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WFP response features

• 7 million targeted / year
• 18 percent of the WFP 2015-2017 requirements
• 65 percent funded overall
• > USD 1 billion of expenditures / year
• General Food / Basic Needs Assistance reached 82 percent of total beneficiaries
  ✓ Syria: 98% in-kind
  ✓ Region: 98% in Cash-based transfers (CBT)
Key findings

Q 1 – Partnerships & Synergies

- Generous, conscientious, and leading partner
- Some [resolving] tensions in CBT partnerships
- Expanding typology of partnerships – (financial service providers, private sector)
- S+5 model appropriate for advocacy & coordination, less so for lessons’ learning

Q 2 – Alignment to needs

- Modalities appropriate to context
- Most activities highly appropriate to needs – resilience activities less so
- Enhanced food security analysis, targeting and prioritization [since 2014 evaluation]
- Areas for improvement: cross-cutting issues, engagement with Affected Populations
Key findings - II

Q 3 – Efficiency

• Highly efficient
  ✓ in time and cost
  ✓ in-kind and CBT
• Innovative supply chain in Syria: highly efficient and effective
• Innovative at scale CBT ensures reliable transfers to target populations in refugee-hosting countries

Q 4 – Results

Outputs

• 105% of target population achieved
• 66% of planned tonnage delivered
• 72% of planned CBT value delivered

Outcomes

• GFA food security indicators targets fully met
• Other activities (school feeding, nutrition, and resilience) showing initial positive trends
Key findings - III

Q 4 – [Additional] results

• Increased access for all humanitarian actors in Syria
• Considerable economic contributions to regional economy
• Technological knowledge shared in host countries

• International Humanitarian Principles (IHP) adhered to with some challenges to operational independence in their application at local level
• Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) mechanisms not fully meeting wider needs, concerns and expectations
Conclusions

WFP stayed, delivered and achieved aims and objectives

- Timely
- Efficient
- Effective
- Sophisticated
- At-scale
- Adaptive response
Conclusions

Some blind spots

• Limited line-of-sight to beneficiaries (and their concerns)
• Resilience activities not adapted to context but emerging gains
• WFP capacity for tracking and ensuring full adherence to the IHP application by partners at local level
• Lack of adequate staff and attention to Gender – Protection – APP
Recommendations

Strengthen capacity & systems for **APP**

**Focus & mainstream** gender

**Reinforce protection capacities**

Build capacities to ensure adherence to **humanitarian principles**

**Develop a regional knowledge management strategy**

**Define a regional vision for the future**