

## OPERATION EVALUATION

Myanmar Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation 200299:  
“Supporting Transition by Reducing Food Insecurity and  
Undernutrition Among the Most Vulnerable” (2013-2017)

An evaluation of WFP’s operation

### **Supplementary Annex**

December 2016

Evaluation team: Bruce Ravesloot, Team Leader; Jeanne Downen, International Evaluator; Tun Wai, National Evaluator; Pyone Yadana Paing, National Junior Researcher; Jeremie Kaelin, Research Associate

Evaluation Manager: Maryada Vallet

Commissioned by the  
**WFP Office of Evaluation**

Report number: OEV/2016/005

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ANNEX**

### **List of supplementary annexes**

Annex 1: List of persons and institutions interviewed

Annex 2: Exit debrief participants

Annex 3: Interview topical outlines

Annex 4: Fieldwork schedule

Annex 5: Evaluation matrix

Annex 6: Team composition

Annex 7: Additional output indicator tables

## Annex 1: List of persons and institutions interviewed

### Key Informants

#### List of persons and institutions consulted

**Note: both individual and small group interviews were conducted**

**Total Number Key Informants: 297 (132 females/165 males)**

Total number of WFP staff interviewed (CO and SO): 85 (30 females/55 males)

Total number of government officials interviewed: 54 (30 females/24 males)

Total number of donors and United Nations agency representatives interviewed: 33 (12 females/21 males)

Total number of CP and other partners interviewed: 125 (60 females/65 males)

NATIONAL KEY INFORMANTS				
Name	M/F	Title	Date	Location
<b>WFP CO</b>				
Naoe Yakiya	F	Deputy Country Director & Head of Programme	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Swe Swe Win	F	Deputy Head of Programme (field support, SF, livelihoods)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Masae Shimomura	F	Deputy Head of Programme (relief, EPR)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Marc Gschwend	M	CBT Focal Point	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Thin Thin Aye	F	Programme Officer (Livelihoods)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Janine Roelofsen	F	Nutritionist	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Soe Nyi Nyi	M	Programme Associate (HIV/TB)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Flaminia Mussio	F	Programme Officer (SF)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Darko Petrovic	M	M&E Officer	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Anna Zingg	F	Protection / Gender Advisor	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Sweta Pokharel	F	M&E Consultant (School Feeding Programme)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Fumitsugu Tosu	M	Programme Policy Officer (Project Cycle Management)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Soi Lang Seng	F	Programme Policy Officer (EPR)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Fabienne Mueller	F	CBT Programme Officer	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Marco Principi	M	VAM Officer	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Sang Luaia	M	Programme Policy Officer (M&E)	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Anna Zingg	M	Protection / Gender Advisor	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Jean-Luc Kohler	M	Head of Supply Chain Management	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Nyunt Win Htay	M	Logistics Officer	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Michael Hemling	M	Head of Admin and Finance	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Cho Nwe Oo	F	Finance Officer	29 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Domenico Scalpelli	M	Country Director	20 Sept	WFP CO, Yangon

Win Khaing	M	Procurement Officer	21 Sept	WFP CO, Yangon
<b>Total: 23 (11 females, 12 males)</b>				

<b>Government</b>				
U Myint Soe	M	Deputy Director General, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U San Wai	M	Director , Department of Planning, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Kyaw Min	M	Director, Department of Shan Ethnic affairs, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Tin Win	M	Director, Department of Kachin Ethnic affairs, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Tun Aung	M	Deputy Director, Department of International relations, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
Kyawt Kyawt Mon	F	Deputy Director, Department of Rakhine Ethnic affairs, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Zin Bo Oo	M	Assistant Director, Department of International relations, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Hein Zaw Latt	M	Assistant Director, Department of International relations, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Nay Lin Aung	M	Assistant Director, Department of Auditing, NaTaLa	30 August	Naypyidaw
Dr. Ko Ko Naing	M	Director General, Relief and Resettlement Department	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Win Htin Kyaw	M	Director, Coordination research, Relief and Resettlement Department	30 August	Naypyidaw
Daw Myat Moe Thwe	F	Deputy Director, Coordination research, Relief and Resettlement Department	30 August	Naypyidaw
Dr. San San Aye	F	Deputy Director General, Department of Social Welfare	30 August	Naypyidaw
Dr. Zarni Min	M	Director, Planning & international relations, Department of Rural Development	30 August	Naypyidaw
Dr. May Khin Than	F	Director, National Nutrition Centre	30 August	Naypyidaw
Dr. Si Thu Aung	M	Deputy Director, National TB Programme	30 August	Naypyidaw
U Htun Zaw	M	Director, Foreign Economic Relation Department	30 August	Naypyidaw
Daw Moh Moh Naing	F	Deputy Director, Foreign Economic Relation Department	30 August	Naypyidaw
Dr Tin Yu Yu Aye	F	Director, National School Feeding Program Manager	19 Sept	Naypyidaw
U Myo Thein	M	Assistant Director, National School Feeding Program Manager	19 Sept	Naypyidaw
<b>Total: 20 (6 females/14 males)</b>				

<b>Meeting with donors and United Nations agencies</b>				
Dr.Myo Min Lwin	M	Health Officer, UNICEF	31 August	UNICEF CO, Yangon
Ms Nandar Aung	F	Social Policy and Child Right Monitoring Specialist, UNICEF	31 August	UNICEF CO, Yangon
Mary Manandhar	F	International Facilitator, REACH	31 August	WFP CO
Edward Benson	M	National Shelter, NFI, CCCM	31 August	UNHCR,

		Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR		Yangon
Gry Hjeltnes	M	Liaison Officer, UNHCR	31 August	UNHCR, Yangon
Laura Payne	F	Protection Coordinator, UNHCR	31 August	UNHCR, Yangon
Gwenolenn Le Couster	M	Senior Programme Officer, UNHCR	31 August	UNHCR, Yangon
Sean Keogh	M	Protection Coordinator, UNHCR	31 August	UNHCR, Yangon
Chris Hyslop	F	Deputy Head of Office, OCHA	31 August	OCHA, Yangon
Narciso Rosa-Berlanga	M	Head of the Coordination Support Section, OCHA	31 August	OCHA, Yangon
Helena Mazarro	F	Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Emergency Response Preparedness, Coordination Support Section, OCHA	31 August	OCHA, Yangon
Norwin Schafferer	M	Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA	31 August	OCHA, Yangon
Linda Gellard	F	Humanitarian Advisor, Australian Embassy	20 Sept	Australian Embassy, Yangon
Esther Perry	F	First Secretary, Australian Embassy	20 Sept	Australian Embassy, Yangon
Aung Naing	M	Humanitarian Assistance Program Development Specialist, USAID	20 Sept	Australian Embassy, Yangon
Nicola Louis	M	Head of ECHO Myanmar	20 Sept	Australian Embassy, Yangon
Bernhard Huwiler	M	Head of Humanitarian Affairs, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC	20 Sept	Australian Embassy, Yangon
Bev Carmichael	M	First Secretary (Development) and Consul, Canadian Embassy	20 Sept	Australian Embassy, Yangon
Andrea Berloff	M	Senior Emergency Coordinator and OIC, FAO	20 Sept	FAO, Seed Division Compound, Myanmar Agriculture Service
Khalid Khan	M	Food Security Sector Coordinator, FAO	20 Sept	FAO, Seed Division Compound, Myanmar Agriculture Service
Kazuyoshi Suzuki and Yoko Yamoto	M/F	Second Secretary (agriculture, livestock and fisheries, forestry and environment) and Coordinator for Economic Cooperation, respectively	21 Sept	Embassy of Japan
Bart Robertson	M	Development Economist	22 Sept	Myanmar Institute for Integrated Development
<b>Total: 23 (8 females/15 males)</b>				

<b>Meeting with headquarters level CPs and other partners</b>				
<b>Nutrition and HIV/TB Partners</b>				
Patrick Duigan	M	Program Manager – Migration Health, IOM	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Saw Teddy	M	Programme Director, MHDO	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Gerhard Serafin	M	Country Coordinator, Malteser International	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Myat Zaw Win	M	Deputy Program Coordinator, PU-AMI	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Thura Kyaw	M	Head of Base, PU_AMI	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Dr Su Wai Mon	F	Field Medical Officer, PU_AMI	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
<b>IDP and Livelihoods Partners</b>				
Saw Fulton	M	Director, World Vision	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Stephane Senia	M	Head of the program, Save the children	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Moe Thu	M	Associate director, World Vision	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Saw Teddy	M	Programme director, MHDO	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Kelland Stevenson	M	Country director, Plan International	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Enrico Rampazzo	M	Business Development manager, Plan International	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
Tito Revereal	M	Program Manager ,CDN	31 August	WFP CO, Yangon
<b>Total: 13 (1 female/12 males)</b>				

SUB-OFFICE AND FIELD LEVEL KEY INFORMANTS			
Title	M/F	Date	Location
<b>Meeting with WFP Sub-Office (SO) Staff</b>			
WFP SO Briefing with: 1.Sakhorn Boongullaya (HoS) 2.Hirofumi Watanabe (UNV PO) 3.Ja Seng (Program Assistant-VAM) 4.Seng Seng (Program Assistant-SF) 5.Tu Khong (Program Assistant-HIV/TB) 6.Nan Aung Dee (Monitoring Assistant) 7.Aung Myat (Monitoring Assistant) 8.Thin Thin Myat (Log Associate) 9.MyoMin Tun (Log Assistant) 10.Sai Seng Main (Tally Assistant) 11.Su Pan (Admin Assistant) 12.Thin Thin Swe (Business Support Assistant)	7 M/ 5 F	1 Sept	WFP Myitkyina Office
WFP SO Briefing with: 1.T Wai Khaung (HoA) 2.S Htwe Lwin (Program Assistant-Engineer) 3.Khin Maung Gyi (Program Assistant) 4.Aung Khaing Win (Monitoring Assistant) 5.Phyu Ma (Monitoring Assistant)	4 M/ 1 F	4 Sept	WFP Pakkoku Office
WFP SO Briefing with: 1.Khin Saw Than (HoA) 2.Khun Aung Myin Kyaw (Sr Program Associate) 3.Sai Zaw Zaw Tun (Log Associate) 4.Aung Tun Min (Program Assistant) 5.Tun Aung (Program Assistant) 6.Thein Zeva Naing (Program Assistant) 7.Nant KyiKyi Lwin (Monitoring Assistant) 8.La Doi Nan(Mr) (Monitoring Assistant) 9.Myo Min Tun (Monitoring Assistant) 10.Sai Tun Tun Aung (Monitoring Assistant) 11.Jan Du (Mr) (Program Assistant)	9 M/ 2 F	7 Sept	WFP Lashio Office
WFP SO Briefing with: 1.Frederic Verjus (HoS) 2.Innocent Kudakwashe Sauti (UNV) 3.Ye Lin Han (Program Associate-Nutrition) 4.Yee Mon Han (Program Assistant-MDRTB) 5.Zaw Win Lay (Field Monitoring Assistant) 6.Zaw Tun Oo (Field Monitoring Assistant) 7.Than Min Htwe (Field Monitoring Assistant)	6 M/ 1 F	12 Sept	WFP Sittwe Office
WFP SO Briefing with: 1.Itaru Furuta (HoS) 2.Mohammed Khowsawr (Program Associate) 3.Shair Ahmed (Program PO) 4.Mohamed Lotif (Program Associate) 5.Pann Nilar Htun (Program Associate) 6.Mir Alom (Monitoring Assistant) 7.Than Than Hla (Monitoring Assistant) 8.Mohamed Elias (Monitoring Assistant) 9.Mohamed Tormis (Monitoring Assistant) 10.Adu Hai (Monitoring Assistant) 11.Su Myat Htwe (Monitoring Assistant) 12.Nyo Nyo San (Monitoring Assistant) 13.Mohamed Aesan (Monitoring Assistant) 14.Hla Aung (Program Associate) 15.Tin Maung Myat (VAM Assistant) 16.Yu Yu Khin (Finance Officer) 17.Zayar Lin (Business Support Assistant)	14 M / 5 F	15 Sept	WFP Maungdaw Office

18.Phyo Nyein Aung 19.Tin Win	(Business Support Assistant) (Log Associate)			
Additional meeting with WFP SO staff: <i>(only names of new staff not part of briefing in row above)</i>		3 M/ 5 F	16 Sept	WFP Maungdaw Office
1.Mar Mar Swe	(Monitoring Assistant)			
2.Maung Maung Hla	(Monitoring Assistant)			
3.Moe Moe Win	(Monitoring Assistant)			
4.Zaw Lin	(Monitoring Assistant)			
5.Khine Khine Zan	(Monitoring Assistant)			
6.Nurul Hakim	(Monitoring Assistant)			
7.Thin Thin Aung	(Monitoring Assistant)			
8.Engineer (Male)				
<b>Total: 62 (19 females/43 males)</b>				

<b>Meeting with field office government staff, including school/health employees</b>			
Regional Officer, National TB Program, Myitkyina	F	2 Sept	NTP Office,Myitkyina Township,Kachin State
Headmistress, Primary School, Myitkyina	F	2 Sept	Ar Lam 5 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
Deputy Township Education Officer, Myitkyina	M	2 Sept	Ar Lam 5 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
5 School Teachers, Myitkyina	5 F	2 Sept	Ar Lam 5 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
Headmistress, Primary School, Myitkyina	F	2 Sept	Maw Hpawng No 4 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
5 School Teachers, Myitkyina	5 F	2 Sept	Maw Hpawng No 4 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
Headmaster, Post Primary School, Myaing	M	5 Sept	Thit Kyi Taw Post Primary School, Myaing, Magway
Headmistress, Primary School, Mayaing	F	5 Sept	Ai Ma Primary School, Mayaing
Deputy Township Education Officer, Pauk	M	5 Sept	In Pin Primary School, Pauk
4 School Teachers, Pauk	3 M/1 F	5 Sept	In Pin Primary School, Pauk
7 School Teachers, Lashio	2M/5 F	8 Sept	Man Kat village, Lashio Township, Shan State(N)
Headmistress, Primary School, Tanyang	F	9 Sept	Kho Young Primary School, Tanyang
Regional Officer, National TB Program, Lashio	M	9 Sept	NTP Office, Lashio Township, Shan State
Focal person Food Assistance	F	9 Sept	NTP Office, Lashio Township, Shan State
Statistical Clerk	F	9 Sept	NTP Office, Lashio Township, Shan State
Health Assistant	M	10 Sept	Ga Leng RHC,Kutkai Township,Shan State(N)
Midwife	F	10 Sept	Ga Leng RHC,Kutkai Township,Shan State(N)
<b>Total: 34 (24 females/10 males)</b>			

<b>Meeting with CPs and other community partners</b>			
Project Medical coordinator, Medical Action Myanmar	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Logistics assistant, AHRN	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Community Development facilitator, World vision	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina



Logistics Assistant, AHRN	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Deputy Director, KMSS	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
PM, KMSS	F	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Distribution Leader, KMSS	F	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Community Development facilitator, World vision	F	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Logistics assistant, Medical Action Myanmar	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
9 Parents of Schoolchildren, Discussing HEB	5 M/4 F	2 Sept	Maw Hpawng No 4 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
11 Parents of Schoolchildren, Discussing HEB	2 M/9 F	2 Sept	Ar Lam 5 Basic Education Primary School, Myitkyina
Volunteer, Discussing Role of Volunteer	F	2 Sept	Khat Cho camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State
Country Director, OISCA International	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Project Coordinator, OISCA International	F	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Office Coordinator, OISCA International	F	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Area Manager, REAM	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
President , MHDO	F	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Project Manager, MHDO	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Project Manager, ALARM	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Work Coordinator, MHDO	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Outreach officer, PC Myanmar	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
Community Health Supervisor, PC Myanmar	M	4 Sept	WFP SO, Pakokku
10 Mothers of students, Discussing HEB	10 F	5 Sept	Thit Kyi Taw Post Primary School, Myaing, Magway
7 Female members of Parent Teacher Association, Discussing HEB	7 F	5 Sept	Thit Kyi Taw Post Primary School, Myaing, Magway
7 Male members of School Working Committee, Discussing HEB	7 M	5 Sept	Ai Ma Primary School, Mayaing
10 Female members of HEB Distribution Committee, Discussing HEB	10 F	5 Sept	Ai Ma Primary School, Mayaing
Project Manager, KMSS	M	11 Sept	WFP SO, Lashio
Project Coordinator, AHRN	M	11 Sept	WFP SO, Lashio
Logistics assistant, NCV	M	11 Sept	WFP SO, Lashio
Project Manager, MHDO	M	11 Sept	WFP SO, Lashio
Field Assistant, MHDO	M	10 Sept	Ga Leng RHC, Kutkai Township, Shan State(N)
Field Assistant, MHDO	M	10 Sept	Ga Leng RHC, Kutkai Township, Shan State(N)
Field Assistant, MHDO	F	10 Sept	Ga Leng RHC, Kutkai Township, Shan State(N)
Distribution Assistant, MHDO	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Distribution Assistant, MHDO	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Distribution Coordinator, MHDO	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Food Team Leader, CDN	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Food Monitor, CDN	F	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Program Coordinator, Save the Children	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Project Manager, MHAA	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Project Officer, Save the children	M	13 Sept	WFP SO, Sittwe
Community Facilitator, MHAA	F	13 Sept	Thet Kel Pyin Camp, Sittwe
Community Facilitator, MHAA	F	13 Sept	Thet Kel Pyin Camp, Sittwe
Community Facilitator, MHAA	M	13 Sept	Thet Kel Pyin Camp, Sittwe
Project Officer, MHAA	M	13 Sept	Thet Kel Pyin Camp, Sittwe
Project Manager, MHDO, Maung Daw	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Admin and Finance Officer, MHDO	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Senior Field Monitor, MHDO	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Deputy Field Coordinator, ACF	F	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Nutrition Project Manager, ACF	F	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw

Deputy Nutrition Manager, ACF	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Project Manager, AGE	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Senior Field Monitor, AGE	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
Nutrition Programme Manager, Malteser International	M	16 Sept	WFP SO, Maung Daw
9 Parents of Schoolchildren, Discussing HEB and hand-washing	3 M/6 F	16 Sept	Post primary school, Baw Di Kone village, Maungdaw township
Logistic Supervisor, Malteser International	M	15 Sept	Malteser International TB screening Unit, Myoma Kanyin Chaung, Maungdaw township
<b>Total: 112 (59 females/53 males)</b>			

<b>Meeting with field office United Nations partners</b>			
National Technical Officer, WHO	M	1 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Consortium, DRC	F	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Protection Consortium Coordinator, DRC	F	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Education Specialist, UNICEF	M	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
FSVL, KBC	M	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Head of the Field Office, UNHCR	F	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
GBV Field Officer, UNFPA	M	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Coordination Officer, OCHA	M	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
Head of Sub-delegation, ICRC	M	2 Sept	WFP SO, Myitkyina
National Technical Officer, WHO	F	9 Sept	NTP Office, Lashio Township, Shan State
<b>Total: 10 (4 females/6 males)</b>			

## Site Observations

### Summary List of Sites Observed

#### Total Number of Sites Observed: 52

Total number of health/nutrition centres observed: 16

Total number of SF sites observed: 10

Total number of IDP/Protracted relief sites observed: 16

Total number of created/renovated assets observed: 10

SITE OBSERVATIONS			
Type of site	PRRO Component	Date	Location
Ar Lam No. (5) Basic Education Primary School	School Feeding	2 Sept	Ar Lam, Myitkyina
Maw Hpawng No. (4) Basic Education Primary School	School Feeding	2 Sept	Maw Hpawng, Myitkyina
Hkat Cho IDP camp	Relief Assistance	2 Sept	Waing Maw Township
AHRN clinic	Nutrition	2 Sept	Waing Maw Township
MAM clinic	Nutrition	2 Sept	Myitkyina Township
NTP clinic	Nutrition	2 Sept	Myitkyina Township
Shatapru Sut Ngai Taung Baptist Church IDP camp (observe cash distribution)	Relief Assistance	3 Sept	Shatapru Quarter, Myitkyina
Man Hring Baptist Church IDP camp	Relief Assistance	3 Sept	Man Hkring Quarter, Myitkyina
Thargara Monastery IDP camp	Relief Assistance	3 Sept	Waing Maw
Maina KBC camp	Relief Assistance	3 Sept	Waing Maw
Sar Lin Kone Village (visit renovated road)	Asset Creation	5 Sept	Yesagy
Kyun Oo Village (visit renovated road)	Asset Creation	5 Sept	Pakokku
Thit Kyi Taw Village (visit HEB distribution)	School Feeding	5 Sept	Myaing
Ai Ma Village	School Feeding	5 Sept	Myaing
In Pin Village	School Feeding	5 Sept	Myaing
Htanaung Kone Village (visit renovated canal)	Asset Creation	6 Sept	Pwint Phyu
Chun Su village (visit renovated road)	Asset Creation	6 Sept	Pwint Phyu
Meeting with HIV/TB Clients at Progetto Continenti	Nutrition	6 Sept	Magwe
Tha Yet Lay Pin. Meeting with MAM beneficiaries	Nutrition	6 Sept	Magwe
Man Kat (Pan Nar) - School visit	School Feeding	8 Sept	Man Kat, Lashio
Man Kat-Wein Sone (asset creation site visit)	Asset creation	8 Sept	Man Kat, Lashio
Man Kat (Pan Nar) (visit nutrition activities)	Nutrition	8 Sept	Man Kat, Lashio
Kho Young (school visit)	School Feeding	9 Sept	Tang Yang
Pein Karn (asset creation site visit)	Asset Creation	9 Sept	Tang Yang
RHC in Kho Young	Nutrition	9 Sept	Tang Yang
TB and AHRN clinics (site visit)	Nutrition	9 Sept	Lashio
Ga Leng RHC	Nutrition	10 Sept	Kutkai
IDP camp in Kutkai (visit small clinic)	Relief Assistance / Nutrition	10 Sept	Kutkai
Sut Awng (visit renovated	Asset Creation	10 Sept	Kutkai

road)			
KBC IDP camp	Relief Assistance	10 Sept	Kutkai
Kone Sar (visit fish pond and weir construction)	Asset Creation	11 Sept	Lashio
Baw Du Pha Camp (observe GFD)	Relief Assistance	12 Sept	Sittwe
Baw Du Pha Camp (clinic visit)	Nutrition	12 Sept	Sittwe
Thet Kay Pyin Camp (observe GFD)	Relief Assistance	13 Sept	Sittwe
Set Yone Su 3 (Rakhine) in Min Gun Quarter (visit MHAA mobile clinic)	Nutrition	13 Sept	Sittwe
Thet Kay Pyin Camp	Relief Assistance	13 Sept	Sittwe
Thin Taung (school visit)	School Feeding	14 Sept	Rathedaung
Thin Taung (observe protracted relief (PR) activities)	Relief Assistance	14 Sept	Rathedaung
Maw Htet (observe protracted relief activities)	Relief Assistance	14 Sept	Rathedaung
Zedi Taung village	Asset Creation	15 Sept	Buthidaung
Pyin Hla PR	Nutrition	15 Sept	Buthidaung
Pho Nyo Lake village (meet with PR beneficiaries)	Relief Assistance	15 Sept	Buthidaung
Kyein Chaung FDP (Visit nutrition/MAM prevention distribution)	Nutrition	15 Sept	Maungdaw North
Kyein Chaung FDP (Visit nutrition (Malteser MAM treatment) centre, meeting with mothers group)	Nutrition	15 Sept	Maungdaw North
Myoma Kayin Tan village- TB distribution point	Nutrition	15 Sept	Maungdaw Urban
Bawdi Gone	School Feeding	16 Sept	Maungdaw South
Chein Kar Li village	Asset Creation	16 Sept	Maungdaw South
Zaw Ma Tet FDP	Relief Assistance	16 Sept	Maungdaw South
Tha Ye Kone Baung Ywa Hong village (visit relief beneficiaries and visit Ywa Hong School)	Relief Assistance / School Feeding	16 Sept	Maungdaw South
Kin Chaung village	Relief Assistance	16 Sept	Maungdaw South
<b>Total: 52 sites visited</b>			

## Beneficiary Interviews

### Beneficiary Interviews Summary:

Total number of beneficiary interviewees: 351 (177 females, 174 males)

Committee/or type (e.g., mothers group)	# of participants	# of males	# of females	Location	Date	Activity discussed, if sector-specific
Camp Management Committee (CMC)	8	4	4	Khat Cho camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	2 Sept	CMC role and responsibilities, Relief assistance, quality of ration, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition
Food Management committee (FMC)	2	1	1	Khat Cho camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	2 Sept	FMC role and responsibilities
IDP elders	1	1	0	Khat Cho camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	2 Sept	Relief assistance, quality of ration, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition
Camp Management Committee	4	3	1	Thargara camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	CMC role and responsibilities, Relief assistance, quality of ration, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition
Complaint Response Mechanism members	2	1	1	Thargara camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	Status of CRM, procedure on CRM
FMC	4	2	2	Thargara camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	FMC role and responsibilities
Gender-based violence (GBV) group	1	0	1	Thargara camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	Domestic and GBV issues
IDP elders	4	3	1	Thargara camp, Waing Maw Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	Relief assistance, quality of ration, pipeline break, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition, trainings received, CRM
Camp Management Committee	4	3	1	Maina KBC Camp, Myitkyina Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	CMC role and responsibilities, Relief assistance, quality of ration, pipeline break, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition, trainings received, CRM

FMC	2	1	1	Maina KBC Camp, Myitkyina Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	FMC role and responsibilities
Complaint Response Mechanism members	3	1	2	Maina KBC Camp, Myitkyina Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	Status of CRM, procedure on CRM
IDPs	22	12	10	Maina KBC Camp, Myitkyina Township, Kachin State	3 Sept	Relief assistance, quality of ration, pipeline break, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition trainings received, CRM
Project Management Committee	10	6	4	Salingone village, Yesagyo Township, Magwe Region	5 Sept	Role and responsibilities of PMC, Road and mini dam construction, vulnerability criteria, benefits from asset creation
Men	12	12	0	Salingone village, Yesagyo Township, Magwe Region	5 Sept	Road and mini dam construction, vulnerability criteria, benefits from asset creation,
Women	15	15	0	Salingone village, Yesagyo Township, Magwe Region	5 Sept	Road and mini dam construction, vulnerability criteria, benefits from asset creation, CRM
Project Management Committee (Road construction)	18	7	11	Kyun Oo village, Pakokku township, Magwe Region	5 Sept	Role and responsibilities of PMC ,Road construction, vulnerability criteria, benefits from asset creation, CRM
PLHIV	10	4	6	PC Office, Magwe township, Magwe Region	6 Sept	Benefits of WFP assistance, Nutrition and Health education
TB Patients	8	3	5	PC Office, Magwe township, Magwe Region	6 Sept	Benefits of WFP assistance, Nutrition and Health education
MAM beneficiaries	20	5	15	Tha Yet Lay Pin village, Magwe Region	6 Sept	Benefits of WFP assistance, Nutrition and Health education
Mothers (Stunting programme beneficiaries)	30	0	30	Man Kat village, Lashio Township, Shan State(N)	8 Sept	Benefit of Stunting programme, ration use, pipeline break ,Health and Nutrition Education, challenges, CRM
Project Management Committee (Terrace land development)	11	11	0	Wein Sun village, Lashio Township, Shan State(N)	8 Sept	Benefit of asset creation, CP and WFP support, PMC role, food vs cash, training received

Mothers (Prevention of Stunting Programme beneficiaries)	11	0	11	Kho Yaung village, Tant Yan Township, Shan State(N)	9 Sept	Benefit of Stunting programme, ration use, pipeline break ,Health and Nutrition Education, challenges, CRM
PLHIV	6	5	1	AHRN Lashio Office, Shan State(N)	9 Sept	Benefit of WFP /AHRN food assistance, nutrition assessment, Health and nutrition education, CRM
Mothers (Prevention of Stunting Programme beneficiaries)	8	0	8	Ga Leng RHC, Kut Kai Township, Shan State(N)	10 Sept	Benefit of Stunting programme, ration use, pipeline break ,Health and Nutrition Education, challenges, CRM
Mothers (Prevention of Stunting Programme beneficiaries)	12	0	12	KBC Church, Kut Kai Township, Shan State(N)	10 Sep	Benefit of Stunting programme, ration use, pipeline break ,Health and Nutrition Education, challenges, CRM
Camp Management Committee	6	3	3	KBC Church, Kut Kai Township, Shan State(N)	10 Sep	Role and responsibilities of CMC
Beneficiaries	12	12	0	Kone Sar village, Lashio township, Shan State(N)	11 Sep	Asset creation, village targeting, benefits, results of asset creation
Mother (MAM beneficiaries)	8	1	7	Baw Du Pha (1) IDP camp, Sittwe	12 Sep	Benefits of MAM treatment programme, Blended food preparation and use, Exclusive Breast feeding , Complementary feeding, challenges
Camp Management Committee	6	6	0	Set Yone Su (3) camp, Sittwe Township, Rakhine State	13 Sep	Challenges in resettled area, opinion on WFP ration cut
FMC	8	4	4	Thein Taung village, Rathedaung Township, Rakhine State	14 Sep	Protracted Relief, challenges, quality of ration, FMC role and responsibility, food vs cash
Beneficiaries (Nutrition Programme)	15	15	0	Kyein Chaung village, Maungdaw	15 Sep	Benefits of blended food, preparation and use of BF, nutrition message, pipeline break, CRM
Students from SF programme	7	5	2	Post primary school, Baw Di Kone village, Maungdaw township	16 Sep	Benefits of HEB, hand washing
Women	10	0	10	Shatapru Sut Ngi Taung Baptist Church IDP Camp, Myitkyina	3 Sept	Relief assistance, quality of ration, pipeline break, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition trainings received, CRM, Income

						generation activities
Women	13	0	13	Man Hring Baptist Church IDP Camp	3 Sept	Relief assistance, quality of ration, pipeline break, coping mechanisms, job opportunities, Cash vs food, communication with WFP, Nutrition trainings received, CRM
Students (Grade 5)	6	3	3	In Pin Primary School, Pauk	5 Sept	Hand Washing, HEB
Men	10	10	0	Canal Renovation Site, Htanaung Kone Village	6 Sept	Their participation in canal renovation, cash transfer, the benefits they got from asset creation
Women	7	0	7	Canal Renovation Site, Htanaung Kone Village	6 Sept	Their participation in canal renovation, cash transfer, the benefits they got from asset creation, gender equity in project activities
Men	15	15	0	Road renovation site, Chun Su village	6 Sept	Their roles in renovation project, cash transfer, benefits they got from project
<b>Total beneficiaries interviewed:</b>	351	174	177			



## Annex 2: Exit debrief participants

The following are lists of internal and external stakeholders that participated in the fieldwork exit debriefing presentations.

### List of WFP CO and RB staff who participated in the preliminary findings internal debriefing

No.	Name	Title/position
<b>Country Office</b>		
1	Domenico Scalpelli	Country Director
2	Swe Swe Win	Deputy Head of Programme (field support, SF, livelihoods)
3	Masae Shimomura	Deputy Head of Programme (relief, EPR)
4	Marc Gschwend	CBT Focal Point
5	Soe Nyi Nyi	Programme Associate (HIV/TB)
6	Flaminia Mussio	Programme Officer (SF)
7	Sakhorn Boongullaya	Head of Sub-Office (Myitkyina)
8	Win Khaing	Procurement Officer
9	Than Zaw Oo	Programme Associate (Global Fund HIV)
10	Marco Principi	VAM Officer
11	Fabienne Mueller	CBT Programme Officer
12	Soi Lang Seng	Programme Policy Officer (EPR)
13	Sweta Pokharel	M&E Consultant (School Feeding Programme)
14	Fumitsugu Tosu	Programme Policy Officer (Project Cycle Management)
Attended session through phone		
15	Naoe Yakiya	Deputy Country Director & Head of Programme, WFP CO
16	Maryada Vallet	Evaluation Manager, TANGO International
17	Janine Roelofsen	Nutritionist, WFP CO
18	Filippo Pompili	Evaluation Officer, OEV (WFP HQ)
<b>Regional Bureau</b>		
-	-	Not available to attend

### List of government officials,<sup>1</sup> partners and donors who participated in the preliminary findings external debriefing meeting

No.	Name	Title/position	Organisation
1	Domenico Scalpelli	Country Director	WFP
2	Swe Swe Win	Deputy Head of Programme (field support, SF, livelihoods)	WFP
3	Masae Shimomura	Deputy Head of Programme (relief, EPR)	WFP
4	Sweta Pokharel	M&E Consultant (School Feeding Programme)	WFP
5	Fumitsugu Tosu	Programme Policy Officer (Project Cycle Management)	WFP
6	Michael Ronning	Democracy and Governance Officer Director	USAID
7	Leslie MacCracken	Senior Humanitarian Affairs Advisor	USAID
8	Sai Nandar Tun	Programme Officer	ECHO
9	Clementina Cantoni	Technical Assistant	ECHO
10	Linda Gellard	Humanitarian Adviser	Australian Embassy
11	Beverly Carmichael	First Secretary (Development) and Consul	Canadian Embassy

<sup>1</sup> Separate debriefing was conducted for government. It was well attended and a listing of names was not provided.

12	Khalid Khan	Food Security Sector Coordinator	FAO (FSS)
13	Noriko Takagi	Deputy Representative	UNHCR
14	Norwin Schafferer	Humanitarian Affairs Officer	OCHA
15	Nandar Aung	Social Policy Specialist	UNICEF
16	Enrico Rampazzo	Business Development Manager	Plan International
17	Saw Fulton	Food Program Manager	World Vision International
18	Moe Thu	Associate Director	World Vision International
19	Myat Zaw Win	Deputy Program Coordinator	PU-AMI
20	Dr. Su Wai Mon		PU-AMI
21	Thura Kyaw	Head of Base	PU-AMI
22	Esther de Jong	Programme Advisor	CDN
23	Paolo Vaggi	Humanitarian Operations Manager	Save the Children
24	Saw Teddy	Programme Director	MHDO
25	Dilanga Manuweera	Deputy Country Director	ACF
26	Malika Fedala	FSL Head of Department	ACF

### **Annex 3: Interview topical outlines**

**Note:** *These topical outlines are illustrative of the interview questions the ET used and should not be viewed as questionnaires. Thus, not all the points in the topical outlines may have been covered in each interview, depending on the dynamics of the discussion and on the time available to the ET. The evaluators are highly experienced interviewers and are sensitive to the context and timing of interviews. WFP CO's suggested interview questions were noted by the team.*

#### **Questions for WFP Country Office and Sub-Offices**

##### **Appropriateness/relevance/design**

##### **Choice of objectives, activities, targeting & transfer modalities**

###### **1. Design of the operation**

- a. Can you reflect on how the operation was designed?
  - b. What analytical work was done to feed into decision-making and how relevant was this work?
  - c. To what extent were (the right) counterparts involved in the various phases of the operation design process?
  - d. Extent of community or beneficiary consultations to feed into design process?
  - e. What factors in your view affected/contributed to the quality of the design?
  - f. How were lessons learned from PRRO 200032 (which was on-going at the time of designing this one) taken into account?
2. What support did the CO receive during design and implementation from RB and/or HQ?
  3. How did the choice of objectives, activities, targeting and transfer modalities correspond to the needs of target groups
    - a. food insecure, malnourished, vulnerable to disasters and economic shocks
    - b. women, men, girls and boys
    - c. What assessments were conducted?
  4. In your opinion, do they continue to correspond to the:
    - a. context
    - b. priorities of the government
    - c. food security needs
    - d. needs of beneficiaries, including specific gender issues and concerns?
  5. How are mechanisms for monitoring changes set up? How has the programme adjusted to changing needs?
  6. What specific issues were identified as requiring WFP technical assistance (e.g., financial needs, capacity gaps, institutional weaknesses, logistical capacity, partnerships)?
    - a. What activities were designed to address these?
    - b. With the benefit of hindsight, are there other actions that should have been taken?
  7. What innovative activities were included in the design?

##### **Coherence with WFP policies, strategies & normative guidance.**

8. Which of the existing WFP policies and normative guidance material were used/helpful, including gender?
9. Any gaps in WFP guidance?
10. Extent to which objectives, targeting method, activity choice, protocols and transfer modalities are complementary to other WFP programmes

### **Coherence with national policies, strategies & programmes.**

11. To what extent was an enabling framework in place (relevant national policies, strategies, normative guidance, including gender)?
12. Were national priorities well-defined?
13. To what extent is the PRRO design in line with those?
14. The extent to which hand over and sustainability strategies for project components is in line with the conditions/constraints in terms of human and financial capacity
15. Are there divergences between WFP's choices and relevant ministries' priorities and normative guidance? If so, how might this be addressed?

### **Complementarity with the UN / humanitarian & development actors.**

16. What is the degree of complementarity (alignment with sector policies and guidance, gap/overlap) between the PRRO and partners, UN agencies, and other humanitarian and development actors?
17. What was done at design stage to establish complementarities?
18. Were these efforts successful?
19. What partnerships were created? (examples) If not, what were the main constraints?

### **Crosscutting issues: gender, partnership, protection and environment.**

20. How are crosscutting issues addressed in the design of the PRRO?
21. To what extent are CO policies and gender initiatives effectively implemented through PRRO activities (taking into account local and diverse contexts)?
22. What activities promote gender empowerment and equality of women?
  - a. What innovation was undertaken?
  - b. What activities promote protection, partnership, environmental issues?
  - c. Significant achievements; challenges

### **Results of the Operation**

23. What in your view are the main results of the operation?
24. To what extent have the expected results been achieved? For outcome targets that have not been achieved to-date, what are the factors that will affect realisation of these targets by end of programme?
  - a. Include targets for stunting prevention 6-23 months: MAD;
  - b. FCS for recovery/livelihoods target communities;
  - c. SF indicators: attendance/enrolment;
  - d. HIV/TB treatment success rate
25. What have been the most significant challenges?
26. What actions were taken/should be taken to address these? How sustainable are they?
27. To what extent has WFP contributed to the human and institutional capacity development of government counterparts?
  - a. What are the constraints to capacity strengthening?
  - b. How much does this capacity development contribute to transition?
28. What has WFP done to ensure programme implementation synergies between the PRRO and other UN programmes?
29. Are there unexpected results or unintended effects of the operation? Please provide details.
30. How efficient is the PRRO? (optimisation of resources, efforts to contain costs, timeliness of distributions)

### **Internal & external factors that have affected the operation**

31. What are the main internal factors affecting PRRO implementation over the period?
  - a. Funding
  - b. Staffing; staff capacity; turnover; gender balance on staff
32. Did the CO request support from WFP HQ or RB? If so, what type of support? Did it respond to the CO expressed needs?

33. Extent and quality of M&E system support to the PRRO?
  - a. Data quality and timeliness; ease of use
  - b. How used to assess progress and make adjustments
34. What in your view are the strong points of WFP's work?
35. How has the context changed since the beginning of the programme?
  - a. What have been the implications for decision-making?
  - b. Did WFP make the right decisions in light of the context?
36. What internal factors have affected collaboration with partners, UN agencies, and relevant humanitarian and development actors working on food security, nutrition, and disaster reduction?
  - a. Please give examples of areas of work and type of complementary inputs provided by them to enhance PRRO's implementation and progress towards its objectives/sustainability (as relevant)?
37. What are the main external factors affecting PRRO implementation over the period?
  - a. Effect of level of resourcing on reduction in activities?
  - b. Which activities were most affected and why?
38. How do the Government, NGOs, and donors perceive the PRRO?
39. How does WFP CO communicate with its stakeholders? How might communication with various stakeholders be improved?
40. In your opinion, what are the priorities for the coming/remaining period?

### **Project activity 1: Relief assistance**

41. Discuss food/cash delivery and distribution system:
  - a. Mechanics of current food/cash delivery and distribution system
  - b. Strengths; challenges
  - c. Amount delivered each month by commodity
  - d. Cash amounts; how determined; how delivered
  - e. Pipeline breaks; transport arrangements; storage adequacy
  - f. Any changes foreseen
  - g. Adequacy of food/cash assistance in meeting nutrient needs
  - h. Impact on nutrition when rations reduced/commodity not available
42. Describe the monitoring system:
  - a. Effectiveness; coverage by field monitors
  - b. How to ensure beneficiaries receiving full entitlements
43. How has WFP adjusted programme deliveries to fit changing context:
  - a. New activities have been initiated
  - b. Changes in activity mix; why
  - c. Effect of natural disasters on operations
44. How do relief activities address gender empowerment and equality of women?
45. How do relief activities promote protection, partnership, environmental issues?
46. Any unintended consequences of the food aid:
  - a. Dependency: challenges; how to overcome
  - b. Any negative consequences vis-à-vis other potential programming initiatives
47. How has food/cash assistance been used to promote self-reliance
  - a. Has food/cash assistance provided a positive or negative impact on other programming initiatives
  - b. Who in the household makes decisions over how the food or cash is used?
  - c. Food sales by beneficiaries – reasons; how much selling is acceptable; how much selling supports healthy diet; how much selling is too much
48. Are there other food or cash distribution modalities that could improve programme effectiveness and efficiency?

### **Project activity 2: Nutrition**

*[focusing on supplementary and curative feeding for children under five, pregnant and lactating mothers, and patients with HIV/AIDS and TB]*

49. What are the main strengths of this activity? Main challenges?
  - a. Protocol, equipment, ration, etc.
  - b. Screening, enrolment, adherence issues for PLHIV/TB patients
  - c. Implementing partner issues
  - d. Data collection and programme monitoring
  - e. Process and outcome monitoring
50. How can activities be improved?
51. What are the underlying nutritional factors related to the levels of acute and chronic malnutrition in IDP and vulnerable communities? Is there an evidence-based understanding of these?
  - a. In Rakhine state, probe regarding cultural norms that favour male children over female children
52. Does WFP have coordination mechanism on its activities at Central/ State/Regional levels with other stakeholders (Government counterparts, UN, INGO, LNGO etc.)
53. Does WFP/partners monitor changes in nutritional status? Have there been any changes in the conditions, and if so what modifications have been made to the programme?
54. Are the nutrition interventions appropriate to the need?
  - a. What is the mix of supplementary/therapeutic feeding programme modalities and food assistance?
  - b. Understand rations provided to different groups of beneficiaries for different programmes and any changes over time.
  - c. Understand counting of beneficiaries in multiple activities (Double counting?)
55. Is the system following international protocols? Aligned with WFP policies?
56. How effective is the nutrition programme targeting and outreach?
57. How is nutrition education conducted and what main messages are provided?
  - a. How effective has it been, and what are the indications of this? Check outcome indicators.
58. Are there inclusion/exclusion errors? What kind, what can be done to improve these?
59. How comprehensive is programme coverage? Evidence?
60. What is the contribution of the food and nutrition support for the HIV/TB patients on their health situation (nutrition) and on their safety net?
  - a. What are the implications of reducing this support? Adherence?
61. What has been the impact on access to diversified and nutritious food among households who changed from food (General Food Distribution) to cash?
  - a. What are households spending the cash on? How much on food? Implications for diet diversity?
62. The CO is planning to scale up the stunting programme; what would be the most effective way to scale up?

**Project activity 3: Post-Disaster Recovery through the Restoration and Rehabilitation of Productive Assets (Food/cash for assets)**

*Food assistance (Food for Assets)*

63. Discuss food deliveries and distribution system (WFP):
  - a. Strengths of the current food distribution system
  - b. Challenges of the current food distribution system.
  - c. Amount delivered each month by commodity. Any changes foreseen
  - d. Pipeline, transport, storage issues; other delivery issues
  - e. Adequacy of food basket in meeting nutrient needs
  - f. Impact on food security and nutrition when rations reduced/commodity not available
64. Describe monitoring system:
  - a. Components of monitoring system; who responsible; how reports are used; effectiveness
  - b. How monitoring ensures beneficiaries receiving full entitlements

65. How has WFP adjusted programme deliveries to fit changing contexts and circumstances:
  - a. New activities have been initiated; challenge responded to
  - b. Changes in activity mix and reasons why
  - c. How have contextual changes affected operations
  - d. How have contextual changes affected livelihood operations
66. Have there been any unintended consequences of the food aid:
  - a. Dependency
  - b. Any negative consequences vis-à-vis other potential programming initiatives
67. How has food assistance been used to promote self-reliance:
  - a. Positive or negative impact on other programming initiatives
  - b. Who in the household makes decisions over how the food is used? (consumed, sold)
  - c. Food sales – reasons; sales value of different commodities; how cash from food sales is used; how much selling is acceptable; how much selling supports healthy diet; how much selling is too much
68. Are there other food distribution modalities that could improve programme effectiveness and efficiency?

Cash assistance (Cash for Assets)

69. Describe procedures for delivering cash assistance
70. What was the rationale behind using a cash-based modality?
71. How have WFP and partners decided where to pilot and implement cash transfers?
72. Who is targeted, why?
73. Roles played by which partners?
74. Strengths and weaknesses of the cash transfer programme?
75. Is the value of the transfer appropriate; how was it determined?
  - a. Frequency and nature of local market monitoring
76. Does cash assistance have specific nutritional outcomes:
  - a. how determined/measured
  - b. was nutrient gap analysis used to set transfer value
77. What are the advantages/disadvantages between food assistance and cash transfers, in terms of:
  - a. Targeting
  - b. Administration
  - c. Monitoring system
78. How do beneficiaries use the cash; How is that tracked?
79. To what extent has the CFA/FFA programme benefited women's empowerment and decision making?
  - a. What would be the lessons learned on how to design FFA/CFA programmes to ensure women's needs and priorities are taken into account?
  - b. How much say do men and women have in cash use/expenditure decisions? Food vs cash?
  - c. Probe for any GBV related to receipt of cash by women
  - d. Protection issues related to receiving cash
80. Impact of the cash transfer; how is cash used differently from food assistance?
81. What possibilities are there for enhancing monitoring cash transfer impact on:
  - a. businesses and the local market
  - b. non-beneficiaries and host communities (for IDPs)
82. What is the best way forward to scale up cash for asset activities, particularly as part of the flagship programme of the national social protection strategy?
83. Effectiveness of current approach and potential for scale?
  - a. Focus on shift from food to cash
84. Can the system be replicated:
  - a. Factors that make replication feasible; factors that make it difficult

**Project activity 4: School Feeding**

85. To what extent is WFP's programme in line with the national policies and priorities? What opportunities existed and were these taken into account?
86. To what extent was an enabling framework in place for school feeding (national law, national programme for school feedings, specific strategies and priorities?).
  - a. How important was this in the design of the programme?
  - b. To what extent does the PRRO link with education-related activities of other agencies?
87. Are there any effects (intended or unintended) of the HEB programme on child enrolment, attendance, health, nutrition status and social safety nets?
88. What is the effectiveness of current partnerships in SF? Are there other partnerships that would be more effective?
89. Are there other linkages that could improve the effectiveness of the SF programme?
90. What is the most efficient and cost-effective way of transitioning to a national SF programme? Of eventually transitioning to school meals?
91. What is the effectiveness of the current approach to developing handover capacity for SF
  - a. Is WFP/GoUM doing enough to set the foundation for a national school feeding programme
92. What are the main external factors that have had an influence on the SF programme? How has the context changed since the beginning of the programme and what have been the implications for decision-making? Did WFP make the right decisions in light of the context?
93. Supply chain and delivery successes and challenges
94. What are the capacity-building needs for government to assume full operation of the programme
  - a. WFP activities and plans for capacity assessment and capacity building
95. Timetable for WFP handing over to government; factors supporting sustainability and challenges
96. What has been the level of cooperation between WFP and other UN agencies involved in school feeding in Myanmar under this PRRO?



## Questions for Government Agencies

1. Please clarify the role of your department/agency in relation to the PRRO activities, and the nature of your relationship with WFP.
2. Please describe activities conducted in relation with WFP.

### Relevance

3. Were you consulted at the design stage? And if so in which way? Are you satisfied with the consultation process?
4. In your opinion, how relevant and appropriate is the PRRO design to the needs of the beneficiaries: beneficiary categories, geographic targeting, type of assistance?
5. Does it adequately address gender empowerment and equality of women and protection of beneficiaries? Any recommendations regarding crosscutting issues?
6. Do you think the PRRO is in line with national policies and strategies (Social protection, food security, gender)?
7. Are there complementarities/synergies between the PRRO and development assistance programmes supported by GoUM (by your ministry)?

### Results

8. Do you receive information on the PRRO implementation? If so, through which mechanism (working group meetings, WFP reports, special reports to you, etc.)?
9. In what ways has your Minister collaborated with the implementation of the PRRO?
10. What is your assessment about the PRRO's success in meeting its targets (Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability)?
11. What factors have influenced positively or negatively on the performance of the collaboration during this period?
12. What opportunities exist that have not been explored (in areas such gender equity, protection, partnership, capacity building, etc.)?
13. Are you satisfied with the information sharing process and with the quality of information received?

### Factors

14. In your view what factors best support implementation? What are the main constraints?
15. How would you assess the nature of the relationship between WFP and your Ministry?
16. What potential WFP internal factors you may be aware of, have influenced in a positive / negative way the observed results? Lessons learnt.
17. Any opportunities for collaboration that WFP did not explore?

### Concluding Remarks

18. Any recommendations on how to improve implementation?
19. In your opinion, what are the priorities for the coming/remaining period?

**Note:** *The topical outlines below cover all project activities. Since different government agencies may be knowledgeable about one aspect of the PRRO but not others, the relevant questions on project activities will be addressed to key informants according to their role, level of engagement, and responsibilities related to the PRRO.*

### Project activity 1: Relief assistance

20. Is the current food/cash delivery and distribution system satisfactory:
  - a. Why or why not
  - b. Changes would you like to see
21. Any unintended consequences of the food/cash assistance
  - a. Dependency; challenges; how to overcome
  - b. Any negative consequences vis-à-vis other potential programming initiatives
22. How has food/cash assistance been used to promote self-reliance:

- a. Has food/cash assistance had a positive or negative impact on other longer-term programming initiatives
- 23. Non-food item programme and implementation activities:
  - a. Successes and challenges
- 24. Effectiveness and efficiency of WFP:
  - a. Strategic planning
  - b. Coordination
  - c. Implementation
  - d. M&E
  - e. Logistics
  - f. Staffing

### **Project activity 2: Nutrition**

- 25. What health and nutrition policies relate to PRRO activities; how are you coordinating with WFP?
- 26. Any round table discussions with partners and Ministries to harmonise the health and nutrition interventions of different organisations?
- 27. Special observations concerning the present interventions in the field of:
  - a. Supplementary feeding
  - b. Therapeutic feeding
  - c. Pregnant and lactating mothers
  - d. General ration
  - e. HIV/AIDS and TB awareness activities
- 28. Describe development of the nutritional situation in the region (according to different target groups)?
- 29. How much your office involved in the programme design of WFP health and nutrition activities?
- 30. Kinds of changes you propose for future WFP programmes in your field of activities
- 31. Achievements/successes.
- 32. Most common bottlenecks in the program? Any mitigation measures? Any emergency preparedness and response plan in place?
- 33. Most urgent intervention needed to improve the situation?
- 34. Appropriateness of food rations and general distribution.
- 35. Changes you would propose in ration and project design?
- 36. Any data or reports on quality of health/nutrition services or nutrition status of IDPs/vulnerable people that you consider important references for us?
- 37. Most pressing issues in the field of health and nutrition?
- 38. What are the most important nutrition education messages to focus on,
  - a. What have been the most successful methods of enhancing nutritional knowledge and improving practices?
- 39. What is the contribution of the food and nutrition support for the HIV/TB patients on their health situation (nutrition) and on their safety net?
  - a. What are the implications of reducing this support? Adherence?
- 40. What has been the impact on access to diversified and nutritious food among households who changed from food (General Food Distribution) to cash?
  - a. What are households spending the cash on? How much on food? Implications for diet diversity?
- 41. The CO is planning to scale up the stunting program; what would be the most effective way to scale up?
- 42. Effectiveness of nutrition education for men and women, and lessons for scale?
- 43. Are there any changes in breastfeeding or complementary feeding practices:
  - a. How do you know – is there any data on outcomes
  - b. What are the challenges

### **Project activity 3: Post-Disaster Recovery through the Restoration and Rehabilitation of Productive Assets (Food/cash for assets)**

#### *Food assistance (Food for Asset)*

44. How can IDPs and vulnerable communities achieve self-sufficiency within the current environment:
  - a. How have WFP programming strategies promoted this goal
  - b. How have the strategies inhibited this goal
  - c. Is the goal obtainable - Why/why not
45. How timely was assistance from WFP
  - a. Are there efforts to promote livelihoods for IDPs at early stage of their arrivals
  - b. What are some other models that you are aware of elsewhere
46. What changes would you like to see in WFP programming strategies
  - a. What are some other models that you are aware of elsewhere

#### *Cash assistance (Cash for Assets)*

47. Rationale behind using a cash-based modality?
48. Effectiveness and efficiency of WFP and partners in piloting and implementing cash transfers:
  - a. Targeting
  - b. Cash transfer mechanism
49. Strengths and weaknesses of the cash transfer programme?
50. Is the value of the transfer appropriate/How was it determined?
51. Differences between food assistance and cash transfers, in terms of:
  - a. Targeting
  - b. Administration
  - c. Monitoring system
52. Impact of the cash transfer, and how is that different from what it would be for food assistance?
53. To what extent has the CFA/FFA programme benefited women's empowerment and decision making?
  - a. What would be the lessons learned on how to design FFA/CFA programmes to ensure women's needs and priorities are taken into account?
  - b. How much say do men and women have in cash use/expenditure decisions? Food vs cash?
  - c. Any GBV related to receipt of cash by women
  - d. Protection issues related to receiving cash
54. Possibilities to enhance monitoring of the impact of the cash transfer impact on:
  - a. Businesses and the local market
  - b. Non-beneficiaries and host communities
55. Can the system be replicated:
  - a. Factors that make replication feasible or difficult

### **Project activity 4: School feeding**

56. How relevant is the WFP school feeding intervention to the priorities of children and parents in Myanmar?
57. To what extent and in what way are the school feeding activities aligned with the national education policy? Has the school feeding work by WFP fed into policy development?
58. How did the design of the activities under the PRRO take place, was this relevant and realistic? How strong do you think this process was in terms of addressing the Governments specific needs and concerns around transitioning? How could this have been improved?
59. Is the SF model chosen upon and currently being tested by the GoUM an efficient and sustainable method of implementing the national school feeding programme following WFP's phase out? If not what is missing?

60. What have been the strengths of the school feeding intervention to date? What have been the challenges?
61. Are there any effects (intended or unintended) of the HEB programme (on child enrolment, attendance, health, nutrition status and social safety nets)?
62. What is the effectiveness of current partnerships in SF? Are there other partnerships that would be more effective?
63. Are there other linkages that could improve the effectiveness of the SF programme?
64. What is the most efficient and cost-effective way of transitioning to a national SF programme? Of eventually transitioning to school meals?
65. What is the effectiveness of the current approach to developing handover capacity for SF
  - a. Is WFP/GoUM doing enough to set the foundation for a national school feeding programme
66. Has WFP appropriately considered and addressed national and local capacity constraints in the design and execution of the school feeding programme and in particular in designing and implementing the transition phase? What has worked well, what has worked less well? What more should be done in the remaining period?
67. What capacity development has been received from WFP? How was the nature of the support determined? What does this support encompass? Gaps?
68. In what way and to what extent are WFP's school feeding activities aligned with other organisations at school level? What specific examples of joint initiatives or synergies exist? How helpful are these in moving the transition process forward?

### **Impact of key policies**

69. What are the key GoUM policies relating to livelihoods and well-being?
70. Have there been changes to government policy:
  - a. Why the changes
71. Long-term vision/plans for IDPs and vulnerable populations in Myanmar?

### **Gender**

72. Effectiveness of WFP in mainstreaming gender issues and HIV/AIDS according to mandate and policies:
73. What programmes does your office promote in gender equality and empowerment of women in addressing food and nutrition challenges?
74. What would you do differently in future to improve and sustain gender in programmes and activities :
  - a. Lessons learned and what changes would you like to see
  - b. What would be important to sustain or build on
75. Measures taken to ensure that women/girls and men/boys are not exposed to violence, sexual exploitation or abuse?
  - a. Describe the degree of women participation in selection of activities, planning of implementation, targeting, food distribution and monitoring (Factors influencing the level of women participation for different operations).
76. Is there a monitoring system in place to ascertain whether women are empowered in terms of decision-making and of benefiting livelihoods?
77. How are the roles of both men and women within the household considered in programming decisions?
78. How the programme affects:
  - a. Safety and security of beneficiaries.
  - b. Dignity of beneficiaries
  - c. Intra-household dynamics
  - d. Relationship within beneficiary community; between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
  - e. Access for specific (vulnerable) groups to assistance

## Questions for UN Agencies and Bilateral Donors

1. Were you consulted at the design stage? And if so in which way? Are you satisfied with the consultation process?
2. How much were objectives, activities, transfer modalities, targeting relevant? In your opinion, how relevant and appropriate is the PRRO design to the priority needs of the beneficiaries: selection of departments, communes, beneficiary categories, transfer modalities (food vs. cash)? Has it been able to adjust to the evolution of the context based on needs assessment? Do other activities would have been more relevant (rather than food contingency stock, participation within assets)? How innovative were the activities?
3. Has it adequately addressed capacity needs? Has it adequately addressed gender empowerment and equality of women and protection of beneficiaries? Any other priority areas and crosscutting issues (environment) it should have addressed? Has WFP sought the right partnerships? Any recommendations regarding crosscutting issues?
4. Do you think the PRRO is coherent with national policies and strategies (food security, nutrition, social protection/social safety nets, DRR, social, gender etc.)? What about complementarities/synergies between the PRRO and development/humanitarian assistance programmes assisted by your agency.

### Implementation/results

*(If agency has collaborated with WFP in implementing the PRRO)*

5. In what ways has your organisation collaborated with the implementation of the PRRO? What factors have influenced positively or negatively on the performance of the collaboration during this period?
6. What is your assessment about the PRRO's success in meeting its targets (Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability)? What are the main positive and main negative results of the PRRO? What are your views particularly on the following: its geographic focus, relevance to national priorities, and relevance to your country's priorities in Myanmar? Any other issues?
7. What opportunities exist that have not been explored (in areas such as food security, nutrition, DDR, gender equity, protection, partnership, environment, capacity building, etc.?)

*(If agency has not collaborated with WFP in implementing the PRRO)*

8. Do you have information on the PRRO implementation? If so, through which mechanism (working group meetings, WFP reports, etc.)? Are you satisfied with the information sharing process and with the quality of information received?
9. Based on the information you have: what is your assessment about the PRRO's success in meeting its targets? What are your views particularly on the following: its geographic focus, relevance to national priorities, and relevance to your country's priorities in Myanmar? Any other issues? What are the main positive and main negative results of the PRRO?
10. How well has the WFP programme mainstreamed gender issues according to the United Nations' mandate and policies? What about protection, partnership, environmental issues?

### Factors affecting results

11. In your view what were most enabling factors and constraints? Any opportunities for collaboration that WFP did not explore?

### Concluding Remarks

12. Any recommendations on how to improve implementation?
13. In your opinion, what are the priorities for the coming/remaining period?

**Note:** The topical outlines below cover all project activities. Since different UN agencies and donors may be knowledgeable about one aspect of the PRRO but not others, the relevant questions on project activities will be addressed to key informants according to their role, level of engagement, and responsibilities related to the PRRO.

**Project activity 1: Relief assistance**

14. Level of efficiency/effectiveness of the current food/cash delivery and distribution system:
  - a. Achievements; challenges
  - b. Timeliness and meeting commitments/targets
  - c. Changes needed
  - d. Support needed to improve system
15. Unintended consequences of the food/cash assistance
  - a. Dependency issues; challenges; solutions
  - b. Any negative consequences vis-à-vis other potential programming initiatives
16. How food assistance used to promote self-reliance:
  - a. Food/cash assistance impact (positive or negative) on other longer-term programming initiatives
  - b. What else can be done
17. Coordination with implementing partners:
  - a. Strengths; areas for improvement
  - b. Roles played by partners
  - c. Communication and coordination
  - d. Targeting
18. Funding levels
  - a. Challenges; recent changes
  - b. Ties between donor, policies and funding

**Project activity 2: Nutrition**

19. Most pressing issues in the field on food security, nutrition and health.
20. Effectiveness and efficiency of WFP in the nutrition sector:
  - a. Cooperation and harmonisation of activities among partners in nutrition
21. Constraints to effective implementation of nutrition programmes and achievement of impact.
22. Relevance and appropriateness of WFP's approach to nutrition for IDPs and vulnerable populations.
23. Suggested changes to WFP nutrition response moving forward,

**Project activity 3: Post-Disaster Recovery through the Restoration and Rehabilitation of Productive Assets (Food/cash for assets)**

*Food assistance (Food for Assets)*

24. Effectiveness in programming strategies that promote livelihoods.
25. Describe important initiatives in promoting livelihoods:
  - a. Innovative agencies/approaches in promoting livelihoods
26. Achieving self-sufficiency within the current environment:
  - a. How WFP programming strategies promote this goal
  - b. How the strategies inhibit this goal
  - c. Government policies in Myanmar regarding livelihood strategies for IDPs
  - d. Is the goal obtainable? Why/why not?
27. Suggested changes to WFP programming strategies
  - a. Other models to replicate

*Cash assistance (Cash for Assets)*

28. Desirability of cash vs food.
29. Efficiency and effectiveness of cash-based modality:

- a. Achievements; challenges
  - b. Effect on other programmes
  - c. Targeting effectiveness
  - d. Monitoring
  - e. Value of transfer (appropriate; how determined)
  - f. Administration of cash accounting and delivery systems
30. Differences between food assistance and cash transfers, in terms of:
- a. Targeting
  - b. Administration
  - c. Monitoring system
  - d. Logistics
  - e. Funding resources
31. Monitoring of the impact of the cash transfer – concerns, challenges.
32. Local impact on:
- a. Businesses, local market
  - b. Non-beneficiaries, host communities
33. To what extent has the CFA/FFA programme benefited women’s empowerment and decision making?
- a. Any lessons on how to conduct FFA/CFA programmes to ensure women’s needs and priorities are taken into account?
  - b. How much say do men and women have in cash use/expenditure decisions? Food vs cash?
  - c. Any GBV related to receipt of cash by women
  - d. Protection issues related to receiving cash
34. Feasibility/desirability of expanding cash system:
- a. resources to do so
  - b. Factors that make expansion feasible or difficult

**Project activity 4: School feeding**

35. In your opinion how relevant and appropriate is the school feeding programme to the needs of the country and the priorities of the beneficiaries?
36. To what extent has the school feeding programme been successful?
37. In what ways has your organisation collaborated with the implementation of the SF programme? What opportunities for collaboration have been explored and how successful have these been? What factors have influenced positively or negatively on the performance of the collaboration during this period? What opportunities exist that have not been explored (in areas such as health, education, gender equity, etc.?)
38. Are there any effects (intended or unintended) of the HEB programme (on child enrolment, attendance, health, nutrition status and social safety nets?)
39. What is the effectiveness of current partnerships in SF? Are there other partnerships that would be more effective? Are there opportunities for collaboration that have not been explored?
40. Are there other linkages that could improve the effectiveness of the SF programme?
41. Do you see any further opportunities to strengthen implementation cooperation with governmental and non-governmental partners?
42. What is the most efficient and cost-effective way of transitioning to a national SF programme? Of eventually transitioning to school meals?
43. What is the effectiveness of the current approach to developing handover capacity for SF
- a. Is WFP/GoUM doing enough to set the foundation for a national school feeding programme

**Impact of key policies**

44. Key policies of your country/organisation relating specifically to IDP support:

- a. Any recent changes to these policies or funding levels (explain)
- 45. Key GoUM policies relating to IDP livelihoods and well-being:
  - a. Influence of GoUM policies on donors/UN partner approaches
- 46. Recent changes to government policy:
  - a. Reason for changes
  - b. Compare impact on different IDP populations
- 47. Advocacy efforts with GoUM on key policies affecting IDPs

### **Gender**

- 48. Policies on gender relating to programmes:
  - a. Including prevention of gender-based violence, sexual exploitation and abuse of women/girls and men/boys
  - b. Specific concerns around these issues
  - c. Adequacy of monitoring and reporting
- 49. Effectiveness of WFP in mainstreaming gender issues and HIV/AIDS:
  - a. Specific issues/concerns to address among cooperating partners
- 50. Programmes to promote gender equality and empowerment of women in addressing food and nutrition challenges.
- 51. Lessons learned to improve and sustain gender in programmes and activities:
  - a. What would do differently
  - b. Actions to sustain or build on



## Questions for NGO Partners

### Relevance/design

1. Were you consulted at the design stage? And if so in which way? Are you satisfied with the consultation process?
2. How much were objectives, activities, transfer modalities, targeting relevant? In your opinion, how relevant and appropriate is the PRRO design to the priority needs of the beneficiaries: selection of departments, communes, beneficiary categories, transfer modalities (food vs. cash)? Has it adequately addressed capacity needs? Has it been able to adjust to the evolution of the context based on needs assessment? Do other activities would have been more relevant (rather than food contingency stock, participation within assets)? How innovative were the activities?
3. Has it adequately addressed gender empowerment and equality of women and protection of beneficiaries? Any other priority areas and crosscutting issues (environment) it should have addressed? How WFP sought the right partnership? Any recommendations regarding crosscutting issues?
4. Do you think the PRRO is coherent with national policies and strategies (food security, nutrition, social protection/social safety nets, DRR, social, gender etc.)? What about complementarities/synergies between the PRRO and development/humanitarian assistance programmes assisted by your organisation.

### Implementation/results

5. In what ways has your organisation collaborated with the implementation of the PRRO? What factors have influenced positively or negatively on the performance of the collaboration during this period?
6. What is your assessment about the PRRO's success in meeting its targets (Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact)? What are the main positive and main negative results of the PRRO? What are your views particularly on the following: its geographic focus, relevance to national priorities, and relevance to your country's priorities in Myanmar? Any other issues?
7. To what extent are the activities implemented sustainable? How the nutrition and CFA activities have contributed to the social protection scheme? How effective has been the building capacity of Government actors? To what extent has the PRRO support transition?
8. What opportunities exist that have not been explored (in areas such as food security, nutrition, DRR, gender equity, protection, partnership, environment, capacity building, etc.?)
9. How well has the WFP programme mainstreamed gender issues according to the United Nations' mandate and policies? What the other crosscutting issues: protection, partnership, and environment?

### Factors affecting results

10. In your view what were most enabling factors and constraints? Any opportunities for collaboration that WFP did not explore?
11. What potential WFP internal factors you may be aware of, have influenced in a positive / negative way the observed results? Lessons learnt.
12. What potential external factors have influenced in a positive / negative way the observed results? Lessons learnt.

### Concluding Remarks

13. Any recommendations on how to improve implementation?
14. In your opinion, what are the priorities for the coming/remaining period?

**Note:** *The topical outlines below cover all project activities. Since different NGO partners may be knowledgeable about one aspect of the PRRO but not others, the relevant questions on project activities will be addressed to key informants according to their role, level of engagement, and responsibilities related to the PRRO.*

### **Project activity 1: Relief assistance**

15. Is the current food/cash delivery and distribution system efficient and effective:
  - a. Why or why not
  - b. Changes needed
16. Describe monitoring system:
  - a. Effectiveness; frequency; how issues dealt with
  - b. How ensure beneficiaries receiving full entitlements
17. Any unintended consequences of the food/cash assistance
  - a. Dependency syndrome; challenges; ways to overcome
  - b. Any negative consequences vis-à-vis other potential programming initiatives
18. How do relief activities address gender empowerment and equality of women?
  - a. Any GBV related to food/cash assistance
  - b. Any protection issues related to food/cash assistance
19. How do relief activities promote protection, partnership, environmental issues?
20. How has food assistance been used to promote self-reliance:
  - a. Has food/cash assistance provided a positive or negative impact on other longer-term programming initiatives
  - b. Why or why not
21. Please comment on non-food item programme and implementation activities:
  - a. Has the programme been successful
  - b. Why or why not

### **Project activity 2: Nutrition**

22. What health and nutrition programmes does your office do with WFP?
23. What other health and nutrition programmes do you implement (in addition to WFP)
24. How much has your NGO been involved in the programme design of WFP health and nutrition activities?
25. Special observations concerning the present interventions in the field of:
  - a. Supplemental feeding
  - b. Therapeutic feeding
  - c. Pregnant and lactating mothers
  - d. General ration
  - e. HIV AIDS awareness activities
26. Appropriateness of food rations and general distribution.
27. What has been the impact on access to diversified and nutritious food among households who changed from food (General Food Distribution) to cash?
28. What are households spending the cash on? How much on food? What kinds of food, and what determines the choice of food? (implications for diet diversity)?
29. Are there any changes you would propose in ration and project design?
30. Successes; most common bottlenecks in the program. Any mitigation measures?
31. What kind of changes would you propose for future WFP interventions? For government?
32. Most urgent intervention needed to improve the situation.
33. Do you have any useful reports or data on malnutrition rates, mortality and morbidity rates or quality of available health care?
34. What are from your point of view the most pressing issues in the field of health and nutrition?
35. What are the most important nutrition education messages to focus on, and what have been the most successful methods of enhancing nutritional knowledge and improving practices?

36. Any changes in breastfeeding/infant feeding practices:
  - a. How do you know – is there any data on outcomes
  - b. What are the challenges to improve these
37. How is the nutrition sector coordinating with other sectors to support the beneficiaries?
38. Are there any round table discussions with partners and Ministries to harmonise the health and nutrition interventions done by different organisations?
39. What is the contribution of the food and nutrition support for the HIV/TB patients on their health situation (nutrition) and on their safety net?
40. How would reducing this support affect adherence to treatment?
41. Support received from other organisations/government

**Project activity 3: Post-Disaster Recovery through the Restoration and Rehabilitation of Productive Assets (Food/cash for Assets)**

*Food assistance (Food for Assets)*

42. How beneficiaries involved in the design, targeting, implementation and monitoring of program?
43. Who makes decisions in the household over the use of food from FFA?
44. Most effective programming strategies to promote livelihoods.
45. Describe important initiatives in promoting livelihoods:
  - a. Which agencies have been most prominent & most innovative in promoting livelihoods
46. How timely was assistance from WFP
47. How can beneficiaries achieve self-sufficiency within the current environment:
  - a. How has WFP programming strategies promoted this goal
  - b. How have the strategies inhibited this goal
  - c. Government policy regarding livelihood strategies
  - d. Is the goal obtainable; Why/why not
48. Changes would you like to see in WFP programming strategies vis-à-vis promoting livelihoods
  - a. What are some other models that you are aware of elsewhere

*Cash assistance (Cash for Assets)*

49. Strengths and weaknesses of the cash transfer programme.
50. Value of the transfer: appropriate; how determined; how often adjusted.
51. Differences between food assistance and cash transfers, in terms of:
  - i. Targeting
  - ii. Administration
  - iii. Market monitoring system; effectiveness
52. How beneficiaries use the cash?
53. Impact of the cash transfer vs food assistance.
54. To what extent has the CFA/FFA programme benefited women's empowerment and decision making?
  - a. Lessons learned on how to design FFA/CFA programmes to ensure women's needs and priorities are taken into account?
  - b. How much say do men and women have in cash use/expenditure decisions? Food vs cash?
  - c. Any GBV related to receipt of cash by women
  - d. Any protection issues related to receiving cash
55. Possibilities for enhancing monitoring of the cash transfer impact on:
  - a. businesses and the local market
  - b. non-beneficiaries

#### **Project activity 4: School feeding**

56. What is your opinion of the school feeding programme? To what extent is this intervention appropriate for the country's priorities and for those of the beneficiaries?
57. How has your institution collaborated with the implementation of the WFP project? Were these decisions in line with the needs and objectives of the collaboration?
58. Are there any effects (intended or unintended) of the HEB programme (on child enrolment, attendance, health, nutrition status and social safety nets)?
59. What is the effectiveness of current partnerships in SF? Are there other partnerships that would be more effective?
60. Are there other linkages that could improve the effectiveness of the SF programme?
61. What is the most efficient and cost-effective way of transitioning to a national SF programme? Of eventually transitioning to school meals?
62. What is the effectiveness of the current approach to developing handover capacity for SF

#### **Gender**

63. Effectiveness of WFP in mainstreaming gender issues and HIV/AIDS according to mandate and policies:
  - a. Is the knowledge on implementation of those policies sufficient among cooperating partners
64. Programmes your office implements to promote gender equality and empowerment of women in addressing food and nutrition challenges:
  - a. Challenges; effectiveness
65. What to do differently in future to improve and sustain gender in programmes and activities:
  - a. Lessons learned; changes needed
  - b. What important to sustain or build on
66. Measures taken by your office to ensure that women/girls and men/boys not exposed to violence, sexual exploitation or abuse:
  - a. Main challenges; how addressed
67. Describe the degree of women participation in selection of activities, planning of implementation, targeting, food distribution and monitoring:
  - a. Factors influencing the level of women participation for different operations
68. Is there a monitoring system in place to ascertain whether women are empowered in terms of decision-making and of benefiting livelihoods?

## Questions for Beneficiaries in Focus Group Discussions

**The Evaluation Team will elicit the views of beneficiaries (male adults; female adults, male youth; female youth) in the context of Focus Group Discussions on the following:**

### General Introduction

1. Which programmes (promoted by the UN and GoUM) are best at addressing your needs/most successful. Why?
  - a. Determine what type of assistance received (food, cash, both); duration, timing, who is registered to receive assistance (female or male) etc.
  - b. How timely was assistance from WFP. Explain
2. Which programmes promoted by the UN and GOE have not been successful. Why?

### Project activity 1: Relief assistance

3. What you receive in food or cash assistance:
  - a. Describe the food ration or cash assistance you receive
  - b. Describe the efficiency and fairness of the food/cash distribution system
  - c. Strengths; weaknesses; problems in the distribution system
  - d. Is food/cash delivery reliable, on time and of good quality
4. Please describe the benefits of food/cash assistance:
  - a. What would you do if you didn't have food/cash assistance
  - b. Probe – different options
5. Is the food basket or cash allotment appropriate:
  - a. Why or why not
  - b. What of food is consumed; Is everything consumed
  - c. Which commodities are sold; why these commodities sold
  - d. Preferred items in the food basket
  - e. Who makes decisions in the household over how food or cash will be used?
  - f. How is cash used (food, non-food items, savings, etc)
6. Food Preparation:
  - a. What works well with food preparation; problems in food preparation. Probe.
  - b. Is there a better way than the current system
  - c. Have you received training in food preparation, food hygiene or nutrition
    - i. Please describe the quality of the training.
    - ii. How have you used the training
    - iii. Other food or nutrition training that you would like to participate in
    - iv. Have you received training from other organisations
7. Are there any unintended consequences from the food/cash assistance:
  - a. Has food/cash assistance been used to promote other livelihood options
    - i. Has food/cash assistance deterred or depressed other income sources
    - ii. Why - Please discuss.

### Project activity 2: Nutrition

**Note:** *To protect patient confidentiality, interviews with HIV/AIDS and TB patients will be conducted separately from other nutrition beneficiaries, and will follow government protocols.*

8. Main health and nutrition problems you face
9. Main causes of these problems.
10. Please describe your access to health care facilities:
  - a. Quality of the facilities; distance; are health care staff approachable and available?
  - b. Is health care at the facility satisfactory, why or why not?
11. How has the WFP activity contributed to improving these issues:

- a. What has been the impact on access to diversified and nutritious food among households who changed from food (General Food Distribution) to cash?
- b. Do you receive cash or food assistance? What are households spending the cash on? How much on food? What kinds of food, and what determines your choice of food? (implications for diet diversity)
- c. Support received from other organisations/government
12. Most urgent intervention needed to improve the health and nutrition situation
13. Health and nutrition programmes that you or any family members participate in:
  - a. Which services received in these programmes
14. Challenges to participating in these programmes.
15. Are the food rations supplied appropriate and sufficient?
16. Changes you would like to see in the programme to improve it.
17. Any new practices learnt on how to feed your babies/young children through the information and awareness sessions:
  - a. If so, please tell us what these are and how you have put them into practice.
  - b. In Rakhine state, probe regarding cultural norms that favour male children over female children
18. Any health services provided by BHS staff and others? (Weight/height and MUAC measurements, Immunisation, Vitamin A and Deworming, etc.)
19. What is the contribution of the food and nutrition support for the HIV/TB patients on their health situation (nutrition) and on their safety net?
20. How would reducing this support affect adherence to treatment?

**Project activity 3: Post-Disaster Recovery through the Restoration and Rehabilitation of Productive Assets (Food/cash for Assets)**

21. Proportion of cash vs food received:
  - a. Who is targeted, how is it determined who receives cash
  - b. How best to target cash (what criteria to use, e.g. vulnerability)
  - c. Frequency, timeliness; mode of distribution
22. Strengths and weaknesses of the cash transfer programme.
23. How is cash used:
  - a. Where is the cash spent; ease of spending;
  - b. Market availability; effect on market prices or goods availability
  - c. Describe how much spent for which needs
24. Who in the household decides how cash will be spent for different needs.
25. Preferences for cash versus food assistance.
26. Possibilities are there for enhancing monitoring of the impact of the cash transfer.
27. Income earning opportunities:
  - a. How income-earning opportunities differ by sex
  - b. To what extent do children – boys, girls – participate in income earning
  - c. Any socially unacceptable income earning opportunities that women or men are forced to participate in. Describe
28. Recommendations for income earning opportunities

**Project activity 4: School feeding**

29. How many members of the FGD have children of school-going age:
  - a. Are your children attending school
  - b. Why or why not
30. How many have children participating in the School Feeding Programme?
31. Please describe the benefits and challenges of the SF programme.
32. What do you think of the biscuits provided?
  - a. Check if anyone received THR previously; ask them to compare the good and bad points of the two methods
  - b. If you could have another food in addition to/instead of biscuits, what food would you like to have in school?

33. Please describe the quality of the school (teachers, teaching materials, fees for school)
34. Major reasons why you send your children to school.
35. Why children stop going to school - Boys vs. girls; by age:
  - a. What can be done to prevent children from dropping out
36. Impact of school feeding on addressing the gender gap in education.
37. Are there any scenarios why you would not send your children to school

### **Gender**

38. Do women/girls or men/ boys experience problems with violence or threats going to or at food or cash distributions; what kinds:
  - a. Please describe the types of violence/threats and causes of the problem (probe for GBV)
  - b. Do women/girls or men/boys ever engage in sex work
  - c. Explain reasons for this and extent of the issue
39. Involvement of you or family members in activities to prevent violence against women, girls and children, or men/boys.
40. Suggested improvements to current programmes to prevent violence against women, girls and children.
41. Describe how men and women separately are involved in selection of activities, planning of implementation, targeting, food distributions and monitoring (i.e. roles).
42. How the programme affects:
  - a. Safety and security of beneficiaries.
  - b. Dignity of beneficiaries
  - c. Intra-household dynamics
  - d. Relationship within beneficiary community; between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
  - e. Access for specific (vulnerable) groups to assistance

### **IDP relations with host or nearby community**

43. Describe the relationship with the host or neighbouring community:
  - a. Social relations, economic relations
  - b. Have relations remained smooth or not so smooth; explain
44. Do you pursue economic income earning strategies that involve host communities:
  - a. Describe what kinds of economic strategies or activities
  - b. How does economic cooperation benefit the IDP and/or host community; is it equal?
45. Explore the impact of the IDPs on the environment.

### **FGD summary**

46. How beneficiaries involved in the design, targeting, implementation and monitoring of program:
  - a. Complaint and feedback mechanisms available (describe; how acted on)
47. Strengths, weaknesses of services (specify which service) provided by:
  - a. WFP
  - b. government
  - c. NGOs and CBOs
48. Recommendations to change the programme if given the opportunity
49. Please talk about your long term goals:
  - a. What are the best ways to achieve self-reliance
  - b. Ideas on longer-term initiatives or interventions that would help you become self-reliant.

## Annex 4: Fieldwork schedule

### Detailed Schedule of Activities

Day	Date	Location	Activity	Site visit details	Activity Type	Comments from Evaluation Team
S	28 August	Arrival in Yangon				
M	29 August	Yangon	AM: Meeting with WFP staff team, CO presentations on PRRO activities <sup>2</sup> PM: KIIs <sup>3</sup> with WFP staff			
T	30 August	Yangon/ Naypyidaw <sup>4</sup> (F) <sup>5</sup>	AM: travel (UB113, RGN (07:00) – NPT (07:35)) <sup>6</sup> AM/PM: KIIs with government stakeholders PM: travel (UB132, NPT (18:40) – RGN (19:15))	Meetings at the Director General (DG) or Director levels at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Border Affairs (NaTaLa)</li> <li>• Ministry of Planning and Finance</li> <li>• Ministry of Education</li> <li>• National Nutrition Centre (under the Ministry of Health and Sports)</li> <li>• Department of Rural Development (DRD, under the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation)</li> <li>• Relief and Resettlement</li> </ul>		

<sup>2</sup> The ET will provide suggestions for presentation topics.

<sup>3</sup> Key informant interviews

<sup>4</sup> One-day return flight Yangon - Naypyidaw

<sup>5</sup> F = flight

<sup>6</sup> Note that there are a number of flight options to/from Naypyidaw.



				<p>Department (RRD, under the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Social Welfare (Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement)<sup>7</sup></li> </ul>		
W	31 August	Yangon	<p>AM: FGDs<sup>8</sup> with CPs<sup>9</sup>  PM: KIIs with UN partners</p>	<p>*Depending on the number of CPs, it could be KIIs or FGDs.</p>		
T	1 September	Kachin (F) (Myitkyina)	<p>AM: travel (6T801, RGN (07:30) – MYT (09:10)); school feeding<sup>10</sup> (JD, TW), relief/nutrition (BR, PP)<sup>11</sup>  PM: field office briefing; meeting with CPs</p>	<p>Note that options are provided for most activities (other than HIV/TB) in Myitkyina, although depending on how long the evaluation team intends to stay in the schools/camps, multiple visits during one morning or afternoon may be possible.</p> <p>For HIV/TB, most of the clinics are in remote townships that may be difficult to visit. The two clinics listed in the schedule are the only ones in the Myitkyina area.</p>		

<sup>7</sup> Meetings can be set up starting at 10:00AM and ending at 17:00. If desired, the team may split into two groups.

<sup>8</sup> Focus group discussions

<sup>9</sup> Cooperating partners

<sup>10</sup> School visits prioritized for mornings

<sup>11</sup> JD=Jeanne Downen, PP=Pyone Yadana Paing, BR=Bruce Ravesloot, TW=Tun Wai

				JD, TW - AM: Ngwe Pyaw San Pya P-Primary (resettlement village) <sup>12</sup> ; may also be possible to visit Palana (1) BEPS <sup>13</sup>	SF SF	
				BR, PP - AM: Jan Mai Kawng KBC (FBF <sup>14</sup> distribution and FGD) - Option: Jan Mai Kawng RC (pig raising activity <sup>15</sup> ) <sup>16</sup> All - PM: field office briefing and meeting with CPs	R, N/R  R	
F	2 September	Kachin (Myitkyina)	AM: school feeding (JD, PP), relief (BR, TW) PM: school feeding (JD, PP), relief, nutrition/HIV/TB	JD, PP <sup>17</sup> - AM/PM: Ar Lam (5) <sup>18</sup> and Maw Hpawng (4) schools <sup>19</sup>	SF SF	Schedule 1 school in AM and 1 school in PM only to allow enough time for discussion

<sup>12</sup> “P-Primary” refers to “post-primary” and includes students from KG to grade 7 (“primary” is from KG to grade 4, but the school in the resettlement village extended enrollment up to grade 7). The evaluation team can meet with resettled IDPs and visit the school.

<sup>13</sup> The number in brackets (“Palana (1)”) simply refers to the number associated with the school and is part of the name (“Basic Education Primary School No. 1, Palana Village”). Palana (1) BEPS is on the way to Ngwe Pyaw San Pyaw Resettlement Village. No extra travel time needed if the team would like to stop by.

<sup>14</sup> Fortified blended food; distributions of Wheat Soya Blend (WSB) ++ (and possibly WSB+) can be arranged to coincide with the evaluation team’s visit.

<sup>15</sup> The pig raising activity and other activities mentioned in subsequent days under “relief” are not activities that WFP engages in directly. They are small livelihood activities of the IDPs. The activities are included here as the WFP ration is deducted for less vulnerable people who are engaging in these activities. It is also possible to interview beneficiaries who receive nutrition assistance (i.e. pregnant and lactating women and children under two).

<sup>16</sup> KBC stands for “Kachin Baptist Church” and RC for “Roman Catholic Church.” The IDP camps were constructed in the KBC and RC compounds and the respective churches have responsibility for camp coordination and camp management (CCCM).

<sup>17</sup> The school feeding programme covered by WFP’s Myitkyina Sub-Office started in December 2015. As such, it is difficult to label the schools as “on track” or “off track.” The four schools are comparable in terms of food security, livelihood activities of parents, teachers’ participation, etc. It is possible to visit all four schools in one day.

<sup>18</sup> Note that Ar Lam (BEPS-4) School is 10-20 minutes from Ar Lam (BEPS-5) School, if another school visit is desired.

<sup>19</sup> Observation and meeting with teachers

			(BR, TW)	BR, TW <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: Thargarah Monastery (meeting with CMC, FMC and IDPs; observe amber polishing income generating activity); Khat Cho (site visit and one FGD (male + female) with IDPs; amber polishing)</li> <li>- PM: Maina KBC (meeting with CMC, FMC and IDPs; observe clothes weaving income generation activity)<sup>20</sup>; AHRN<sup>21</sup> Clinic -Waing Maw<sup>22</sup></li> </ul>	R  R	
S	3 September	Kachin (F) (Myitkyina)	AM: relief (JD, PP), nutrition/TB (BR, TW) PM: relief (JD, PP), nutrition/TB (BR, TW); travel (K7623, MYT (15:35) – MDL (16:45))	JD, PP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: Shatapru Sut Ngai Taung (cash distribution<sup>23</sup> and FGD with women's group)</li> <li>- PM: Man Hring KBC (home gardening and meeting with women's group)</li> </ul>	R  R	
				BR, TW <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: NTP<sup>24</sup> clinic (meeting with staff and observation of food stocking)</li> <li>- PM: MAM Office<sup>25</sup> (meeting with staff and patients)</li> </ul>	N/TB N/TB	
S	4 September	Magway (Pakkoku)	AM: travel (drive 4 hours from Mandalay to Pakkoku) PM: lunch, field office			

<sup>20</sup> As noted above, IDPs that engage in these livelihood activities receive a reduced ration. There are also beneficiaries of nutrition activities that may be interviewed in these camps.

<sup>21</sup> Asian Harm Reduction Network – one of WFP's cooperating partners for the HIV/TB programme

<sup>22</sup> The HIV/TB clinics (AHRN Clinic in Waing Maw and NTP clinic and MAM clinic scheduled on the next day) cover host communities and not IDP camps. However, IDP TB cases can be transferred to these clinics. The evaluation team can meet with staff and patients.

<sup>23</sup> The timing of the cash distribution is earlier than usual but it should be feasible to arrange cash distributions for the evaluation team to observe.

<sup>24</sup> National TB Programme

<sup>25</sup> Medical Action Myanmar – one of WFP's CPs for TB patient nutrition support.

			briefing; meeting with CPs (MHDO, OISCA); call with CO to debrief on Kachin trip			
M	5 September	Magway (Pakkoku)	AM: asset/cash (BR, TW) <sup>26</sup> , school feeding (JD, PP) PM: asset/cash (BR, TW), school feeding (JD, PP)	BR, TW <sup>27</sup> - AM: site visit to renovated road in Sar Lin Kone Village in Yesagy; meeting with PMC <sup>28</sup> and community/beneficiaries. - PM: site visit to renovated road in Kyun Oo Village in Pakkoku <sup>29</sup> ; meeting with Cash Management Committee and beneficiaries JD, PP - AM: site visit for HEB distribution and meeting with students, parents and teachers in Thit Kyi Taw Village in Myaing; similar visit in Ai Ma Village (but without observing distributions <sup>30</sup> ). <sup>31</sup> - PM: site visit and meeting with students, parents and teachers in Pin Village and Kyu Taw Village in Pauk.	CFA CFA SF SF	

<sup>26</sup> All asset creation site visits for Magway are scheduled to be CFA (cash for assets) activities. There has been no FFA activity covered by the Pakkoku Sub-Office since mid-2015. If the evaluation team would like to visit FFA sites, we can select activities implemented in 2014 or during the first half of 2015.

<sup>27</sup> The drive from Pakkoku to Na Htein (South) Village is approximately 90 minutes. From there, the team will return to Pakkoku for lunch and travel to Kyun Oo Village in the afternoon (this drive takes approximately 30 minutes). Note that the second team (JD, PP) is scheduled to take lunch elsewhere.

<sup>28</sup> Project management committee

<sup>29</sup> The renovated roads connect Kyun Oo, Kokoe Kone and Kyat Tan Kone villages. The evaluation team can visit all three villages.

<sup>30</sup> Note that distributions at the schools normally take place around 8:30 – 9:00am. As such, for multiple visits in a single day, only one distribution can be observed.

<sup>31</sup> The drive from Pakkoku to Myaing takes roughly 45 minutes, and another 30 minutes to reach Thit Kyi Taw Village. From Thit Kyi Taw Village to Ai Ma Village takes about 30 minutes.

T	6 September	Magway (Pakkoku)	AM: asset/cash (BR, JD, PP), HIV/TB (TW) PM: asset/cash (BR, JD, PP), nutrition/PLW_CU5 (TW)	JD, PP, BR <sup>32</sup>	CFA  CFA	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: site visit to renovated canal project in Htanaung Kone Village in Pwint Phyu; meeting with Cash Management Committee and community</li> <li>- PM: site visit to renovated road in Chun Su Village in Pwint Phyu and meeting with Cash Management Committee and community.</li> </ul>		
				TW <sup>33</sup>	N/HIVTB  N/CU5	
W	7 September	Pakkoku/Yangon/Lashio (F)	AM: travel (45 minute drive from Pakkoku to Nyaung U; UB482, NYU (08:05) – RGN (10:15))  PM: travel (K7828, RGN (12:30) – LSH (14:45) <sup>36</sup> ); SO			

<sup>32</sup> Note that the drive from Pakkoku to Pwint Phyu takes 3.5 hours one way. This township was selected as it is a new site where WFP started implementation of asset creation activities following the floods in August 2015. If this location is too far, we can select Yaesagyo, which is just a one hour drive away from Pakkoku.

<sup>33</sup> Note that the drive from Pakkoku to Magwe is 3.5 hours one way. There are other HIV/TB programmes closer to Pakkoku, but nutrition activities are only implemented in Magwe.

<sup>34</sup> The evaluation team can meet with 4-5 clients at our partner (PC)'s office as it is not possible to visit the clients' homes.

<sup>35</sup> Note that there is no stunting prevention programme in this area anymore.

<sup>36</sup> If the connection is deemed to be too tight, another option is to leave Pakkoku the previous evening, flying out of Nyaung U Airport at 17:20 and arriving in Yangon at 18:40 (K7265). The team would then spend the evening in Yangon and leave for Lashio the next day (8 September) on flight K7828, leaving Yangon at 12:30 and arriving in Lashio at 14:45. If the team elects to go with this

			debriefing; CO debriefing (phone)			
T	8 September	Lashio <sup>37</sup>	AM: school feeding PM: asset/food (BR, PP), nutrition/PLW_CU2 (JD, TW)	BR, PP - AM: School feeding site visit in Man Kat <sup>38</sup> - PM: Food for assets (terrace land development) in Man Kat in Lashio	SF FFA	General note for Lashio schedule. Please schedule 2 site visits for SF for JD, preferably in AM
				JD, TW - AM: School feeding site visit in Man Kat - PM: Nutrition activities in Man Kat in Lashio <sup>39</sup>	SF N/PLW_CU2	
F	9 September <sup>40</sup>	Lashio	AM: nutrition (BR, TW), asset/cash (JD, PP) PM: relief/nutrition (BR, TW), relief (JD,	BR, TW - AM: Nutrition activity (prevention of stunting) at Ga Leng RHC <sup>41</sup> - PM: Relief/nutrition in Kutkai (RC camp <sup>42</sup> ) <sup>43</sup>	N/PLW_CU2 N/R	

option, the Pakkoku schedule on 5 and 6 September will likely have to be swapped, as the current schedule on 6 September has the team traveling to a distant site and arriving back to Pakkoku town at 18:00 (while the 5 September schedule has the team arriving back in Pakkoku earlier). Needless to say, the Lashio schedule will need to be adjusted if this change is made.

<sup>37</sup> Note that there is usually heavy rain in September in Shan State. There is a risk of flight delays and cancellations. In addition, depending on the road conditions transportation by car may take longer than initially planned. A further risk is the unstable/unpredictable security situation in Shan.

<sup>38</sup> A separate field visit site for BR and PP may be identified.

<sup>39</sup> WFP engages in stunting prevention activities in Man Kat. Usually, this is done through health centres, but there is no rural health centre (RHC) in Man Kat. Instead, the evaluation team may meet with the village leader (and health assistant) and beneficiaries that are part of the programme.

<sup>40</sup> Note that 9 September is the Myanmar Full Moon Day and Sabbath day. All schools will be closed on this day.

<sup>41</sup> Rural health centre

<sup>42</sup> Roman Catholic Church; again, this refers to IDP camps that were constructed in the RC compound and the church has responsibility for camp coordination and camp management (CCCM).

<sup>43</sup> There is a small clinic in the Kutkai IDP camp where a meeting with PLW beneficiaries can be scheduled.

			PP)	JD, PP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: Cash for assets: road renovation and fish pond (in Zut Awng in Kutkai)</li> <li>- PM: Relief activities in Kutkai (RC camp)<sup>44</sup>.</li> </ul>	CFA  R	For JD – Please schedule the SF visit to Man Kat, preferably in AM. (This is not possible as 9 Sept is the Myanmar Full Moon Day and all schools will be closed. Instead, SF visits have been scheduled on 8 and 10 September.)
S	10 September	Lashio	AM: asset/food (BR, JD, PP), nutrition/PLW_CU2 (TW) PM: asset/cash (BR, JD, PP), nutrition/PLW_CU2 (TW)	BR, PP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: Food for assets (water supply) in Win Kaing in Tang Yang (TY)</li> <li>- PM: Cash for assets (road renovation) in Naung Saing in TY; another option is to visit a food for assets (gravity flow water supply) in Naung Saing</li> </ul> JD, TW <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AM: School feeding site visit in Man Sai (on the way to Tan Yang) <sup>45</sup>; Nutrition in Man Kat in TY<sup>46</sup></li> <li>- PM: Nutrition at RHC in Mai Kyaing in</li> </ul>	FFA  CFA   SF, N/CU2 N/CU2	Please schedule the SF site for JD, preferably in AM

<sup>44</sup> Observe cash for relief activity, interview IDP families (especially on mixed cash/food package), the CP (MHDO), and the camp committee.

<sup>45</sup> Although it is a weekend, schools are open on Saturdays during the Buddhist lent period (19<sup>th</sup> July to 16<sup>th</sup> October). Note that one hour has been allocated to the school visit. HEB distributions may be observed.

<sup>46</sup> Tan Yang Township also does not have a rural health centre (RHC). The evaluator(s) can meet nutrition beneficiaries and a mid-wife (who is the nutrition focal point for the village) at a village community centre.

				TY; a school feeding site in Mai Kyaing can also be visited if requested		
S	11 September	Lashio (F)	AM: asset/cash and asset/food (BR, JD, PP), nutrition HIV/TB (TW) PM: meeting with CPs (all) PM: travel (K7829, LSH (15:00) – RGN (17:15))	BR, JD, PP - AM: Cash for assets (fish pond construction) in Kone Sar in Lashio; Food for assets (weir construction) in Kone Sar in Lashio - Another option: cash for assets (fish pond construction) and food for assets (terrace land development) in Pan Hto Lin Village in Lashio (an additional 1 hour drive from Kone Sar to Pan Hto Lin) 2 hours from Lashio SO)	CFA FFA	
				TW - AM: AHRN clinic <sup>47</sup> and HIV/TB clinic for NTP <sup>48</sup> in Lashio - Option: nutrition (prevention of stunting) in Kone Star <sup>49</sup>	N/HIV	
				All (PM) - Meeting with CPs		
M	12 September	Rakhine (F) (Sittwe)	AM: travel (6T611, RGN (11:35) – AKY (12:40)) PM: field office debrief; relief (JD, PP), relief/nutrition (BR, TW); call with	Visit to Baw Du Pha IDP Camp JD, PP - Observe General Food Distribution, meet with beneficiaries, food management committee and camp management committee members	R	

<sup>47</sup> The AHRN clinic is for harm reduction activities for drug users. WFP provides nutrition support for HIV/TB patients that are drug users. These are the only HIV/TB clinics in Lashio. There is another in Laukkai in Kokang but this may be difficult to visit due to conflict and obtaining travel authorization.

<sup>48</sup> Food support for MDR TB patients

<sup>49</sup> A meeting with nutrition programme beneficiaries can be held at the village leader's house.



			CO to debrief on Lashio trip	BR, TW - Visit mobile clinic to see a Targeted Supplementary Feeding programme (treatment of MAM). Health education sessions may also be observed.	N/R	
T	13 September	Rakhine (Sittwe)	AM: relief (JD, PP), relief/nutrition (BR, TW) PM: relief (JD, PP), relief/nutrition (BR, TW), meeting with CPs	Visit to Thet Kay Pyin IDP camp (AM) and Set Yone Su 3 (Rakhine population) in Min Gun Quarter of Sittwe (PM) JD, PP - AM: Observe General Food Distribution, meet with beneficiaries, food management committee and camp management committee members at Thet Kay Pyin IDP camp. - PM (entire team): Visit MHAA mobile clinic in Set Yone Su 3 to see a Targeted Supplementary Feeding programme (treatment of MAM). Health education sessions may also be observed. Meetings with beneficiaries, the food management committee and village leaders may be arranged.	R  R/N	
				BR, TW - AM: Visit mobile clinic in Thet Kay Pyin IDP camp to see a Targeted Supplementary Feeding programme (treatment of MAM). Health education sessions may also be observed. - PM (entire team): Visit MHAA mobile clinic in Set Yone Su 3 to see a Targeted Supplementary Feeding programme (treatment of MAM). Health education sessions may also be observed. Meetings with beneficiaries, the food management committee and village leaders may be arranged.	R/N  R/N	Please arrange a visit to 1 Rakhine IDP camp to observe TSFP and other nutrition activities

W	14 September	Rakhine (Sittwe/Maungdaw)	AM: school feeding (JD, PP), relief (BR, TW)  PM: travel to Maungdaw <sup>50</sup> ; debrief call with CO	Visit schools and Protracted Relief villages in Thin Taung and Maw Htet (in Rathedaung) <sup>51</sup>	SF	
				JD, PP - AM: Visit schools to observe school feeding		
				BR, TW - AM: Visit Protracted Relief activities	R	
				<p><b><u>Maungdaw</u></b></p> <p>Option to meet with local authorities and/or for an inter-agency meeting/dinner in Maungdaw (on one of the days).</p> <p>Distributions may be observed for school feeding, protracted relief (cash and food), IDP/BDP<sup>52</sup>, and nutrition (prevention of MAM, treatment of MAM and TB). Interviews of beneficiaries during the distributions are also possible.</p> <p>Home visits have been scheduled for PR and nutrition beneficiaries.</p> <p>With regards to the asset creation activities, the home garden and school garden are ongoing, while the other 2 projects have been completed.</p>		

<sup>50</sup> From Maw Htet (Rathedaung), the team will travel 90 minutes by boat to Buthidaung, and another 1 hour by car to Maungdaw, arriving in Maungdaw around 16:30.

<sup>51</sup> There is no school feeding programme in Sittwe. As such, we have scheduled a visit to Rathedaung, which is roughly 2 hours by boat from Sittwe. As Rathedaung is on the way to Maungdaw, the evaluation team can head straight to Maungdaw from Rathedaung.

<sup>52</sup> Support to Bangladeshi people

T	15 September	Rakhine (Maungdaw)	AM: field office brief, asset/cash (JD, BR, PP), nutrition/MAM prevention/PLW_CU5 (TW) PM: relief (PR <sup>53</sup> ) (BR, JD, PP), nutrition/TB (TW)	JD, BR, PP to go to Buthidaung - AM: Visit Cash for Assets site (dam) and home gardening (also under asset creation) <sup>54</sup> in Zedi Taung village. - PM: Visit PR households in Pyin Hla village and observe PR distributions at Pho Nyo Lake FDP <sup>55</sup> .  TW to go to Maungdaw North - AM: Visit nutrition/MAM prevention distribution at Kyein Chaung FDP; visit Malteser MAM treatment center <sup>56</sup> and meeting with mothers group at the center - PM: Visit Malteser TB distribution point and ACF OTP <sup>57</sup> center at Myoma Kayin Tan village	CFA  R  N/PLW_CU5  N/HIVTB	
F	16 September	Rakhine (Maungdaw)	AM: school feeding + assets/cash (JD, PP), relief (PR) (FFR <sup>58</sup> ) + school feeding (BR, TW) PM: relief (PR) (CFR <sup>59</sup> ) + school feeding (BR, PP),	AM: all go to Maungdaw South - JD, PP: School feeding site visit; meet with parents and students, and observe school garden at Bawdi Gone. Visit asset/cash site at Chein Kar Li village (dyke construction) and meet with Project Management Committee - BR, TW: Observe relief distribution at	SF CFA  R SF	

<sup>53</sup> Protracted relief; note that Zaw Ma Tet and Tha Yet Kon Baung Ywa Hong receive food under the PR, while all other PR villages scheduled receive cash.

<sup>54</sup> A new pilot was introduced in the second half of 2016 under the asset creation programme. Vulnerable households in targeted villages who live in housing compounds were identified. Costs for seeds, fertilizer and fencing are provided in addition to the labour cost.

<sup>55</sup> Final distribution point; qualified households receive PR cash assistance, while all children under five and PLW in the village (regardless of whether they are part of the PR activity) receive WSB+ or WSB++ as a nutrition ration.

<sup>56</sup> Note that the Malteser MAM treatment centre (in Maungdaw North) is closed on Fridays

<sup>57</sup> OTP stands for "Outpatient Therapeutic Program." WFP rations are provided every week to malnourished children at an ACF nutrition centre.

<sup>58</sup> Food for Relief: this refers to the Protracted Relief beneficiaries who still receive food.

<sup>59</sup> Cash for Relief

			IDP/BDP (CFR) (JD, TW)	Zaw Ma Tet FDP; visit relief beneficiaries' households at Tha Yet Kon Baung Ywa Hong and visit Ywa Hong School  PM: BR, PP go to Maungdaw North, and JD, TW to stay in Maungdaw South - BR, PP: Observe PR distribution at Ngan Chaung FDP and meeting with beneficiary group; Visit PR HHs at Phur Wet Ywa Thit and Natala villages and visit San Pya Phurwet Chung School. - JD, TW: Visit Maw Ya Waddy IDP village and Kin Chaung BDP village, and meet with village committees.	R SF  R	
S	17 September	Rakhine (F) (Maungdaw)	AM: Meeting with CPs AM/PM: travel (Maungdaw to Sittwe, 45 min drive + 3hr boat; UB218, AKY (14:45) – RGN (16:50))			
S	18 September	Yangon	AM/PM: ET prep for debriefing PPTs (BR, JD, TW, PP)			
M	19 September	Yangon / Naypyidaw (F)	AM: UB101, RGN (07:05) – NPT (07:40) AM/PM (TBC): debrief with government stakeholders, travel (BR, JD, TW, PP) PM: UB132, NPT (18:40) – RGN (19:15)	The 1.5 hour debriefing session may be held in a group (hosted by the Ministry of Border Affairs), with representatives from the relevant ministries.  *Note that the late morning flight from Yangon leaving at 11:00 and the early afternoon flight leaving NPT at 13:00 are not yet available but are expected to open up in the coming weeks.  *A senior staff from WFP should join this debrief session.		

T	20 September	Yangon	AM/PM: Follow up meetings CPs and WFP, and meetings with donors (BR, JD, TW, PP)			
W	21 September	Yangon	AM: Internal WFP debriefing (BR, JD, TW, PP) PM: finalization of external debrief PPT (BR, JD, TW, PP)	*As OEV and EM (Maryada) will join, the debriefing is schedule for 11:30am, for the duration of approximately 1.5 hours.		
T	22 September	Yangon	AM: External CP debriefing (BR, JD, TW, PP) PM: final meetings with WFP staff (BR, JD, TW, PP)			
F	23 September	Departure from Yangon				

### Annex 5: Evaluation matrix

Key Question 1: How appropriate is the operation?						
No.	Sub-questions	Measure/Indicator	Main Sources of Information	Data Collection Methods	Data Analysis Methods	Evidence quality
<b>1</b>	To what extent the objectives, targeting, choices of activities and transfer modalities:					
<b>1.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were appropriate at project design stage to the needs of the food insecure population including the distinct needs of women, men, boys and girls from different groups and geographical areas, as applicable, and remained so over time?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of use of problem analysis and previous assessments in designing the PRRO</li> <li>Evidence of consultations with partners and different groups of beneficiaries, at design stage and subsequently</li> <li>The extent that analysis was done to identify the differentiated needs of women and men, children and youth, of different ethnic groups, and the objectives and components designed to respond to such needs</li> <li>Whether there is analysis of differences in context (e.g., IDPs, returnees, settled communities), and if this influences programme delivery in any way</li> <li>Congruence in the logic of design as compared with available information about needs, at initial project stage and evolving over time</li> <li>The extent to which beneficiary groups and geographical targeting are in line with the spatial pattern of food insecurity following natural hazard; and address inclusion/exclusion error</li> <li>Rationale for transition from food to cash in some settings; the extent of market analysis and monitoring for determining and tracking cash and/or food assistance modalities</li> <li>Coherency with recommendations from earlier PRRO evaluation</li> <li>The extent to which communities and local</li> </ul>	<p>WFP and other country assessments/studies</p> <p>Project documents, logframe</p> <p>WFP CO staff, RB</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions, including: MoH, MoE, MSWRR, MoALI, Ministry of Planning and Finance, Ministry of Border Affairs, Department of Rural Development, Township General Administrative Department, and District Relief and Resettlement Department</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar such as: FAO, OCHA, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, WHO</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national and international stakeholders</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p>	<p>High</p>

		<p>CBOs and NGOs were consulted and involved in the design of the PRRO operation, and subsequently</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of ownership and responsibility that was accorded to the communities, CBOs and NGOs at the design of the programme</li> </ul>				
1.2	<p>(external coherence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector and gender policies and strategies?</li> </ul> <p>• Achieve complementarity with the interventions of relevant humanitarian and development partners?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reference to and use of national policies and documents of other partners, and consultations with them</li> <li>• Extent to which objectives, targeting method, activity choice and transfer modalities conform with and support policies</li> <li>• Relevance of the project objectives and activities to the performance of the national school feeding, nutrition, DRR, social protection and other relevant programmes</li> <li>• Degree of coherence between the problems and constraints identified in relevant national strategies and the objectives and activities of the project</li> <li>• The extent to which hand over and sustainability strategies for project components is in line with the conditions/constraints in terms of human and financial capacity</li> </ul> <p><b>Complementarity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coherence of the objectives and activities of the project with those of other development partners</li> <li>• Degree of consultation between the WFP office and other actors in relevant areas</li> <li>• Synergies that were foreseen with other projects and with related sectors (e.g., health etc.)</li> <li>• Degree of understanding that other actors who work in the same area demonstrate of the project</li> <li>• Existence of memoranda of understanding and</li> </ul>	<p>WFP and other country assessments/studies</p> <p>Project documents</p> <p>WFP CO staff</p> <p>GoUM and UN strategic and policy documents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework for Economic and Social Reforms</li> <li>• Myanmar National Social Protection Strategic Plan</li> <li>• Myanmar National Action Plan for Food and Nutrition Security</li> <li>• Myanmar Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction</li> <li>• GoUM National Education Strategic Plan</li> <li>• MoE National School Feeding Programme Operational Guidelines (draft)</li> </ul> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions: MoH, MoE, MSWRR, MoALI, Ministry of Planning and Finance, Minist order Affairs, Department of ry of B Rural Development Township General Administrative Department and District Relief and Resettlement</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p>	<p>High</p>

		their relevance to the objectives/activities of the project	<p>Department</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar such as: FAO, OCHA, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, WHO</p> <p>UN strategic and policy documents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN Humanitarian Response Plan (2016)</li> <li>• MOUs and FLAs with partner organisations</li> </ul>			
1.3	<p>(internal coherence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were coherent at project design stage with relevant WFP and UN-wide system strategies, policies and normative guidance (including gender<sup>60</sup>), and remained so over time?</li> <li>• Support gender empowerment and the equality of women (GEEW) in WFP and partner activities, and where are there gaps?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which the project aligns to WFP strategies, policies and normative guidance</li> <li>• Evidence of reference to and comparison with key strategies and documents of other programmes, including consultations among the WFP and partner staff</li> <li>• Extent to which objectives, targeting method, activity choice, protocols and transfer modalities are complementary to other WFP programmes</li> </ul>	<p>Alignment with WFP corporate guidance, including gender sector policy and related documents</p> <p>Other WFP country assessments, studies, strategies, and policies, e.g., UNDAF documentation</p> <p>WFP project documents for other projects</p> <p>WFP CO staff, RB</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions (MoH, MoE, MSWRR, MoALI, Ministry of Planning and Finance, Ministry of Border</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national and international stakeholders</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p>	<p>Medium to High</p>

<sup>60</sup> Relevant policies and normative guidance will relate to the following subjects: education, nutrition, food security, cash and voucher transfers, capacity development and gender. For gender, please see the Convention to Eliminate all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).



			<p>Affairs, Department of Rural Development Township General Administrative Department and District Relief and Resettlement Department)</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar such as: FAO, OCHA, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, WHO</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

**Key Question 2: What are the results of the operation?**

No.	Sub-questions	Measure/Indicator	Main Sources of Information	Data Collection Methods	Data Analysis Methods	Evidence quality
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the level of attainment of the planned outputs (including the number of beneficiaries served disaggregated by women, girls, men and boys)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of beneficiaries by activity and disaggregated by category, percentage of eligible beneficiaries served</li> <li>Changes and trends in total number of targeted beneficiaries since inception</li> <li>Tonnage of food/amount of cash distributed, by type, as a percentage of planned distribution</li> <li>Number of technical assistance and training activities provided, and beneficiaries disaggregated by sex and activity type</li> </ul>	<p>WFP quantitative data; Post Distribution Monitoring reports; Implementing partner reports</p> <p>Project and GoUM documents, especially the SPR and donor reports</p> <p>WFP CO staff</p> <p>Bilateral donor stakeholders</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions</p> <p>District-level government and stakeholders (e.g., schools, health clinics, IDP service providers)</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders</p> <p>KIIs with district and school stakeholders and health care providers</p> <p>Direct observation with a focus on quality of activities/ outputs</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of KII data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p> <p>Analysis of secondary quantitative data with gender disaggregation</p>	<p>Medium: relies on accuracy of CO reporting</p>

<p><b>2.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent the outputs led to the realisation of the operation objectives as well as to unintended effects highlighting, as applicable, differences for different groups, including women, girls, men and boys; how GEEW results have been achieved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent outcome indicators values have progressed towards targets</li> <li>• Key indicators include those related to outcomes of stabilising or reduction of undernutrition, stabilised/improved food consumption, prevention of chronic malnutrition, including acute malnutrition, dietary diversity, food consumption, other food security indicators.</li> <li>• Impact on access to diversified and nutritious food among households that changed from food (GFD) to cash ; what households spend cash assistance on; how much of cash assistance spent on food; implications for diet diversity</li> <li>• Lessons and challenges thus far in shift to cash for nutrition</li> <li>• Effectiveness of nutrition education for women and men; most effective way to scale up CO stunting programme</li> <li>• How cash and/or food used to meet food security, nutrition, and non-food needs</li> <li>• Perception of sufficiency of food rations; effectiveness of nutrition education, by sex</li> <li>• Effectiveness of current CFA approach; potential for scaling up (focus on shift from food to cash)</li> <li>• Best way to scale up CFA activities, particularly as part of national social protection strategyProtection</li> <li>• Effectiveness of gender initiatives for women and men within local context, as implemented in PRRO</li> <li>• Effect of programmes on women’s empowerment and decision-making and</li> </ul>	<p>WFP and other country assessments/studies</p> <p>Project and GoUM documents, especially the SPR and donor reports</p> <p>WFP CO staff</p> <p>Bilateral donor stakeholders</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions</p> <p>District-level government and stakeholders (e.g., school staff, School Feeding Technical Committees, PTAs, parents; local health clinic staff; partners in IDP assistance; FFA beneficiaries)</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders</p> <p>KIIs with local partners, local stakeholders, and community leaders, disaggregated</p> <p>FGDs with beneficiaries, disaggregated by sex</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p> <p>Analysis of secondary quantitative data with gender disaggregation</p>	<p>Medium to High: relies on accuracy of CO reporting, and visibility and strength of outcomes and attribution pathways</p>
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>lessons for design, GBV, equity (e.g., CFA, FFA), i.e.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which CFA/FFA has benefitted women's empowerment and decision-making</li> <li>• Degree of decision-making control of women and men in use of cash; in use of food vs cash</li> <li>• Lessons on design of CFA/FFA to ensure women's need and priorities met</li> <li>• Challenges to decreasing dependence on food assistance by IDPs and how to overcome</li> <li>• Feasibility and ways of increasing use of cash over food in relief, where possible; potential to use cash as a food exit strategy; modalities for providing cash assistance in this scenario; assessment of market readiness</li> <li>• Perception of satisfaction with programme fulfilment of objectives, and of unintended effects, by beneficiaries, staff and partners</li> <li>• Contribution of food and nutrition support to health and nutrition of HIV/TB patients, and to their safety nets; Implications of reducing this support on health, nutrition, food security, adherence, etc.</li> <li>• Qualitative data regarding the ability to pay for household expenses, ability to undertake or enhance livelihood activities, increased incomes.</li> <li>• The above will be collected/related to general food, supplemental and curative nutrition programme, school feeding, as well as self-reliance activities and cash transfers</li> </ul> <p>Unintended effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With respect to the beneficiary populations (including any difference between sexes)</li> <li>• With respect to the secondary beneficiaries</li> <li>• On national institutions</li> </ul>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unintended effects on nutrition habits ; from school feeding programme; related to dependency on food assistance, etc.</li> </ul>				
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do different activities of the operation dovetail and are synergetic within the PRRO and with what other actors are doing to contribute to the overriding WFP objective in the country?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which WFP is successful in coordinating efforts to enhance complementarity and reduce overlap.</li> <li>• Types of programme changes to improve internal and external coordination.</li> <li>• References made to other operations in programme documentation (complementarity)</li> <li>• The extent to which WFP is successful in the partnerships and implementation arrangements: # of MOUs, # of joint meetings and assessments, etc.</li> <li>• Level and quality of participation of WFP in the coordination meetings with other partners in the sector</li> <li>• Perceptions of other partners of the level and quality of engagement of WFP</li> <li>• Trainings programmes for partners- type of training and frequency, number of trainees, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>WFP and other country assessments/studies</p> <p>Project and GoUM documents, especially the SPR and donor reports</p> <p>WFP CO staff</p> <p>Bilateral donors</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar; UNDAF documentation; Cluster coordination minutes, inter-agency coordination documentation; relevant Technical Working Group documents</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions</p> <p>District-level government and stakeholders (such as schools)</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders</p> <p>KIIs/FGD with regional (state level) stakeholders/beneficiaries</p> <p>Direct observation with a focus on coherency in capacity building material and activities</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p>	<p>Medium to High: depends on availability of process documentation and capacity building material</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How efficient is the operation and what is the likelihood that the benefits will continue after the end of the operation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signs of sustainability of benefits and self-reliance, including: beneficiaries' perceptions, hand-over strategies developed and implemented, extent of government ownership and capacity strengthened to reduce undernutrition</li> <li>• Complementary linkages with other programmes that increase the level of impact</li> </ul>	<p>WFP and other country assessments/studies</p> <p>Project and GoUM documents, especially the SPR and donor reports</p> <p>WFP CO staff</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders</p> <p>KIIs/FGD with</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency</p>	<p>Medium to High: depends on availability of process documentation and how</p>

2.4		<p>(e.g., school feeding and nutrition)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any specific issue or effects of the HEB/SF on enrolment, attendance, health, nutrition, and social safety net status that should be considered in the design of the SF impact study? What complementary linkages with other activities (eg, nutrition, milk distribution) can increase impact of SF programme</li> <li>• Most efficient and cost-effective way of transitioning to a national school feeding programme and eventually to school meals</li> <li>• Effectiveness of current approach to developing handover capacity for SF; what is CO doing to set foundation for a national SF programme</li> <li>• Feasibility and implications of scaling up programmes (e.g., CFA, cash in relief) and linking to national social safety nets</li> <li>• Perceptions of staff and stakeholders on efficiency (cost, systems, staff, alternatives, etc.).</li> <li>• Extent to which resources (human, physical, financial, organisational and functional) were optimally used in project implementation.</li> <li>• Effectiveness of the particular technologies used in cash transfer</li> <li>• Performance Monitoring system refined</li> <li>• Frequency and depth of data disseminated from community and household surveys</li> <li>• Supply chain management and management of potential pipeline breaks.</li> <li>• Timeliness of distributions and average time between</li> <li>• Efforts to contain distribution costs (including analysis of changes in DSC and ODC), and considerations of cost-effectiveness</li> <li>• Quality of processes, relevance of the division of responsibilities in the management of the operation at different levels</li> <li>• Existence and quality of coordination that has</li> </ul>	<p>Bilateral donor stakeholders</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions</p> <p>District-level government and stakeholders (such as schools, health services, community leaders)</p>	<p>district and local stakeholders</p> <p>Direct observation of project (e.g., CFW/FFA infrastructure) and assessment of local and institutional capacities (e.g., funding, logistics support, storage, staff capacity and support, turnover, etc)</p>	<p>of evaluation findings across sources</p> <p>Analysis of secondary quantitative data to inform basic value for money analysis</p>	<p>advanced the handover process is</p>
-----	--	---	--	--	--	---

		<p>been put in place with other partners to optimise resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of the choices that were made in terms of the management and implementation of the programme</li> <li>•</li> </ul>				
<b>Key Question 3: Why and how has the operation produced the observed results?</b>						
No.	Sub-questions	Measure/Indicator	Main Sources of Information	Data Collection Methods	Data Analysis Methods	Evidence quality
3.1	<p><b>Discussion of factors affecting outcomes (internal) What are the factors affecting the outcomes that are within WFP's control?:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quality of the processes, systems and tools in place to support the operation design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation and reporting</li> <li>• The existence or lack of synergies across the various PRRO activities; the governance structure and institutional arrangements (including issues related to staffing, capacity and technical backstopping from RB/HQ)</li> </ul>	<p>Internally (factors within WFP's control):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transparency of targeting criteria and degree to which they are followed and managed, addressing inclusion/exclusion error</li> <li>• Beneficiary perceptions of effectiveness of modalities</li> <li>• Perceptions of staff and stakeholders on efficiency (cost, systems, staff, alternatives, etc.)</li> <li>• Presence of adequate management arrangements (timely reporting, coordination meetings, field visits, training processes)</li> <li>• Pipeline integrity</li> <li>• Effectiveness of monitoring and data reporting systems</li> <li>• Use of data and other learning methods to enhance management and respond to changing conditions</li> <li>• Availability of technical expertise in CO and RB</li> <li>• Quality of staff capacity building</li> <li>• Capacity building resources within CO for transitioning programmes (e.g., school feeding)</li> <li>• Staffing consistency, performance management, gender balance</li> <li>• Regularity and effectiveness of technical backstopping</li> <li>• Timeliness of distributions</li> </ul>	<p>Project documents, e.g., SPRs, internal memos; funding, pipeline and logistics information</p> <p>WFP corporate documents</p> <p>WFP CO/RB staff</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar</p> <p>Partner organisations</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders, WFP CO and RB staff</p> <p>Direct observation of WFP CO processes and local institutional capacities in school feeding, health services, DRR, social protection</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p> <p>Process evaluation; qualitative institutional analysis</p> <p>Analysis disaggregated by project/CO process</p>	<p>Medium to high: depends on how visible evidence is made to external ET</p>

3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existence of coordination arrangements with key stakeholders</li> <li>• Whether appropriate partnerships built with the Government (at different levels) and with other actors</li> <li>• Lessons learned that can be applied to future operations especially as the new government takes over</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness of partnership coordination arrangements</li> <li>• Effectiveness of current and future partnerships in SF</li> <li>• Effectiveness of approach to developing handover strategies and capacity (e.g., school feeding)</li> <li>• Extent to which activities increased capacity of partners</li> <li>• Gender balance in WFP, partners and local management committees for WFP-supported activities</li> <li>• Staff complement reporting</li> <li>• Other efficiency and effectiveness indicators as relevant</li> </ul>				
	<p><b>Discussion of impact: (external) What are the factors affecting outcomes that are outside WFP's control?:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which external factors influence outcomes, including the operating environment; the funding climate; external incentives and pressures; etc.</li> <li>• The extent to which the government transition has and/or might impact on WFP's programmes.</li> <li>• The extent to which WFP has adapted its operations in an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of rapidly transitioning operating environment on WFP programmes</li> <li>• Capacity to make timely adjustment of project to changing circumstances</li> <li>• The extent to which the project resources situation is reflective of the larger funding trends.</li> <li>• Social/economic/political factors affecting IDPs and vulnerable communities</li> <li>• Key developments in assistance programmes (national or donor-supported) affecting IDPs and vulnerable communities</li> <li>• Impact of government transition on handover plans and sustainability of activities</li> <li>• Capacity to assume full support of programmes (e.g., school feeding)</li> <li>• The extent to which market trends affected the deliverables.</li> <li>• Local initiatives undertaken as a result of WFP-supported activities</li> </ul>	<p>Project documents, e.g., SPRs and donor reports</p> <p>WFP corporate documents</p> <p>WFP CO/RB staff</p> <p>Bi-lateral donors</p> <p>Government stakeholders from relevant ministries and divisions</p> <p>UN staff from relevant UN agencies in Myanmar</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>KIIs with national stakeholders and WFP, RB</p> <p>Direct observation of WFP CO processes</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis based on structured review of documents, assessment of primary data, and triangulation to assess consistency of evaluation findings across sources</p> <p>Process evaluation; qualitative institutional analysis</p>	High

	appropriate and timely manner to the evolving socio-political situation, funding climate and development needs in the country.					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



## Annex 6: Team composition

The following table shows the roles of the team members.

Team Members	Primary Role	Specific tasks within the Evaluation
Bruce Ravesloot	<p>Team leader</p> <p>International evaluator</p> <p>Disaster relief and recovery including food/cash assistance</p> <p>Co-lead on: Livelihoods, asset-creation, FFA/CFA</p> <p>Gender/protection (cross-cutting across activities)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design the evaluation approach and research methodology, including tools and topic guides</li> <li>• Lead and coordinate the evaluation process and team</li> <li>• Represent the team in meetings</li> <li>• Oversee and participate in field research and analysis (interviews, meetings, focus groups, literature review)</li> <li>• Draft and revise inception package, debrief presentations and evaluation report in line with EQAS</li> <li>• Lead the debriefing workshop</li> <li>• Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process</li> </ul>
Jeanne Downen	<p>International evaluator</p> <p>School feeding, capacity building</p> <p>Co-lead on: Livelihoods, asset-creation, FFA/CFA</p> <p>Gender/protection (cross-cutting across activities)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct desk review</li> <li>• Contribute to the design/ inception process (methodological approach and data collection tools)</li> <li>• Conduct field work and participate in meetings with evaluation team and stakeholders</li> <li>• Contribute to drafting and revision of evaluation products: inception package, debrief presentations, and evaluation report</li> <li>• Participate and contribute to the debriefing workshop</li> <li>• Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process</li> </ul>
Tun Wai	<p>National evaluator</p> <p>Nutrition activities (including nutrition sensitivity across components, HIV/TB)</p> <p>Gender/protection (cross-cutting across activities)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct desk review</li> <li>• Contribute to the design/ inception process (methodological approach and data collection tools)</li> <li>• Conduct field work and participate in meetings with evaluation team and stakeholders</li> <li>• Provide English-Burmese translation in Magway Region and Sittwe (Rakhine State)</li> <li>• Contribute to drafting and revision of evaluation products: inception package, debrief presentations, and evaluation report</li> <li>• Participate and contribute to the debriefing workshop</li> <li>• Provide feedback to OEV on the evaluation process</li> </ul>
Pyone Yadana Paing	<p>National Junior Researcher</p> <p>Assist on thematic areas covered by international team members, provide support on context and translation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During field mission only: Provide context briefings and translation, assist with fieldwork and notetaking, contribute to notes and debrief presentations as directed by team leader</li> <li>• Provide English-Burmese translation in Magway Region and Sittwe (Rakhine State)</li> </ul>
Jeremie Kaelin	<p>Research, report coordination and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct desk review</li> <li>• Participate in inception meetings</li> </ul>

	support (TANGO Bangkok office-based)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Contribute to methodology design and tool development, focusing on areas of expertise</li><li>• Contribute to drafting and revision of evaluating products, specific to topical coverage, including: inception report, debriefings, evaluation report</li></ul>
--	--------------------------------------	---

## Annex 7: Additional output indicator tables

**Table 1: Planned vs actual food distributed for total programme, by commodity type**

Commodity	2013			2014			2015			2016		
	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs Plan	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs Plan	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs Plan	Planned	Actual (Jan-June)	% Actual vs Plan
Rice	50,453	51,390	<b>101.9%</b>	63,475	48,947	<b>77.1%</b>	54,538	42,464	<b>77.9%</b>	38,882	13,647	<b>35.1%</b>
Beans	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	337	315	<b>93.5%</b>	5,186	1,827	<b>35.2%</b>
Peas	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	1,170	228	<b>19.5%</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Chickpeas	4,576	5,564	<b>121.6%</b>	6,807	5,739	<b>84.3%</b>	4,479	4,105	<b>91.6%</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
Oil	2,158	2,341	<b>108.5%</b>	3,305	2,451	<b>74.2%</b>	2,931	2,241	<b>76.5%</b>	2,533	862	<b>34.0%</b>
Salt	381	469	<b>123.1%</b>	567	477	<b>84.1%</b>	499	410	<b>82.2%</b>	438	150	<b>34.2%</b>
Wheat-soya blend with sugar (WSB +)	-	330	<b>Not planned, cannot calculate</b>	1,500	1,088	<b>72.5%</b>	1,704	1,154	<b>67.7%</b>	6,004	784	<b>13.1%</b>
Rice-soya blend (RSB)	1,593	1,627	<b>102.1%</b>	1,049	913	<b>87.0%</b>	918	600	<b>65.4%</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
High Energy Biscuits	330	207	<b>62.7%</b>	508	483	<b>95.1%</b>	1,518	1,080	<b>71.1%</b>	7,425	406	<b>5.5%</b>
MIX, READY TO USE SUPPLEMENTARY FOOD	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>	35	-	<b>0.0%</b>

## S01: Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies— Relief Component

**Table 2: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and distributions by food and cash, relief**

Year	Beneficiary Category	Planned					Actual (Jan-Dec)					% Actual v. Planned Beneficiaries			% Achieved by Modality	
		Beneficiaries			Modality		Beneficiaries			Modality		Male	Female	Total	Food	Cash
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)					
2013	Beneficiaries of general food distributions (GFD)	125 000	125 000	250 000	26 160	N/A	164 423	191 700	356 123	41 228	N/A	131.5%	153.4%	142.4%	157.6%	N/A
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2013</b>	<b>125 000</b>	<b>125 000</b>	250 000	<b>26 160</b>	- N/A	<b>164 423</b>	<b>191 700</b>	356 123	<b>41 228</b>	-	131.5%	153.4%	142.4%	157.6%	N/A
2014	Beneficiaries of GFD	150 000	150 000	300 000	45 672	N/A	147 330	171 100	318 430	42 647	N/A	98.2%	114.1%	106.1%	93.4%	N/A
	Beneficiaries of cash based transfers (CBT): STARTED PILOT	N/A	N/A	Not planned	N/A	N/A	289	314	603	N/A	22 315	No planned, cannot calculate				
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2014</b>	<b>150 000</b>	<b>150 000</b>	300 000	<b>45 672</b>	-	<b>147 619</b>	<b>171 414</b>	319 033	<b>42 647</b>	<b>22 315</b>	98.4%	114.3%	106.3%	93.4%	N/A
2015	Beneficiaries of GFD	362 400	347 600	710 000	50 940.4	N/A	369 672	400 477	770 149	45 206	N/A	102.0%	115.2%	108.5%	82.6%	N/A
	Beneficiaries of CBT (relief cash beneficiaries are same people as food recipients)	67 000	82 000	149 000	N/A	3 396 774	29 577	33 353	62 930	N/A	1 161 564	44.1%	40.7%	42.2%	N/A	34.2%
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2015</b>	<b>429 400</b>	<b>429 600</b>	859 000	<b>50 940</b>	<b>3 396 774</b>	<b>399 249</b>	<b>433 830</b>	<b>833 079</b>	<b>45 206</b>	<b>1 161 564</b>	93.0%	101.0%	97.0%	88.7%	34.2%
2016 (Jan-Jun)	Beneficiaries of GFD	177 168	191 932	369 100	39 742	N/A	98 214	106 399	204 613	15 251	N/A	55.4%	55.4%	55.4%	38.4%	N/A
	Beneficiaries of CBT (relief cash beneficiaries are same people as food recipients)	25 680	27 820	53 500	N/A	4 249 901	40 154	43 500	83 654	N/A	2 937 770	156.4%	156.4%	156.4%	N/A	69.1%
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2016 (Jan-June)</b>	<b>202 848</b>	<b>219 752</b>	422 600	<b>39 742</b>	<b>4 249 901</b>	<b>138 368</b>	<b>149 899</b>	<b>288 267</b>	<b>15 251</b>	<b>2 937 770</b>	68.2%	68.2%	68.2%	38.4%	69.1%
<b>Total</b>		<b>907 248</b>	<b>924 352</b>	1 831 600	<b>162 515</b>	<b>7 646 675</b>	<b>849 659</b>	<b>946 843</b>	1 796 502	<b>144 332</b>	<b>4 121 649</b>	93.7%	102.4%	98.1%	88.8%	53.9%

Notes on overlap of beneficiaries:

- 2013: 50% of nutrition beneficiaries overlap with relief; 2014: 65%; and 2015: 64%
- 2014-2015: 100% Relief cash beneficiaries overlap with relief food
- 2015: 6% Relief cash beneficiaries overlap with FFA

**S02: Support or restore food security and nutrition and establish or rebuild livelihoods in fragile settings and following emergencies— Assets Creation Component**

**Table 3: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and distributions by food and cash, assets creation**

Year	Beneficiary Category	Planned					Actual					% Actual v. Planned			% Achieved by Modality	
		Beneficiaries			Modality		Beneficiaries			Modality		Male	Female	Total	Food	Cash
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)					
<b>2013</b>	Participants in FFA-food	36 000	36 000	72 000	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	25 610	19 201	44 811	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	<b>71.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>62.2%</b>	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A
	Beneficiaries in FFA-food ( <i>participants x 5 or 6, HH size*</i> )	180 000	180 000	360 000	11 556	N/A	129 103	97 393	226 496	6 078	N/A	<b>71.7%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>53%</b>	N/A
	Participants in FFA-cash	2 000	2 000	4 000	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	1 300	948	2 248	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>47.4%</b>	<b>56.2%</b>	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>
	Beneficiaries in FFA-cash	10 000	10 000	20 000	N/A	600 000	6 519	4 721	11 240	N/A	191 887	<b>65.2%</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>56.2%</b>	N/A	<b>32%</b>
	<b>Total participants</b>	<b>38 000</b>	<b>38 000</b>	<b>76 000</b>			<b>26 910</b>	<b>20 149</b>	<b>47 059</b>			<b>70.8%</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>61.9%</b>		
	<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>190 000</b>	<b>190 000</b>	<b>380 000</b>			<b>135 622</b>	<b>102 114</b>	<b>237 736</b>			<b>71.4%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>		
<b>2014</b>	Participants in FFA-food	36 000	36 000	72 000	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	20 056	15 504	35 560	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	<b>55.7%</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A
	Beneficiaries in FFA-food	180 000	180 000	360 000	11 556	N/A	100 878	77 983	178 861	4 732	N/A	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>41%</b>	N/A
	Participants in FFA-cash	3 000	3 000	6 000	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	5529	3729	9258	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	<b>184.3%</b>	<b>124.3%</b>	<b>154.3%</b>	N/A	
	Beneficiaries in FFA-cash	15 000	15 000	30 000	N/A	900 000	27 862	18 788	46 650	N/A	805 601	<b>185.7%</b>	<b>125.3%</b>	<b>155.5%</b>	N/A	<b>90%</b>
	<b>Total participants</b>	<b>39 000</b>	<b>39 000</b>	<b>78 000</b>			<b>25 585</b>	<b>19 233</b>	<b>44 818</b>			<b>65.6%</b>	<b>49.3%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>		
	<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>195 000</b>	<b>195 000</b>	<b>390 000</b>			<b>128 740</b>	<b>96 771</b>	<b>225 511</b>			<b>66.0%</b>	<b>49.6%</b>	<b>57.8%</b>		
<b>2015</b>	Participants in FFA-food	15 000	10 000	25 000	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	9 592	7 236	16 828	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>72.4%</b>	<b>67.3%</b>	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A
	Beneficiaries in FFA-food	75 000	50 000	125 000	964.8	N/A	49 772	36 042	85 814	2 258.5	N/A	<b>66.4%</b>	<b>72.1%</b>	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>234%</b>	N/A
	Participants in FFA-cash	4 800	5 200	10 000	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	4 192	3 163	7 355	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>60.8%</b>	<b>73.6%</b>	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>
	Beneficiaries in FFA-cash	24 000	26 000	50 000	N/A	4 553 225	21 462	16 190	37 652	N/A	750 964	<b>89.4%</b>	<b>62.3%</b>	<b>75.3%</b>	N/A	<b>16%</b>
	<b>Total participants</b>	<b>19 800</b>	<b>15 200</b>	<b>35 000</b>			<b>13 784</b>	<b>10 399</b>	<b>24 183</b>			<b>69.6%</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>69.1%</b>		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>99 000</b>	<b>76 000</b>	<b>175 000</b>			<b>71 234</b>	<b>52 232</b>	<b>123</b>			<b>72.0%</b>	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>70.6%</b>		

**Table 3: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and distributions by food and cash, assets creation**

Year	Beneficiary Category	Planned					Actual					% Actual v. Planned			% Achieved by Modality	
		Beneficiaries			Modality		Beneficiaries			Modality		Male	Female	Total	Food	Cash
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)					
	<b>beneficiaries</b>								<b>466</b>							
<b>2016 (Jan-Jun)</b>	Participants in FFA-food	11 934	7 956	19 890	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	3 897	2 939	6 836	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<i>see cell below</i>	N/A
	Beneficiaries in FFA-food	59 670	39 780	99 450	3 198	N/A	19 483	14 698	34 181	540	N/A	<b>32.7%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	Participants in FFA-cash	8 400	9 100	17 500	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	11 443	8 633	20 076	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>	<b>136.2%</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>114.7%</b>	N/A	<i>see cell below</i>
	Beneficiaries in FFA-cash	42 000	45 500	87 500	N/A	2 985 000	57 217	43 163	100 380	N/A	1 587 034	<b>136.2%</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>114.7%</b>	N/A	<b>53%</b>
	<b>Total participants</b>	<b>20 334</b>	<b>17 056</b>	<b>37 390</b>			<b>15 340</b>	<b>11 572</b>	<b>26 912</b>			<b>75.4%</b>	<b>67.8%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>		
	<b>Total beneficiaries</b>	<b>101 670</b>	<b>85 280</b>	<b>186 950</b>			<b>76 700</b>	<b>57 861</b>	<b>134 561</b>			<b>75.4%</b>	<b>67.8%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>585 670</b>	<b>546 280</b>	1 131 950	<b>27 275</b>	<b>9 038 225</b>	<b>407 759</b>	<b>313 515</b>	721 274	<b>13 609</b>	<b>3 335 487</b>	<b>70.4%</b>	<b>56.6%</b>	<b>63.7%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>37%</b>

\*Note: In Pang Kham and northern Rakhine State, the family size used is 6 (note from CO to ET). This then influences the total number of beneficiaries. The male/female breakdown for beneficiaries is based on the proportion of male/female participants.

Notes on overlap of beneficiaries:

- 2013: 37% of FFA beneficiaries overlap with school feeding; 2014: 23%; and 2015: 13%
- 2015: 6% Relief cash beneficiaries overlap with FFA

**Table 4: Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted HHs and communities, by type and unit, assets creation**

Asset type	Unit	2013			2014			2015			2016		
		Planned	Actual	% Actual vs Plan	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs Plan	Planned	Actual	% Actual vs Plan	Planned	Actual (Jan-June)	% Actual vs Plan
Hectares (ha) of agricultural land benefiting from new irrigation schemes (including irrigation canal construction, specific protection measures, embankments, etc)	Ha	517	516	99.81%	326	300	92.02%	152	141	92.76%	100	Data not available	N/A
Ha of agricultural land benefiting from rehabilitated irrigation schemes	Ha	228	229	100.44%	302	259	85.76%	292	268	91.78%	268	Data not available	N/A
Ha of cultivated land treated and conserved with physical soil and water conservation measures only	Ha	2,100	2,091	99.57%	2,132	2,179	102.20%	1,800	1,468	81.56%	179	Data not available	N/A
Kilometres (km) of feeder roads built and maintained (self-help)	km	711	602	84.67%	388	380	97.94%	140	137	97.86%	27	Data not available	N/A
Km of feeder roads rehabilitated and maintained (self-help)	km	147	142	96.60%	118	114	96.61%	100	84	84.00%	174	Data not available	N/A
Volume (m3) of check dams and gully rehabilitation structures (e.g. soil sedimentation dams) constructed	m3	5,218	5,218	100.00%	8,882	12,439	140.05%	50,109	29,953	59.78%		Data not available	N/A
Volume (m3) of earth dams and flood protection dikes constructed	m3	45,756	45,596	99.65%	86,402	82,121	95.05%	115,472	90,348	78.24%	48,847	Data not available	N/A

## S04: Reduce undernutrition and break the intergenerational cycle of hunger- Nutrition and HIV/TB Component

**Table 5: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and food distributions by activity, nutrition**

Year	Beneficiary Category by Year	Planned				Actual				% Actual v. Planned			% Achieved Modality
		Beneficiaries			Modality	Beneficiaries			Modality	Male	Female	Total	Food
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)				
<b>2013</b>	<i>Prevention of Stunting</i>				549				387				70.5%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under blanket supplementary feeding (BSF)	5 640	5 640	11 280		2 842	2 750	5 592		50.4%	48.8%	49.6%	
	Pregnant and lactating women (PLW) given food under complementary feeding	N/A	4 000	4 000		N/A	2 286	2 286		N/A	57.2%	57.2%	
	<i>Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</i>				1 851				2 322				125.4%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	3 438	3 438	6 876		2 949	2 136	5 085		85.8%	62.1%	74.0%	
	Children 24 to 59 months given food under BSF	10 312	10 312	20 624		7 780	7 476	15 256		75.4%	72.5%	74.0%	
	PLW participating in BSF	N/A	8 800	8 800		N/A	6 616	6 616		N/A	75.2%	75.2%	
	<i>Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition</i>				114				75				65.8%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under targeted supplementary feeding (TSF)	1 875	1 875	3 750		1 293	1 959	3 252		69.0%	104.5%	86.7%	
Children 24 to 59 months given food under TSF	5 625	5 625	11 250		4 390	5 366	9 756		78.0%	95.4%	86.7%		
PLW given food under TSF	N/A	600	600		N/A	616	616		N/A	102.7%	102.7%		
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2013</b>	<b>26 890</b>	<b>40 290</b>	<b>67 180</b>	<b>2 514</b>	<b>19 254</b>	<b>29 205</b>	<b>48 459</b>	<b>2 784</b>	<b>71.6%</b>	<b>72.5%</b>	<b>72.1%</b>	<b>110.7%</b>
<b>2014</b>	<i>Prevention of Stunting</i>				1 008				439				43.6%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	8 700	8 700	17 400		3 629	3 776	7 405		41.7%	43.4%	42.6%	
	PLW given food under complementary feeding	N/A	6 000	6 000		N/A	4 030	4 030		N/A	67.2%	67.2%	
	<i>Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</i>				2 359				2 218				94.0%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	6 600	6 600	13 200		7 537	7 657	15 194		114.2%	116.0%	115.1%	
	Children 24 to 59 months given food under BSF	9 900	9 900	19 800		11 036	11 487	22 523		111.5%	116.0%	113.8%	
	PLW participating in BSF	N/A	9 600	9 600		N/A	12 448	12 448		N/A	129.7%	129.7%	
	<i>Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition</i>				154				33				21.4% <sup>1</sup>
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under TSF	4 000	4 000	8 000		1 672	2 508	4 180		41.8%	62.7%	52.3%	
Children 24 to 59 months given food under TSF	6 000	6 000	12 000		2 510	3 760	6 270		41.8%	62.7%	52.3%		
PLW given food under TSF	N/A	2 000	2 000		N/A	1 549	1 549		N/A	77.5%	77.5%		
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2014</b>	<b>35 200</b>	<b>52 800</b>	<b>88 000</b>	<b>3 521</b>	<b>26 384</b>	<b>47 215</b>	<b>73 599</b>	<b>2 690</b>	<b>75.0%</b>	<b>89.4%</b>	<b>83.6%</b>	<b>76.4%</b>
<b>2014 Notes:</b> <sup>1</sup> The CO notes this low achievement is due to months of rations missed from pipeline breaks in 2014.													
<b>2015</b>	<i>Prevention of Stunting</i>				478				358				74.9%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	8 200	7 800	16 000		5 218	5 703	10 921		63.6%	73.1%	68.3%	
	PLW given food under complementary feeding	N/A	8 000	8 000		N/A	6 230	6 230		N/A	77.9%	77.9%	
	<i>Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</i>				1 572				2 643				168.1%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	8 600	8 200	16 800		8 848	9 585	18 433		102.9%	116.9%	109.7%	
Children 24 to 59 months given food under BSF	13 000	12 200	25 200		13 272	14 377	27 649		102.1%	117.8%	109.7%		



**Table 5: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and food distributions by activity, nutrition**

Year	Beneficiary Category by Year	Planned				Actual				% Actual v. Planned			% Achieved Modality
		Beneficiaries			Modality	Beneficiaries			Modality	Male	Female	Total	Food
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Male	Female	Total	Food
	PLW participating in BSF	N/A	13 500	13 500		N/A	8 298	8 298		N/A	61.5%	61.5%	
	<i>Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition</i>				262				137				52.4%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under TSF	3 700	3 500	7 200		700	1 246	1 946		18.9%	35.6%	27.0%	
	Children 24 to 59 months given food under TSF	5 500	5 300	10 800		1 051	1 869	2 920		19.1%	35.3%	27.0%	
	PLW given food under TSF	N/A	3 000	3 000		N/A	1 916	1 916		N/A	63.9%	63.9%	
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2015</b>	<b>39 000</b>	<b>61 500</b>	<b>100 500</b>	<b>2 312</b>	<b>29 088</b>	<b>49 223</b>	<b>78 312</b>	<b>6 261</b>	<b>74.6%</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>77.9%</b>	<b>270.7%</b>
2016	<i>Prevention of Stunting</i>				1 008				74				7.3%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	8 802	9 536	18 338		2 102	2 468	4 570		23.9%	25.9%	24.9%	
	PLW given food under complementary feeding	N/A	9 662	9 662		N/A	3 045	3 045		N/A	31.5%	31.5%	
	<i>Prevention of Acute Malnutrition</i>				2 520				608				24.1%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under BSF	10 153	10 999	21 151		9 242	10 012	19 253		91.0%	91.0%	91.0%	
	Children 24 to 59 months given food under BSF	15 229	16 498	31 727		13 862	15 017	28 880		91.0%	91.0%	91.0%	
	PLW participating in BSF	N/A	17 122	17 122		N/A	9 803	9 803		N/A	57.3%	57.3%	
	<i>Treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition</i>				2 062				46				2.3%
	Children 6 to 23 months given food under TSF	4 582	6 874	11 456		1 320	1 979	3 299		28.8%	28.8%	28.8%	
	Children 24 to 59 months given food under TSF	6 874	10 310	17 184		1 979	2 969	4 948		28.8%	28.8%	28.8%	
PLW given food under TSF <sup>2</sup>	N/A	170	N/A		N/A	170	170		N/A	100.0%	100.0%		
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2016 (Jan-June)</b>	<b>45 640</b>	<b>81 170</b>	<b>126 810</b>	<b>5 590</b>	<b>28 505</b>	<b>45 463</b>	<b>73 968</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>
<b>2016 Notes :</b> <sup>2</sup> According to the CO, PLW treatment for MAM was not in PRRO plan for 2016, so 170 is the figure from the ACF FLA plan to continue providing for 170 PLW to support their children under six months of age in the programme. Treatment of acute malnutrition for PLW was suspended according to the mid-term review recommendation to: give priority to CU5 and to enhance skills of CPs to implement the current MAM programme instead of expanding that activity.													
<b>Total</b>		<b>146 730</b>	<b>235 760</b>	<b>382 490</b>	<b>13 938</b>	<b>103 231</b>	<b>171 106</b>	<b>274 338</b>	<b>9341</b>	<b>70.4%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	<b>71.7%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>

Notes on overlap of beneficiaries:

- 2013: 50% of nutrition beneficiaries overlap with relief; 2014: 65%; and 2015: 64%
- 2015: 0.7% overlap between MAM treatment and prevention beneficiaries

**Table 6: Planned vs actual number of nutrition sites assisted by WFP**

Type of site	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual (Jan-June)
Stunting prevention health centre	23	23	23	23	35	35	30	30
MAM treatment health centre	26	26	16	16	17	17	38	38
HIV/TB patient support health centre	29	29	30	30	45	45	132	132

**Table 7: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and food distributions, HIV/TB nutrition support**

Year	Beneficiary Category	Planned					Actual				% Actual v. Planned			% Achieved Modality	
		Beneficiaries			Modality		Beneficiaries			Modality	Cash (USD)	Male	Female	Total	Food
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)					
2013	HIV/AIDS and TB patients	8,000	8,000	16,000	1,616	N/A	6,497	5,481	11,978	1,440	N/A	81.2%	68.5%	74.9%	89%
2014	HIV/AIDS and TB patients	9,000	9,000	18,000	1,818	N/A	6,547	5,930	12,477	1,474	N/A	72.7%	65.9%	69.3%	81%
2015	HIV/AIDS and TB patients	11,000	12,000	23,000	2,019.6	N/A	7,362	5,554	12,916	1,036.2	N/A	66.9%	46.3%	56.2%	51%
2016	HIV/AIDS and TB patients (Jan to June)	11,000	12,000	23,000	4,513	N/A	4,669	3,525	8,194	753	N/A	42.4%	29.4%	35.6%	17%
<b>Total</b>		<b>39,000</b>	<b>41,000</b>	<b>80,000</b>	<b>9,966</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>25,075</b>	<b>20,490</b>	<b>45,565</b>	<b>4,704</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>57.0%</b>	<b>47%</b>

**Table 8: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and food distributions by HIV/AIDS or TB patients, HIV/TB nutrition support**

Year	Beneficiary Category	Planned 2013-2015 from annual FLA plans Planned 2016 from budget revision			Actual						% Actual v. Planned		
		Beneficiaries			Modality	Beneficiaries			Co-infection	Modality	Male	Female	Total
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Male	Female	Total		Food (MT)			
2013	HIV/AIDS & TB patients	7,850	6,688	14,538	1,616	6,497	5,481	11,978	0	1,440	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>82.0%</b>	<b>82.4%</b>
	HIV/AIDS patients	5,681	4,840	10,521	Data not available	4,953	4,179	9,132	-	Data not available	87.2%	86.3%	86.8%
	TB patients	2,169	1,848	4,017		1,544	1,302	2,846	-		71.2%	70.5%	70.8%
2014	HIV/AIDS & TB patients	7,521	6,813	14,334	1,818	6,547	5,930	12,477	3,012 <sup>61</sup>	1,474	<b>87.0%</b>	<b>87.0%</b>	<b>87.0%</b>
	HIV/AIDS patients	5,754	5,212	10,966	Data not available	4,887	4,426	9,313	-	Data not available	84.9%	84.9%	84.9%
	TB patients	1,767	1,601	3,368		1,660	1,504	3,164	-		93.9%	93.9%	93.9%
2015	HIV/AIDS & TB patients	10,051	7,582	17,633	2,020	7,362	5,554	12,916	0	1,036	<b>73.2%</b>	<b>73.2%</b>	<b>73.2%</b>
	HIV/AIDS patients	5,063	3,820	8,883	Data not available	4,235	3,195	7,430	-	Data not available	83.6%	83.6%	83.6%
	TB patients	4,987	3,763	8,750		3,127	2,359	5,486	-		62.7%	62.7%	62.7%
2016	HIV/AIDS & TB patients (Jan to June)	11,000	12,000	23,000	4,513	4,669	3,525	8,194	0	753	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>35.6%</b>
	HIV/AIDS patients	4,600	3,400	8,000	Data not available	2,680	2,024	4,704	-	Data not available	58.3%	59.5%	58.8%
	TB patients	8,600	6,400	15,000		1,989	1,501	3,490	-		23.1%	23.5%	23.3%
<b>Total</b>		<b>75,044</b>	<b>63,966</b>	<b>116,010</b>	<b>9,966</b>	<b>45,481</b>	<b>37,455</b>	<b>82,936</b>	<b>3,012</b>	<b>4,704</b>	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>71.5%</b>

<sup>61</sup> These co-infected beneficiaries are in Kachin State, according to the CO.

## S04: Reduce undernutrition and break the intergenerational cycle of hunger– School Feeding Component

**Table 9: Planned vs actual beneficiaries and food distributions by activity, school feeding**

Year	Beneficiary Category	Planned					Actual					% Actual v. Planned			% Achieved Modality
		Beneficiaries			Modality		Beneficiaries			Modality		Male	Female	Total	Food
		Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)	Male	Female	Total	Food (MT)	Cash (USD)				
2013	Children receiving take-home rations (THR)	108 333	108 334	216 667	17 316	N/A	94 132	83 475	177 607	10 191	N/A	<b>86.9%</b>	77.1%	<b>82.0%</b>	<b>58.9%</b>
	Beneficiaries of THR	216 667	216 666	433 333	N/A	N/A	188 264	166 950	355 214	N/A	N/A	<b>86.9%</b>	77.1%	<b>82.0%</b>	N/A
	Children receiving school meals (i.e., HEB)	22 000	22 000	44 000	330	N/A	15 447	15 448	30 895	207	N/A	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>62.7%</b>
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2013</b>	<b>347 000</b>	<b>347 000</b>	<b>694 000</b>	<b>17 646</b>	-	<b>297 843</b>	<b>265 873</b>	<b>563 716</b>	<b>10 398</b>	-	<b>85.8%</b>	<b>76.6%</b>	<b>81.2%</b>	<b>58.9%</b>
2014	Children receiving THR	86 666	86 666	173 332	13 853	N/A	86 481	78 027	164 508	8073	N/A	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>58.3%</b>
	Beneficiaries of THR	173 334	173 334	346 668	N/A	N/A	189 669	175 199	364 868	N/A	N/A	<b>109.4%</b>	<b>101.1%</b>	<b>105.3%</b>	N/A
	Children receiving HEB	22 000	22 000	44 000	792	N/A	27 151	26 744	53 895	483	N/A	<b>123.4%</b>	<b>121.6%</b>	<b>122.5%</b>	<b>61.0%</b>
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2014</b>	<b>282 000</b>	<b>282 000</b>	<b>564 000</b>	<b>14 645</b>	-	<b>303 301</b>	<b>279 970</b>	<b>583 271</b>	<b>8556</b>	-	<b>107.6%</b>	<b>99.3%</b>	<b>103.4%</b>	<b>58.4%</b>
2015	Children receiving THR	38 000	34 000	72 000	10 340	N/A	14 638	11 977	26 615	266	N/A	<b>38.5%</b>	<b>35.2%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
	Beneficiaries of THR	38 000	34 000	72 000	N/A	N/A	14 638	11 977	26 615	N/A	N/A	<b>38.5%</b>	<b>35.2%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	N/A
	Children receiving HEB	105 200	102 800	208 000	1 518	N/A	99 215	87 984	187 199	692	N/A	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>85.6%</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	<b>45.6%</b>
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2015<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>181 200</b>	<b>170 800</b>	<b>352 000</b>	<b>11 858</b>	-	<b>128 491</b>	<b>111 938</b>	<b>240 429</b>	<b>958</b>	-	<b>70.9%</b>	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>68.3%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
<b>2015 Notes :</b> <sup>1</sup> For 2015 actuals: Children receiving take-home rations also received school meals. The CO notes that some children receiving HEB in 2014 also received THR. It should be noted that the 2015 Beneficiaries of THR values do not follow the logic of calculation from 2013 (i.e., based on estimate of average of two children per HH to benefit from THR).															
2016	Children receiving THR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Beneficiaries of THR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Children receiving HEB	255 000	245 000	500 000	2 722	N/A	96 010	88 624	184 634	403	N/A	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>36.2%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>
	<b>Total beneficiaries 2016 (Jan-June)</b>	<b>255 000</b>	<b>245 000</b>	<b>500 000</b>	<b>2 722</b>	-	<b>96 010</b>	<b>88 624</b>	<b>184 634</b>	<b>403</b>	-	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>36.2%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>

<b>Total</b>		<b>1 065 200</b>	<b>1 044 800</b>	<b>2 110 000</b>	<b>46 871</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>825 645</b>	<b>746 406</b>	<b>1 572 050</b>	<b>20 315</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>71.4%</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>43.3%</b>
--------------	--	----------------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------	----------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------	----------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Notes on overlap of beneficiaries:

- 2013: 37% of FFA beneficiaries overlap with school feeding; 2014: 23%; and 2015: 13%

**Table 10: Planned vs actual number of schools assisted by WFP**

	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual (Jan-June)
School feeding sites	1,821	1,791	2,038	1,983	1,837	1,820	3,221	1,855

**Office of Evaluation**  
[www.wfp.org/evaluation](http://www.wfp.org/evaluation)



**World Food Programme**