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Overview of Evaluation

WHAT

- Assessed strategic positioning, quality of strategic decision-making and results

WHY

- Inform design of the CSP
- Learning from WFP work in complex security contexts
WFP Portfolio – 7 operations (2012-2017)

OCHA APPEALS
46%
average funding received

WFP FUNDING
51%
required USD 829 m
received 425 m

March 2012: President overthrown

June 2015: Peace Agreement

WFP PRRO starts

2017: Increased security tensions

Expenditure USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Protracted relief</th>
<th>UNHAS</th>
<th>Other special operations and trust funds</th>
<th>Actual expenditure as % of planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 Strategic Alignment

• Some delays in emergency response - 2012

• Aligned with needs; relevant and appropriate reactive approach

Q2 Quality of Strategic Decision Making

• Analysis of needs (with government and partners)

• National priorities, capacities and infrastructure

• Level of funding and donor preferences
Q3 Performance and Results

WFP delivered to over 80 percent of planned beneficiaries, in spite of funding shortfalls

Achieved by:

- Increased local procurement
- Increased use of CBT
- Reduction in level of assistance to beneficiaries

General Food Assistance

2.3 m beneficiaries. 2017, 79 percent of beneficiaries in the North (67 percent in 2015)

Cash-Based Transfers

Appreciated by beneficiaries. Number of beneficiaries doubled to 350,000. Used in GFA, school feeding and FFA.
Q3 Performance and Results

**School Feeding**
Significant increase in school attendance

**Nutrition**
High success rate for treatment of moderate acute malnutrition

**P4P, FFA and Capacity Building** reduced due to funding constraints
Q3 Performance and Results

Areas for attention

- Gender
- Humanitarian Principles and Protection
- Accountability to Affected Populations
Q3 Performance and Results

**Efficiency**
- Good use of the Global Commodity Management Facility
- High proportion of local purchases
- Reduced delivery costs through increased use of CBT
- New technologies could reduce costs further

**Sustainability**
Funding and security remain a challenge
Conclusions – Part 1

Overall, the “reactive” approach was relevant and appropriate

Good working relations with the government and other humanitarian and development partners supported the delivery of assistance
Conclusions – Part 1

- Funding levels and donor preferences influenced geographic location and types of activities and modalities. Funding shortfalls risk jeopardizing results achieved in nutrition and school feeding.

- Root cause of needs and the geographic prioritization need attention.

- Changes in activities or modalities need to be carefully planned and monitored.
Recommendations

Zero Hunger Challenge

Efficient and Effective Delivery