Context

• Lower-middle income economy: half population in poverty, most severe in northeast, northwest

• Mass displacement due to conflict since 2009

• Worsened pre-existing chronic food and nutrition insecurity

• In 2016–2017, over 3 million people in IPC phase from 3 to 5

• 7.1 million people in need of humanitarian assistance
WFP in Northeast Nigeria

Operations included:

• Regional Emergency Operation (in Nigeria)
• Two Special Operations
• Immediate Response EMOP
• Immediate Response Preparation
Activities evolved over time:

• Government Capacity strengthening (2015)
• Pilot Cash-Based Transfers (2016)
• Food and nutrition security assistance (March 2016)
• Targeted nutrition support (June 2016)
• Livelihood recovery activities commenced (Oct 2017)
Data collection methods

- Field missions
- Review of data from standard project and other reports
- Focus group discussions
- Key informant interviews
Findings – Alignment

- Broadly appropriate **emergency response**
- Well-adapted **nutrition strategy**
- Appropriate **cash-based response** but assessment of delivery mechanism was inadequate
- Close attention to risk management but important **protection risks** not addressed
- Important opportunities for **gender analysis** were missed
- Challenges in compliance with **humanitarian principles**
Findings – Performance

- Limited progress in **national capacity development**
- Rapid and **impressive scale-up**, with some shortfalls in targets and little evidence of outcomes
- Inadequate attention to **gender**
- Delivery and utility of **common services** commendable
- Rapid scale-up affected the **quality of programmes**
Findings – Influencing Factors

- **Political factors** delayed WFP’s decision to become operational in Nigeria

- Operations relatively **well-funded**

- Pivotal **role of the regional bureau** to establish in-country operations

- **Frequent changes** in country office leadership and other staffing challenges

- Increased **humanitarian access** but remains constrained

- Engagement with government coordination mechanisms compounded by **unclear responsibilities across multiple institutions**
Conclusions

- Rapid scale-up but not before famine-like conditions had occurred
- Scale-up underpinned by recruitment of national staff and effective supply chain
- WFP was slower to deliver a high-quality response
- Lack of programmatic oversight due to frequent changes in senior leadership
- In common with UN as a whole, WFP struggled to adhere to humanitarian principles
Conclusions

Opportunities to further develop and strengthen coordination and partnership approaches

Limited progress in building national capacities demands greater investment

A more robust approach needed to provide beneficiaries with sustainable livelihood opportunities

Life-saving assistance is a continuing priority
Recommendations

1. Enhance coverage and preparedness for major emergencies in non-presentation countries
2. Strengthen corporate capacity for rapid emergency deployment
3. Strengthen support for national capacity in emergencies
4. Maintain a core strategic focus on addressing the immediate needs of affected populations in northeast Nigeria
5. Promote the application of humanitarian principles and equal access to assistance
6. Reinforce gender mainstreaming
7. Improve targeting