 1.1 million in 2009 to over 10 million in 2016. The transfer value to beneficiaries also grew exponentially, from US\$10 million in 2009 to US\$879 million in 2016 in 54 countries, representing about 26 per cent of WFP's total food assistance portfolio. WFP has also been increasingly using government-owned CBT delivery systems to provide assistance to vulnerable populations, particularly in emergency contexts. Following Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines for example, WFP provided cash assistance to the affected population using the government's social safety net mechanism. The same approach was used in Fiji following the February 2016 cyclone and in Ecuador in the wake of the April 2016 earthquake.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

Having gained considerable experience and expertise in the use of CBT, WFP's focus is shifting from delivering cash to gauging the outcomes that can be achieved through these transfer modalities. In particular, in supporting countries implement SDG2, WFP focuses on providing technical assistance and capacity development to governments to either establish or enhance cash-based social safety nets which are also shock responsive. This work is undertaken in partnership with the World Bank Group and UNICEF.

WFP is implementing a new financial framework which will enable the organisation to accurately track transfers to beneficiaries by modality (cash, vouchers, in-kind) and by mechanism (debit card, mobile phone transfers etc.). It will also enable WFP to accurately track costs by transfer modality. WFP is also investing in financial risk management through the deployment of experts from the private sector. WFP's corporate monitoring guidelines have been adapted to the use of CBT and the terms of reference for evaluations of WFP operations now include the assessment of results achieved through the use of CBT.

WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF and OCHA have tested 'cash preparedness' initiatives in four countries to increase inter-agency cash readiness in those countries and to jointly learn if and whether such a concept could be taken up more widely throughout the humanitarian sector. WFP has also made

available an on-line basic training package on how to do cash programming, mostly useful as a core introduction for smaller NGOs and civil society organisations. Additionally, WFP has commissioned cost effectiveness type studies as well as some more policy and programmatic studies of cash in the context of shock-responsive programme design.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

WFP will continue to update the CBT business processes and tools as the organisation's experience in them grows. WFP will continue to provide support to host governments in the adoption of shock-responsive safety nets, in collaboration with other partners. WFP will also invest in operational research to build an evidence base on the impact of its operations that use CBT compared to other transfer modalities. WFP will continue to engage with the wide community of practice in sharing tools, standards and lessons learned.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 4 – Management costs

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

- *Delivering through technology*
 - There has been long-standing corporate emphasis and leadership support for using technology and innovation to improve operations. Successful innovations include mVAM (mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping), which uses mobile technology for remote needs assessment, the One Card and Iris Scan payment methods for cash-based transfers.
 - WFP has also established an Innovation Accelerator in Munich, Germany to support innovations more systematically.
- *Harmonising partnership agreements*
 - WFP had started work on a simplified field-level agreement for use in emergencies, which is expected to be activated in the coming weeks.
- *Transparent and comparable cost structures*
 - A new Country Portfolio Budget structure has been designed and agreed (2015 – 2016). The new structure provides a clear line of sight starting from country specific activities through country strategic outcomes right up to SDG targets, all aligned with WFPs corporate strategic objectives. It will further improve comparability of expenditure reports across UN utilising the harmonised UNCC cost classification.
- *Reducing duplication of management costs*
 - WFP launched a Cost Excellence initiative to find ways to reduce costs and improve efficiency while sustaining investments in strategic priorities. Work has focused on an analysis of global support costs and the optimisation of processes in five functional areas, including HR and IT.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

- *Delivering through technology*
 - WFP currently delivers 26 per cent of its operational portfolio via cash-based transfers. Shared and digital cash-based transfers reduce overhead costs and increase system-wide effectiveness. WFP is also institutionalising the digital registration of all its beneficiaries through an in-house developed system (SCOPE).
 - WFP has developed a Green Box with which untrained field staff can monitor energy consumption on site themselves, thus reducing costs of energy surveys as well as energy consumption. WFP has made the Green Box available to all interested agencies and NGO partners.
- *Harmonising partnership agreements*
 - WFP, together with UNHCR and UNICEF, is assessing the feasibility of a shared platform for eligibility assessments, partner registration and profiles. The platform could also be a common hub for calls for expression of interest/proposals. The group is also exploring harmonisation and simplification opportunities in agreement templates, budgets and reporting formats. Other entities, including OCHA, have been brought into discussions or are interested in joining; NGO partners were also consulted.
- *Transparent and comparable cost structures*
 - A prototype has been developed and successfully tested in eight WFP country offices (2016).

- Business Blueprint, System Design/Build and Testing was finalised in December 2016.
 - System roll-out to up to 16 pilot countries will take place in two waves, in February and June 2017.
 - *Reducing duplication of management costs*
- In 2016, analysis of global support costs identified Programme Support and Administrative (PSA) budget savings of US\$3.8 million which were reinvested in priority areas.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- *Delivering through technology*
 - WFP is planning to implement mVAM in between 30 and 35 countries by the end of 2017 and is looking into using new platforms (e.g. chat apps) to better reach people and share information.
 - WFP is considering using big data generated by CBT transactions to optimise its service offering, e.g. by optimally pre-positioning supplies and detecting abnormalities.
 - WFP's Innovation Accelerator aims to support successful innovations scale up across all of WFP's operations, including delivering cash-based transfers.
- *Harmonising partnership agreements*
 - A timetable with clear deliverables has been agreed for the inter-agency process. Current focus is on moving forward with the shared platform.
- *Transparent and comparable cost structures*
 - The new financial architecture should be rolled out to all WFP country offices from 2018 onwards.
- *Reducing duplication of management costs*
 - The emphasis in 2017 is on further improving the examined processes. For example, in management services, a self-service platform is being developed to improve travel planning and travel policies to yield additional savings; WFP is also looking into optimising the management of assets and right-sizing light vehicles.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

- *Reducing duplication of management costs*
 - Optimisation efforts will focus on processes with a high volume of transactions which have the potential to provide significant financial savings and enable field offices to focus on more significant, value-added work. Process optimisation work has the potential to generate cashable savings of up to US\$6.2 million in 2017.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

- *Reducing duplication of management costs*

Cost Excellence work includes engagement with sister agencies to better understand how they achieve efficiencies and effectiveness and to identify potential for collaboration and knowledge sharing. WFP also ensures knowledge is transferred across programmes and countries, inside and outside the organisation.

Work stream 5 – Needs Assessment

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

WFP is committed to undertaking joint needs assessments. Examples of well-established joint assessments include: Crop and Food Security Assessment missions (CFSAM) with FAO, the Multi Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessments with OCHA, Joint Assessment Missions (JAM) with UNHCR and Post Disaster/Conflict Needs Assessments (PDNA/PCNA) with UNDP, the World Bank Group and EU.

• Integrated Phase Classification (IPC): A multi-agency platform, launched in 2004, with the objective of bringing partners together for consensus building, increasing transparency and improving quality of assessments. The IPC has 12 members from within key organisations focusing on food security. WFP is an active member of the Global IPC steering committee and other technical working groups within the IPC structure.

• Cadre Harmonisé (CH): WFP is a member of the Harmonised Framework for the analysis and identification of areas at risk and vulnerable groups in the Sahel. The Technical Steering Committee comprises various governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at the regional level. This Committee is responsible for monitoring and directing activities towards the implementation of the initiative in CILSS countries.

• Food Security Information Network (FSIN): A global initiative, co-sponsored by WFP and FAO since 2012 with more than 1,000 members. FSIN is a global initiative to strengthen food and nutrition security information systems for producing reliable and accurate data to guide analysis and decision-making.

• The Global report on Food Crisis: EU, WFP, FAO, FEWSNET and the regional governmental bodies of CILSS, SICA and IGAD have since 2016 joined forces to coordinate the compilation of food security and nutrition analysis to inform resource allocation for humanitarian and resilience responses. The network will act as a catalyst for shared analysis of needs and the impact of current and future crises. It will enhance coordination in response to food and nutrition crises, including between humanitarian and development programming.

• State of Food Insecurity in the World (SOFI): A joint yearly publication of WFP, FAO, IFAD and WHO reporting, among others, on the SDG2 targets.

Humanitarian Data Exchange (DHX): since 2014, WFP is one of the top contributors to this OCHA-lead platform for open data. Food security indicators from mVAM are uploaded for anyone to use for better situation analysis.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

There has already been an expansion of the members for the Global Report on Countries in Crisis as the first report in March 2016 only included WFP and FAO. The plan for 2017 is to further expand to include UNICEF, civil society and regional governmental bodies such as SADC.

WFP is leading the work with the Global Food Security Cluster partners in developing specific assessment tools for urban needs assessments.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

- Expand IPC to other countries and partners and ensure that the IPC is used as the process of choice in arriving at agreed situation analysis. This will include an active focus on improving quality and frequency of data.
- Roll out the WFP/UNICEF joint food and nutrition security assessment guidelines (JANFSA) and encourage joint assessments.
- As the 72h approach (emergency analysis after rapid onset crisis) is being standardised, there are pilots in the WFP Asia and the Pacific Regional Bureau looking at how this can be done for and with other sectors.
- Undertake joint IFAD/WFP climate analysis with the aim to prioritise countries for climate adaptation projects.
- Pilot joint market assessments with WFP/UNHCR/UNICEF/OCHA for multi-purpose cash for refugees. Four countries have been selected for the pilot: Afghanistan, Burundi, Myanmar and Niger.
- Strengthen the joint cross-border trade monitoring in Eastern Africa between WFP/FAO and FEWSNET.
- Moving from the 2017 Global Report to the Global Network against Food Crisis: The Global Assessment is the technical keystone of the future Global Network that will be a platform in which UN agencies, donors and regional governmental bodies participate to analyse the food insecurity situation globally and from which donors can prioritise funding based on joint needs analysis.
- Pilot urban food security assessments in Bangladesh and Indonesia in 2017 and disseminate urban assessment guidelines that have been developed in collaboration with partners including the private sector.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Work stream 6 – Participation Revolution

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Engaging with affected populations is not new to WFP - its policy on participatory approaches was outlined already in 2000 – but has in recent years become a key priority for the organisation.

To gain an overview of ongoing AAP activities, establish benchmarks for current practices, and comprehensively and strategically support the integration of AAP going forward, a global baseline survey of practices in all country offices was undertaken in 2015. The survey showed that AAP practices were widely used in WFP programmes. Examples of AAP initiatives were found in all types of programmes and contexts, from emergency operations to country programmes, and both formal and informal avenues for engaging affected communities were utilised. Work on information provision and consultation appeared to be slightly more advanced than on complaints and feedback mechanisms. In all these areas, the approaches could be more consistently utilised across all WFP country offices and more systematically integrated into the project cycle.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

WFP has developed an AAP strategy that outlines the organisation’s vision and approach to achieving more accountable programmes.

Complementing the strategy, programmatic guidance has been developed to support country offices in understanding their role and responsibilities in implementing WFP’s commitments.

Focal points responsible for AAP have been assigned in all Regional Bureaux and in three of these, a Humanitarian Advisor position has been established to ensure the presence of technical expertise at the regional level.

WFP’s corporate indicators on AAP have been updated to better capture country offices’ performance on WFP’s AAP commitments.

WFP’s commitments on AAP have also been integrated in an annex to WFP’s field level partnership agreements to ensure clarity regarding the role and responsibilities of both WFP and its partners in their implementation.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

WFP’s strategy on AAP adopts a two-phased approach covering the period 2016-2021. Phase one (2016-2018) focuses on getting the basics right and laying the foundation for a more ground-breaking system in the future, while phase two (2018-2021) capitalises on those foundations and takes the innovations to scale.

Implementation during phase one envisages:

- Development of operational guidance on AAP;
- Training and awareness raising for staff;
- Appointment of regional level focal points for AAP;
- Piloting of technological innovations for AAP;
- Documentation of good practices on AAP;
- Integration of AAP in WFP's corporate compliance and monitoring and evaluation systems;
- Inclusion of AAP in cooperation with partners.

As highlighted under section 2, several of these have already been completed, while others have been initiated. WFP will continue working along these areas over the next two years.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

It is still too early to determine efficiency gains associated with the implementation of the GB commitments. In the course of 2017, the results of WFP's corporate reporting together with follow up to the 2015 baseline survey are expected to yield a better understanding of this.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

It is still too early to draw conclusions regarding good practices and lessons learnt. The identification and documentation of these are however foreseen as part of the implementation of phase one of WFP's AAP strategy.

Work stream 7 - Multi-year planning and funding

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

WFP - an entirely voluntary funded organisation - has traditionally prioritised predictable funding as a resourcing goal to allow for efficient and effective organisational response. As part of these efforts, WFP promotes Strategic Partnership Agreements (SPAs) with donors to allow for predictable and flexible funding around a set of jointly agreed longer-term objectives. At the time of the signing of the Grand Bargain, WFP had twelve standing SPAs with top donors.

As part of the global humanitarian community, WFP has been a key contributor to the activities of the IASC Task Team on Humanitarian Financing and co-sponsors and co-leads efforts on system-wide advocacy messaging with the donor community to reduce donor conditions.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In November of 2016, WFP's Executive Board approved a new strategic framework and architecture aimed at optimizing the Programme's support to national efforts towards meeting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). As part of this approach, WFP is introducing Country Strategic Plans (CSPs) which cover a period of time of up to five years, outlining the outcomes, outputs and activities that WFP will achieve. This provides a better basis for donors to commit resources over multi-year periods. The accompanying Country Portfolio Budgets (CPB) present WFP's portfolio of work in a holistic fashion and reposition operations and management at the country level to ensure optimal use of resources and demonstrate value for money.

WFP is finalising a multilateral visibility strategy to make the case for both donors and tax-payers that flexible and predictable funding yields greater impact for affected populations.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

WFP will roll out its strategic framework and architecture by 2018 and update and implement its multilateral visibility strategy.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Analyses based on past practices indicate that predictable funding leads to gains when available for pre-positioning food and non-food items so to ensure uninterrupted activities. Cash-based transfer (CBT) systems implemented by WFP to provide assistance in an emergency context improve when funding is predictable. Multi-year funding promotes cost effective supply chain arrangements to deliver assistance through the CBT modality. Predictable funding is particularly critical in situations

where food needs to be pre-positioned 2-3 months ahead of the actual distribution cycle due to seasonal and climatic challenges. In addition, multi-year funding increases accountability to affected populations and improves planning, thus reducing operational complexities and leading to better services to beneficiaries. However, despite GB commitments, multi-year funding to WFP has continued on a downward trend. In 2016 multi-year contributions to WFP decreased by three per cent.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Examples of previous practices supporting the effectiveness of Strategic Partnership Agreements (SPAs):

Benefits of Strategic Partnership Agreements from School Meals Activities in Asia

WFP school meals activities in Asia (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar) benefited from predictable and stable funding through a Strategic Partnership Agreement, averting pipeline breaks and ensuring uninterrupted assistance. In all countries, multi-year funding enabled WFP to support national governments in developing their own quality, sustainable school meals programmes, becoming a credible and reliable partner and making long-term commitments.

Examples of practices supporting WFP humanitarian operations through multi-year funding

In February 2016, Canada committed CAD\$120 million in multi-year funding (2016-2018) to WFP's humanitarian operations in Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon. In collaboration with key partners and other donors, WFP adopted the "Vision 2020" initiative with the aim to transition over time WFP's humanitarian assistance towards building resilience with scalable and sustainable solutions, increasing food security through education, improved economic access and strengthening of national systems.

Work stream 8 - Earmarking/flexibility

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Flexible and multi-year funding allows WFP to ensure continuity in operations by avoiding funding gaps (e.g. allocating funding to neglected and forgotten crisis), avoiding pipeline breaks, being always capable of responding to urgent and unforeseen emergencies and reducing transaction costs. The predictability and flexibility of funding helps WFP to mitigate price volatility and procure food commodities at favourable market prices, ensuring continued supply of food to beneficiaries.

WFP applies an internal resource allocation mechanism to ensure that earmarked and non-earmarked contributions complement one another. Through diversifying the allocations of multilateral funding, WFP has been able to bridge funding gaps and kick-start operations even before donors respond to specific humanitarian appeals. To further maximise the use of non-earmarked funds, WFP makes use of advance financing facilities including the Immediate Response Account (IRA) and the Global Commodity Facilities Management (GCMF). The IRA allows WFP to respond rapidly, within 24 hours of the onset of a crisis, to life-saving situations e.g. even before an appeal is launched. GCMF allows WFP to buy a specific amount of food before contributions from donors are confirmed. However, despite record contributions from donors, WFP has experienced a downward trend in flexible non-earmarked contributions. In 2016 WFP received US\$ 380 million in multilateral, un-earmarked, contributions -- a 10 per cent decrease compared to the US\$421 million in 2015. Multilateral, un-earmarked funding nonetheless remains only a small portion – 6.4 per cent - of overall contributions to WFP.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

In line with the Agenda 2030 and the new way of working, WFP began developing in 2015 a new management framework known as the Integrated Road Map (IRM), approved by its Executive Board in November 2016. This new corporate approach and architecture increases visibility on WFP's resource management and activity outcomes through Country Strategic Plans (CSP) Framework and Country Portfolio Budget (CPB) structures and provides a complete view of WFP's portfolio of work at the country level. The Country Portfolio Budget and the Corporate Results Framework (CRF) mirror the results-oriented focus of the CSP, transparently linking resources from WFP's Strategic Results and WFP Strategic Outcomes to activities and costs. In short, a clear 'line of sight' demonstrates the link between resource mobilisation and allocation across WFP's areas of work, to outputs and outcomes emanating from the use of these resources in field operations and their link to SDG2 – Zero Hunger.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

[Linked to 1 and 2 above] The IRM global roll out is expected will be implemented by 2018. New corporate tools developed in support of the IRM implementation are expected to enhance donor

reporting for directed or un-earmarked 'multilateral' funds. These include for example corporate reporting on the use of multilateral funds at the strategic outcome level. The decision-making process for allocating multilateral funds will also be reviewed.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Examples of benefits resulting from the Global Commodity Facilities Management (GCMF)

In 2016, purchases through GCMF resulted in an average reduction of 62 per cent in lead-time compared to conventional procurement process. This suggests that the more can be pre-positioned thanks to flexibility of funds, the more timeliness and cost efficiencies can be improved.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

N/A

Work stream 9 – Reporting requirements

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

The principal tool for reporting to donors on WFP activities are WFP's Standard Project Reports (SPR) which are issued annually. The SPRs provide information on progress, performance and achievements made in the implementation of specific projects and initiatives and include the relevant financial information.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

WFP is seeking to deliver on its Grand Bargain commitments by simplifying and harmonising partnership processes across UN agencies to facilitate improved collaboration with traditional NGO partners and new opportunities for local and national actors. WFP is working with UNHCR and UNICEF on simplifying and harmonising processes for our operational partners, including reporting formats. Discussions have started with the Norwegian Refugee Council to explore the use of a harmonised reporting template, as part of a pilot coordinated by ICVA and Germany, the co-convenors of this GB work stream. Although the initial group was limited to WFP, UNHCR and UNICEF, there is significant potential for simplification and harmonisation across other agencies. OCHA has been brought into discussions, and other agencies have shown interest in joining the initiative. NGO partners were also briefed on progress to date at a meeting in Geneva in January.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

As part of the initiative coordinated by ICVA and Germany, the co-convenors of the reporting work stream, the Global Public Policy Institute (GPPi) has conducted an analysis of reporting requirements and proposed a new approach. In support of these efforts, WFP has developed an updated format for its annual Standard Project Reports (SPR) in line with the proposed approach. The new format will be applied to 2016 SPRs, to be issued in 2017.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Not yet available

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

Not yet available

Work stream 10 – Humanitarian – Development engagement

1. Baseline (only in year 1)

Where did your organisation stand on the work stream and its commitments when the Grand Bargain was signed?

Commitments by global leaders in the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, as well as the World Humanitarian Summit's deliberations, stress the critical importance of enhanced roles for governments and other national and local actors in financing development initiatives and humanitarian preparedness, response and recovery.

Throughout the various inter-governmental processes that have taken place over the past two years, in particular the Third International Conference on Financing for Development and Agenda 2030, WFP has worked with partner agencies to provide strategic advice and evidence to Member States in order to demonstrate the importance of coherence and complementarity across the humanitarian-development nexus.

In preparation for the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), WFP continued to advocate for rationalizing the linkages between humanitarian and development assistance across relevant work streams of the Grand Bargain process. Most critically, however, WFP has undertaken efforts to mainstream the nexus into its strategic orientation, business processes and financial model.

2. Progress to date

Which concrete actions have you taken (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream?

As a signatory to the Commitment to Action on Transcending the Humanitarian-Development Divide, or the 'New Way of Working', WFP signalled its readiness to work with partners from across the UN system to realise the key objectives of this work stream. With the approval by its Executive Board of its 'Integrated Road Map'(IRM) – consisting of its Strategic Plan 2017-2021, Country Strategic Plan, Corporate Results Framework and Financial Framework – WFP has undertaken a full spectrum effort to deliver on this commitment under Agenda 2030.

With a strategic focus on SDG2 and SDG17, the IRM represents an ambitious and transformative approach to enhancing the organization's ability to respond effectively to emergencies while enhancing national capacity to achieve Zero Hunger over the long-term. The IRM is guided by the recognition that effective partnerships are essential to delivering on this work stream. By placing SDG17 at the centre of its new strategic plan, working to develop more long-term Country Strategic Plans, and enhancing its business model, WFP will be more capable of developing effective partnerships across the humanitarian-development nexus to address the root causes of hunger and vulnerability.

In line with this objective, WFP has initiated a number of new partnerships since the launch of the Grand Bargain. For example, UNHCR and WFP have launched a 'Joint Strategy for Enhancing Self-Reliance in Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Refugee Situations'. The strategy will focus on strengthening the livelihoods of refugees, while ensuring access to nutritious food and other essential services. The World Bank Group and WFP are collaborating on operational research related to shock-responsive social protection systems to enhance the capacity of government-led safety nets

to meet emergency needs. In addition, WFP is engaged in discussions to update MoUs with a number of key partner agencies to reflect the priorities of the 'New Way of Working'.

3. Planned next steps

What are the specific next steps which you plan to undertake to implement the commitments (with a focus on the next 2 years)?

The implementation of the IRM at the country office level will be a key corporate priority for delivering on the humanitarian-development nexus. The development and roll-out of the Country Strategic Plan process will be essential for driving collaboration with counterparts in host governments, UN system partners and local and international civil society partners. The identification of opportunities to enhance long-term impact through innovative partnerships will be prioritised in this process.

In addition, WFP will continue to work with the member states of the V20, UNDP, OCHA, FAO and the World Bank Group to establish the Global Partnership on Preparedness. This WHS initiative will be focused on strengthening national capacity for emergency preparedness and response to natural disasters. WFP, along with UNHCR, UNICEF and OCHA will also continue to participate in discussions related to operationalising the UN-World Bank Group framework agreement on increasing complementarity of planning and implementation to sustain peace and achieve sustainable development in fragile contexts.

4. Efficiency gains (optional for year 1)

Please indicate, qualitatively, efficiency gains associated with implementation of GB commitments and how they have benefitted your organisation and beneficiaries.

Given the nature of this work stream and the short time elapsed since the launch of the Grand Bargain in mid-2016, it is too early to show measureable efficiency gains directly derived from this work stream. The IRM and the range of partnership initiatives related to the humanitarian-development nexus are expected to provide a more rationalised approach to the use of resources and contribute to reducing humanitarian needs over time.

5. Good practices and lessons learned (optional for year 1)

Which concrete action(s) have had the most success (both internally and in cooperation with other signatories) to implement the commitments of the work stream? And why?

The key lesson learned to date is that efforts to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus must be guided by a focus on results that have the potential to contribute to achieving collective outcomes. The overarching framing of the nexus work stream provides an opportunity for agencies to align internal strategy and business process around partnerships based on comparative strengths of relevant organisations. This focus on results is the guiding principle of the IRM as well as various inter-agency partnerships that are being developed.